THE REPRESENTATION OF CLASS-INFLECTED MASCULINITY

IN CONTEMPORARY TURKISH CINEMA

GÜRSEL KAHRAMAN

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2019

THE REPRESENTATION OF CLASS-INFLECTED MASCULINITY

IN CONTEMPORARY TURKISH CINEMA

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Critical and Cultural Studies

by

Gürsel Kahraman

Boğaziçi University

2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Gürsel Kahraman, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;

- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;

- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature...

Date ...13.05.2019.................................

ABSTRACT

The Representation of Class-Inflected Masculinity in Contemporary Turkish Cinema

This study aims to analyse the representation of masculinity, with a specific focus on disentangling the relationship between masculinity and class in contemporary Turkish cinema, by exploring four movies that have been produced during the last decade and received international recognition. It borrows the concept of hegemonic masculinity to characterize and locate the kinds of masculinities that are represented in the films *Winter Sleep* (*Kış Uykusu*) (2014) and *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* (*Bir Zamanlar Anadolu'da*) (2011) by Nuri Bilge Ceylan, *Majority* (*Çoğunluk*) (2010) by Seren Yüce and *Beyond the Hill* (*Tepenin Ardı*) (2012) by Emin Alper. Pierre Bourdieu's formulation of cultural and symbolic capital is also employed to demonstrate class denominators. Consequently, the thesis merges practices that stem from class status with masculinities, in order to locate them at the very juncture of class and gender. Through this conceptualization, this study argues that there are certain notions that are intrinsic to class statuses which are incorporated with gender, specifically masculinity. From this perspective, class status is intrinsic to the mode of masculinity in gender relations as depicted in these representative films from the canon of contemporary Turkish cinema.

ÖZET

Çağdaş Türk Sinemasında Sınıf Üzerinden Oluşturulan Erkekliklerin Temsilleri

Bu çalışma erkeklik rollerini son on yılda çekilmiş ve uluslararası olarak tanınmış Türk filmlerindeki temsili üzerinden ve erkeklik ile sosyal sınıf arasındaki ilişkiye odaklanarak analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Hegemonik erkeklik konsepti bu çalışmada Nuri Bilge Ceylan'ın *Kış Uykusu* (2014) *ve Bir Zamanlar Anadolu'da* (2011), Seren Yüce'nin *Çoğunluk* (2010) ve Emin Alper'in *Tepenin Ardı* (2012), filmlerinde erkekliklerin nasıl temsil edildiğini tespit etmek için kullanılmıştır. Bununla birlikte, Pierre Bourdieu'nun kültürel ve sembolik kapital konseptleri de sınıf statülerini belirten pratikleri ortaya çıkarmak için kullanılmıştır. Tezin amacı bu iki ana konsept üzerinden, sınıf statüsü ile erkeklik rollerini birleştirerek, sınıf ile toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin kesişim noktasını tespit etmektir. Bu kavramlar üzerinden, sınıf ile iç içe geçmiş olan toplumsal cinsiyete, özellikle de erkekliğe ait bazı olguların ve pratiklerin olduğunu ileri sürmektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Emine Fişek for her academic guidance and her tremendous help with my research. I will always be grateful for her help especially during the times whenever I ran into a trouble spot or had a question about my research.

I would also like to thank Prof. Işıl Baş for introducing me to the academically stimulating field of Cultural Studies. Without her passionate dedication to the field and academia, this study would not have been successfully done.

I am also grateful to Assist. Prof. Başak Demirhan for her positive attitude and constructive feedback. Her challenging questions made it possible for me to consider other angles.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to analyse the representation of masculinity, with a specific focus on disentangling the relationship between masculinity and class in contemporary Turkish cinema, by exploring four movies that have been produced during the last decade and received international recognition and awards. The movies I have chosen for this study are Nuri Bilge Ceylan's *Winter Sleep* (*Kış Uykusu*) (2014) and *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* (*Bir Zamanlar Anadolu'da*) (2011), Seren Yüce's *Majority* (*Çoğunluk*) (2010) and Emin Alper's *Beyond the Hill* (*Tepenin Ardı*) (2012). Ceylan's *Winter Sleep* was awarded the Palme d'Or and *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* was awarded the Grand Jury Prize at the Cannes Film Festival, among many other prizes. Likewise, *Majority* and *Behind the Hill* were both awarded with various international and national awards. Among other prizes, *Majority* won the best film and best director prizes at the Antalya Golden Orange Film Festival and it was also awarded the Luigi De Laurentiis Award at the Venice Film Festival in 2010. Similarly, *Beyond the Hill* was awarded with the best film, best director and best screenplay prizes at the Ankara International Film Festival in 2013, it also won the Caligari Film Award at the Berlin International Film Festival in 2012. These movies problematize social phenomena such as masculinity, its relation to and function in the Turkish family, and structures of institutional power and hierarchy.

From a historical point of view, the military coup that took place on September 12, 1980 engendered long-term political instability and impacted a variety of artistic fields, including Turkish cinema. After the political turmoil of the 1980s, the Turkish film industry was revived in the 1990s, a period that is considered the

turning point for Turkish cinema (Aslı Daldal, 2014 and Savaş Aslan, 2010). Yavuz Turgul's *The Bandit* (*Eşkiya*) (1996) is acknowledged as the movie that started the ¨new Turkish cinema¨, which marks the revival of Turkish cinema through new practices: with the adoption of an open-market system and technological advancements, studios began to produce special effects similar to those employed in Hollywood movies. However, as Daldal points out, apart from commercial films, art house movies began to thrive as well and *Somersault in a Coffin* (*Tabutta Rövaşata*, Derviş Zaim) (1996) is considered the movie that initiated the new art house movies period for the Turkish film industry (Daldal, 2014.). Notable directors of this period were Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Derviş Zaim, Yeşim Ustaoğlu, Zeki Demirkubuz, Reha Erdem and Semih Kaplanoğlu. Daldal asserts that these directors distanced themselves from the framework of the traditional Turkish film industry, commonly referred to as Yeşilçam. The period before the new Turkish cinema, known as the Yeşilçam era, was marked with its high speed of production. As Aslan points out, during this period producers would pre-emptively plan the number of movies that they were going to produce in any given year. In this rapid production system, movie plots were usually adapted from both national and international texts. Among many others, Turkish texts such as Kerime Nadir's *Samanyolu*, Reşat Nuri Güntekin's *Yaprak Dökümü* and *Çalıkuşu* and Rıfat Ilgaz's *Hababam Sınıfı* were adapted to the screen. Plots that derived and borrowed some elements from George Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion* were also prominent. Moreover, interpreting foreign movies with national codes and adapting them into the Turkish cultural context was also a frequently employed strategy. Some of the examples of this method of adaptation include Arthur Hiller's *Love Story* (1970) which was adapted as *Our Love Story* (*Aşk Hikayemiz*) in 1986 and Robert Wise's *The Sound of Music* which was adapted as

You Are an Angel (*Sen Bir Meleksin*) in 1969. The rapid production cycle and concern for box office success led the producers to recycle previously successful plots by adapting them over and over again with minor differences. In order to create a cultural coherence between the audience and the movies, directors included cultural codes. From the point of gender and masculinity, heroic masculinities were the dominant male role in 1970s Turkish cinema with Cüneyt Arkın's Malkoçoğlu and Kartal Tibet's Tarkan movies. Although some of these heroic masculinity codes were retained in different movies in the 1980s, different types of masculinities were also represented in political drama movies. However, in Yeşilçam melodramas a bifurcated pattern of masculinity was prominent. In hackneyed films based on the "rich girl poor guy" formula, male characters were defined through their financial status; the ¨poor guy¨ was usually portrayed as a man with incorruptible ideals, and rich men were depicted as evil villains. Moreover, in these melodramas, the leading actors were portrayed as good looking, brave, honest and hardworking men and this stereotype was fortified with their heterosexuality. "

However, the aforementioned directors working in the era of "new Turkish cinema" have found new ways to finance their movies; these include transnational funds such as Eurimages, which is the cultural support fund of the Council of Europe and the financial resources associated with the prizes offered by prominent film festivals. After Ceylan's success at the Cannes Film Festival with *Distant* (*Uzak*) in 2003, young directors have started to follow his path. This proliferation has paved the way for movies featuring diversified subjects that contrast with the products of the Yeşilçam Era. In this period, directors have focused on and portrayed different social situations and issues in relation to both the individual and society. Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Yeşim Ustaoğlu, Zeki Demirkubuz and Derviş Zaim, as distinguished

directors of new Turkish cinema, have concentrated on the reflection of global issues on the local Turkish context, with a particular focus on Turkey's unique position between the East and the West. For instance, Zeki Demirkubuz's movies depict alienated individuals in juxtaposition to society in order to underline their incompatibility; Nuri Bilge Ceylan underlines social problems related to the family, personal integrity, and social relationships and seeks to show how these domains affect the individual by contrasting the interactions of local and global social dynamics. From a similar thread, Yeşim Ustaoğlu contrasts the Turkish past and the present through both social and political points of views. Adding to that, Derviş Zaim addresses the concepts of belonging, guilt, and conscience and criticizes the status quo through irony.

The men's role in these social situations and issues has further been problematized by contemporary movies that represent male characters in a wide range of conditions. For instance, Uğur Yücel's *Toss Up* (*Yazı Tura*) (2004*)*, depicts two veterans of military service, who are trying to cope with the loss of their bodily integrity and as a consequence they feel that their masculinity is threatened. Zeki Demirkubuz's movies also portray men in distress, unsteady and vulnerable. Mehmet Binay's *Zenne Dancer* (*Zenne*) (2012) represents a gay man who struggles against social and heterosexual norms. Ali Aydın's *Mold* (*Küf*)'s (2012) portrayal of a father raises questions about the stereotypically powerful, proud and heroic father figure faced with political changes and state bureaucracy. From a similar perspective, in Nuri Bilge Ceylan's *Three Monkeys* (*Üç Maymun*) (2008) the conception of the father that upholds his family's ¨honour¨ and devotion through his wife is questioned by way of an economic and moral dilemma. These examples demonstrate how men and masculinity have been represented in contemporary Turkish cinema, in contrast

to the one-dimensional portrayal of men in Yeşilçam melodramas. One of the aims of this study is to analyse how masculinities are formed and maintained in the aforementioned movies, and the practices and traits through which masculinity is established.

In this new era of Turkish cinema, masculinity has been represented through different perspectives. However, the movies I have chosen for the study incorporate the class and masculinity together through variety of social locations. In order to define masculinity's relation with class, different class positions ought to be considered. It becomes possible through the juxtaposition of lower class and upper class statuses in the movies. From this perspective, while *Winter Sleep* represents an aristocrat in relation to working class in a feudal setting, *Beyond the Hill* represents inner class relations in a similar setting. *Majority*, on the other hand, focuses on the issues of internal migration and its consequences through economic and production relations. It paves the way for analysing and locating masculinities in this dynamic relations. *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* highlights the public domain and how it is constructed predominantly male. In its highly categorical structure, how masculine subjects interact with each other and how their titles affect those interactions are demonstrated as well. Furthermore, these movies generate a geographical transition; *Winter Sleep* and *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* take place in Central Anatolia and *Beyond the Hill* illustrates Aegean region and finally, *Majority* takes place in Istanbul. Through that transition, it becomes possible to consider different masculinities that are disseminated throughout Turkey.

Moreover, in these movies, the intersections of class and masculinity are represented in relation to urban vs rural, local vs global and religious, national vs secular. For instance, *Winter Sleep* and *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* contrast the

concepts of rural and urban by situating the urban within a rural setting. *Majority,* on the other hand, positions certain local cultural codes and symbols within an urban context. *Beyond the Hill* and *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* also problematize these codes and symbols within a rural setting. The contrast between religion and secularity and the concepts of family and institutions are also prevailing themes in these movies. Through that angle, these movies provide wide coverage of the key dynamics that surround class and masculinity in the Turkish context. It is vital for this study because masculinity and more broadly gender, cannot be fully understood outside of the question of class because class as a social structure is a dynamic concept that underlines an individual's social position. This social position is engendered and obtained through different and multi-layered strategies. There are symbolic values that are assigned to social domains and they depend on historical, socio-economic and cultural contexts. For instance, in a more rural and agricultural setting, the land itself has a certain importance in the relations of production, which generate a symbolic value over the land. This symbolic value resonates through the social stratum and becomes a sign of social position, thus engendering a certain hierarchy through the comparison of those who possess land and those who lack it. Conversely, in a modern and urban society, expertise in a certain field has a symbolic value because it carries exchange value. In this sense, the value of the field and the degree of the expertise generate systems of values and they become attached to the field. From this perspective, urban or rural contexts, which are themselves encompassed by different sub-contexts, affect the means by which class signifiers are expressed. The movies chosen for this study, represent certain themes by juxtaposing them in similar social contexts. Therefore, what these movies present makes it

possible to locate social positions with their components and then pinpoint the intersection of class and masculinities in a broader context.

This study's focus on masculinity and class is not accidental. Contemporary Turkish art-house movies portray different social circumstances and problematize diverse issues. Among these issues, the prevalent ones are family, politics, hierarchy, class and ethnicity through their relationship to gender in general and masculinity in particular. Although Turkish masculinity has been studied from different perspectives in both society and on the screen, its relation to class has not been a prominent research topic. This study, which takes masculinity as its focus, also aims to focus on its relationship to class. In this context, class is delineated as a social position in which certain factors are at play simultaneously. Social class is not determined by economic wealth alone and it is expressed through diverse practices such as manners, the use of language, one's influence on others, and one's social networks. How do these denominators of class interact with masculinity? Do they effect how masculinity is performed?

Moreover, considering Turkey's specific socio-economic and socio-cultural changes in the last two decades, the relationships that these movies problematize and represent become more important. Starting with the first post-coup elections of 1983, Turkey started to adopt liberal economic policies and was integrated into the global marketplace, especially in the areas of communication, finance and trade. In the aftermath of the 2001 economic crisis, Turkey started to follow neoliberal policies as well and İzak Atiyas and Ozan Bakış (2015) demonstrate how this period witnessed structural change in economic and industrial policy in Turkey. Economic changes resonated through different political, social and cultural areas as well. One of the remarkable changes occurred in this period is related to urbanization, especially in

Istanbul. Binnur Oktem Unsal (2015), Zeynep Merey Enlil (2011) and Asu Aksoy (2012) emphasize the political policy of globalization through urban regeneration in Istanbul. More importantly, these studies underline the political aspiration of making Istanbul a global city and the effects of this aspiration on daily life. Economic growth had a positive impact across different sectors but, as Atiyas and Bakış point out, it was not equally distributed across different regions (Atiyas and Bakış, 2015). The unevenness of Turkey's economic development caused many people to migrate internally in search of better jobs; in return this engendered a socio-economic and socio-cultural shift.

Needless to say, this high-speed social mobility has affected both political and civil culture and made it increasingly difficult to locate singular categorical notions of masculinity and class. For example, Cenk Özbay, Marak Erol, Ayşecan Terzioğlu and Umut Turem (2016) analyse the sociohistorical changes and their effects of modern-day neoliberal Turkey. While they attempt to conceptualize the dynamics of the modern Turkey, they examine the important role of culture and its domain in order to comprehend how power actually operates and circulates in everyday life. They also underline how domains of conduct among people, groups and institutions have been redefined and reordered under neoliberalism (Özbay et al., 2016). From this point of view, class becomes a domain that, this socio-historical and socio-cultural changes can be located in a broader context and it also enables us to engage these notions with other domains, such as gender. Özbay's study (2016) of a new urban male subjectivity demonstrates the intricacies of the construction of neoliberal masculinity in urban Turkey. He locates neoliberal masculinity, with its ambivalent character, in the politics and culture (Özbay, 2016). From the same vein,

class occupies a central or centripetal position that we can detect how masculinity is constructed and performed through it.

Since cinema cannot be separated from the social influences and contexts in which it is produced, social shifts or problems can be observed in the films that are produced during a particular period. Graeme Turner states that, culture has become to be redefined as the process which constructs society's way of life and films has become one of the prime targets for cultural research as it is a part of a culture (Turner, 1999, p.48). From this perspective, in order to understand better how social notions such as gender, masculinity, class, power and relations of production are parts of cultural systems, analysing cinema as a specific means of producing and reproducing cultural significance has become vital.

This study consists of two main sections. In the first part, in order to outline and locate masculinity within a critical framework, basic concepts such as sex and gender difference, masculinity, and hegemonic masculinity are discussed. This chapter emphasizes masculinity as a social structure and a position that is naturalized through certain practices. It is constructed in relation to women and other men. Following this thread, how masculinity and hegemonic masculinity are studied in the Turkish context is also discussed. After establishing how gender functions as a central axis of social difference, its relationship to masculinity and class is outlined. The following sections outline the research trends that focus on masculinity in Turkish cinema. This part aims to explain how certain concepts engender masculinity and its representation. For instance, the relationship between masculinity and violence, hegemonic masculinity and its representation, and the crisis of masculinity are prevalent themes in these studies, but masculinity has not been analysed vigorously through the lens of class and the ramifications of their collaboration.

9

Subsequently, the next chapter of this study first aims to locate masculinity in relation to class, and second it aims to deconstruct the elements of class from masculinity in order to reveal how these two social structures interact with each other.

CHAPTER 2

SEX, GENDER AND MASCULINITY

In order to analyse masculinities, the difference between sex and gender ought to be explained briefly. Gender scholars note that biological difference is often associated with reproductive organs and the social interpretations of this difference is then attached to anatomical bodies. This binary opposition not only engenders the distinction between men and women in terms of biological sex, but it also marks and assigns certain practices to those physiological bodies. For instance, in the Turkish context, men have to serve in the military because their bodies are presumed to be stronger than women's, they are also required to be circumcised in order to be accepted as a man in the society. Moreover, they are expected to be breadwinners and provide for their families; when they fail to do so, they are perceived as less manly. This aspect of masculinity in Turkish society underlines that there is a direct correlation between breadwinning and masculinity. Women, on the other hand, are expected to take care of the household and children because they are assumed to be nurturing and selfless, they cannot work outside the home because presumably they are not strong enough. Although the notions that women are ¨born¨ to become mothers and men are the breadwinners have declined with the advancements in feminist studies, a recent study shows that most Turkish families are still male-centred and the assumption that the physiological bodies we have define our roles in society is still prevalent. (H.B. Boratav, G.O. Fişek, H.E. Ziya, 2018). These assumptions inscribe meanings on the body and social roles are engendered through certain practices and discourses that surround these inscriptions.

The social and cultural aspects of genders also refer to a process of construction. From this perspective, the historical, psychological and cultural contexts of gender cannot be denied. Prior to the growth of gender studies, femininity and masculinity were the gender roles that were accepted as the basic oppositions. Pierre Bourdieu explains how this bifurcation has affected other oppositions and in return, dichotomous categories have been accepted (Bourdieu, 2002). Through this binary opposition, personal traits such as dominant – submissive, strong – weak, logical – emotional etc. have all been inscribed with reference to genders, which in turn are considered to be the natural expression of the biological characteristics of anatomical bodies. Simone de Beauvoir suggests in The Second Sex that one is not born a woman, but rather, becomes one (Beauvoir, 1956). In other words, one is born with male or female reproductive organs but these bodies are engrossed with the cultural and social meanings of these distinctions, thus rendering masculinity and femininity both equal to the physical body and the natural consequence of biology. In this process, the cultural definitions and interpretations associated with biological sex play a big role, so that an individual's role is defined and prescribed in a given society.

Against the essentialist standpoint that assumes that biology determines gender difference, scholars like Simone de Beauvoir, Judith Butler and Luce Irigaray have pointed out that gender is a system of organizing difference. Judith Butler also asserts that biological differences acquire their meanings because of the social organization of genders (Butler, 1999). Social practices inform individuals' physiological bodies and shape their experiences; therefore, social practices and physical bodies are inseparable. From the same standpoint, Kessler and McKenna

claim that the social construction of gender and gender attribution is the grounding

for all scientific work on gender (Kessler, 1985).

2.1 Masculinity

Masculinity, like its counterpart femininity, is also culturally and socially constructed

and it is usually inscribed on the male body. The first attempts to theorize maleness

and masculinity focused on the male sex role. The general concept of sex roles

connects the elements of social structures with cultural norms. R.W. Connell, as one

of the most prominent and pioneering scholars in the field of masculinity studies,

points out that there is a general set of expectations which are attached to one's sex

and in sex role theory, there are always two sex roles; when these sex roles are

learned socially, they are internalized by an individual (Connell, 2005).

Since sex role theory emphasizes a process of learning which results in

internalization, this social aspect of sex role theory indicates possible changes in

these roles, because the social conditions that form sex roles are also subject to

change, and through social processes, agencies of socialization might form new roles

differently. The main problem with sex role theory was that it assumed that there was

a harmony between sex role norms and cultural norms or social institutions. In

return, Joseph Pleck criticized this normative understanding of sex role theory

because its function was becoming so deeply rooted in gender politics (Pleck, 2010).

In order to understand how masculinity and maleness became attached to

each other, researchers R.W. Connell, Joseph Pleck and Jeff Hearn turned to history.

Studying histories and changes in social relations led these scholars to understand

how presumed masculinities were actually produced for and through political, social,

economic and cultural strategies. With the increase of ethnological research in

different disciplines, masculinity researchers tried to identify differences and similarities between cultures and their interpretations of maleness, in order to understand whether there was a universal structure to masculinity. As Connell points out, although there are some psychological similarities, especially in regard to the functioning of what Sigmund Freud called the Oedipal complex, we cannot speak of a universal masculinity because some cultures do not consider masculinity as a sex role at all (Connell, 2005).

As sociological studies on masculinity developed, especially in industrialized countries, scholars focused on discovering masculinities in different contexts and its relation to other social structures. Scholars Frank Barrett, Lynne Segal, Scott Fabius Kiesling, Katherine Wood and Rachel Jewkes have focused on masculinity in relation to power and oppression in different fields, such as the military and language. Additionally, the relationship between masculinity and violence has been an important theme of masculinity studies, with violence examined both in relation to the oppression of women and other masculinities and in its function as a political tool. David Collinson and Jeff Hearn, Alan Segal, and Richard Majors have also explained how masculinities in public domains, work places, schools and sports are established and how they are conducted. As a result of these studies, sex role theory became less relevant because scholars asserted that masculinities are not formed concordantly with cultural norms and that the process is more complex. These sociological and ethnographical studies led to the discovery that masculinities are constructed in interaction with other phenomena. Following that, it became more important to analyse how masculinity as a social construct is in inextricable relationship with other social factors, such as institutions, class, race and ethnicity.

Focusing on gender's interaction with other social structures paved the way for masculinity to be located within cultural and historical contexts. Connell points out the relationship between different masculinities and she suggests that we ought to focus on the ¨relations of alliance, dominance and subordination¨ (Connell, 2005.) that are involved in different contexts. The relationship between masculinities is also similar to gender politics because in masculine interaction there are strategies of exclusion and inclusion, intimidation and exploitation. From this perspective, masculinity as a gender practice is not only socially constructed but it also constructs social practices in ways that engender hierarchical relationships in turn. This patriarchal ideology legitimizes different types of violence, but mainly towards women and non-hegemonic forms of masculinity.

Since masculinity as a social practice is inscribed on men's bodies, it is crucial to understand how male bodies function in this social structure. Connell focuses on how male bodies are discussed, and she identifies two common strategies: In the first approach, the body is perceived as a ¨natural machine¨ and gender difference is justified through genetic, biological differences. The second approach, however, considers the body as a ¨neutral surface¨ on which social interpretations of gender concepts are inscribed. Following these two body models, a third type has emerged, which considers how both biological and sociological influences form gender jointly. However, Connell argues that these notions are not enough to comprehend the relationship between male bodies and masculinity (Connell, 2005.) In return, she offers a different explanation in which the physical aspect of maleness and femaleness is at the core of cultural interpretations of gender. She asserts that gender has its ties to the ways individuals conduct their lives and these ties are inextricable, thus, ¨masculine gender is a certain feel to the skin, certain muscular

shapes and tensions, certain postures and ways of moving, certain possibilities in

sex¨ (Connell, 2005.)

Moreover, Connell offers a three-fold model to analyse and understand the

relationship between masculinities and their relations to other social structures. This

three-fold model consists of power, production and cathexis (emotional attachment):

> Power relations: The main axis of power in the contemporary
> European / American gender order is the overall subordination of
> women and dominance of men –[it is] the structure [that]
> Women's Liberation named 'patriarchy' …
> Production relations: Equal attention should be paid to the
> economic consequences of gender divisions of labour, the
> dividend accruing to men from unequal shares of the products of
> social labour.
> Cathexis: …when we consider desire in Freudian terms, as
> emotional energy being attached to an object, its gendered
> character is clear. This is true both for heterosexual and
> homosexual desire. The practices that shape and realize desire are
> thus an aspect of the gender order (Connell, 2005, p.74).

This three-fold system of analysis provides us, as Connell suggests, with the

possibility of going beyond the question of gender. Social structures and practices

cannot be fully understood without a sound analysis of gender. Michael Kimmel

agrees with Connell on power relations:

> Manhood is equated with power-over women, over other men.
> Everywhere we look, we see the institutional expression of that
> power – in state and national legislatures, on the boards of
> directors of every major U.S corporation or law firm, and in every
> school and hospital administration (Kimmel, 2005, p.39).

More importantly, Connell's scheme paves the way to fully grasp the dynamic

system of gender. Following this model, various types of relations between

masculinities become visible, including the four key concepts that will be underlined

in the following section: hegemony, subordination, complicity and marginalization.

In the meantime, Connell calls this three-step process of power, production and

cathexis, gender socialization. The process of gender socialization also includes tools

of teaching, appropriation and normalization. In this system, individuals learn the shared values and norms that are assigned to bodies and genders. Gender socialization lays the foundation for an individual to develop their identity and therefore, intensify the already-existing dichotomous gender roles. Butler (1999), West and Zimmerman (1987) draw attention to how individuals ¨perform¨ their gender in a society. Butler suggests that by constantly performing what is expected socially, individuals are persuaded to believe that genders are innate and they emerge from the body, and are therefore natural (Butler, 2009.) By underlining the performative aspect of gender, Butler adds another dimension to the debate around masculinity.

CHAPTER 3

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY

One of Connell's most significant contributions is her use of the concept of

hegemony, which is borrowed from Marxist intellectual Antonio Gramsci.

Hegemony is an approach for studying dynamic class structures. In Gramsci's

understanding, hegemony refers to a group that leads a society by engendering a

system of domination through economic and cultural practices. Similar to a cultural

hegemony, masculinity is also a system that can be employed by groups of men as a

gender practice, thus generating a hegemonic position of masculinity in the gender

order. Importantly, this hegemonic position is not always occupied by the most

powerful people in a given society, as actors, athletes or singers may appear at the

top of this ranked system.

According to Connell, hegemonic masculinity can be established only if there

is some correspondence between a cultural ideal and an institutional power,

collective if not individual (Connell, 2005.). One of the most important aspects of a

hegemonic system is that it is an integral part of a dynamic system, because the

conditions that created or caused a certain type of masculinity to become the

hegemonic one can change, or hegemonic masculinity might be challenged by

another group of men or women. Connell's system provides a very useful tool to

point out and extricate the strategies that masculine groups employ. In a similar vein,

Michael Kimmel also defines hegemonic masculinity as the following:

> All masculinities are not created equal; or rather, we are all
> created equal, but any hypothetical equality evaporates quickly
> because our definitions of masculinity are not equally valued in
> our society. One definition of manhood continues to remain the
> standard against which other forms of manhood are measured and
> evaluated. Within the dominant culture, the masculinity that

defines white, middle-class, early middle-aged heterosexual men
is the masculinity that sets the standards for other men, against
which other men are measures and, more often than not, found
wanting (Kimmel, 2005, p.30).

Kimmel underlines the social aspect of gender by pointing out society's influence on

how one kind of masculinity is often valued more than others. Through this process,

hegemonic masculinity becomes the point of assessment of other masculinities in a

society. His analysis of hegemonic masculinity with regards to the dominant culture

would resonate in the Turkish context with a figure who is heterosexual, circumcised

has completed his military service, is married and possibly has children. Apart from

these notions, economic welfare would be another assessment and comparison point

for hegemonic masculinity in the Turkish context, mainly because, while

breadwinning would mark someone as hegemonic in the family setting, outside of

the family it wouldn't guarantee the same effect.

Precisely in the same way that masculinity is an integral part of femininity,

we cannot speak of hegemony without its counterpart, subordination. In order for one

group or type of men to take the hegemonic position, other groups ought to be

subordinated. In the process of subordination, different kinds of practices might be

employed politically, culturally and linguistically. The most prominent practices

associated with hegemonic masculinity are exclusion, oppression and appropriation.

Connell asserts that the most important case in European / American societies is the

dominance of heterosexual men and the subordination of homosexual men (Connell,

2005.) As Connell and Kimmel assert, however, the equation does not simply

involve a dichotomy between the hegemonic position and a subordinated group;

there may be other groups that do not occupy a subordinate position. Connell

identifies that these groups have a relationship of complicity with the hegemonic

group, as she explains; ¨Masculinities constructed in ways that realize the patriarchal

dividend, without the tension or risks of being the frontline troops of patriarchy, are complicit in this sense¨ (Connell, 2005.). From this perspective, hegemony, subordination and complicity are integral parts of the relationship between different types of masculinities.

All of these relations are indispensable parts of a gender order but gender is not the only arena in which masculinities interact; when another social structure, such as class, race or ethnicity interacts with masculinity, the subordinated group may become marginalized. Stephen M. Whitehead and Frank J. Barrett also focus on the relationship between masculinities and how it interacts with identity:

> The importance of masculinity to this process of identity work is in the validation it can give to this fluid self. So if we accept that there is no core self, then socially dominant forms of being a male (masculinities) can be seen to provide an acceptable means by which boys and men may express their gender and thus their sense of identity. In taking up these localized and culturally specific signifying practices, males achieve an association with other males and also a differentiation from the 'Other' – not only women but also those males who appear 'different'. This difference is usually marked through sexual orientations, but can also include forms of embodiment and ethnicity, as well as national and cultural variations of masculine performance (Whitehead and Barrett, 2001, pp.15-16).

In the same vein, Connell, Tim Carrigan, and John Lee maintain the idea that hegemonic masculinity is rather a question of how a particular group of men legitimate and reproduce the social relationships that generate their dominance (Carrigan, Connell, Lee, 2010). These groups also occupy positions of power and wealth. Therefore it is imperative to study masculine dominance in relation to these positions. As the following sections will show, in the Turkish context, this task involves thinking about masculinity in relation to social class, but also vis-à-vis the culturally hegemonic articulations of Sunni-Turkish nationalism and patriotism.

R.W. Connell also claims that with the effects of globalization hegemonic masculinity has acquired a new form, which she identifies as ¨transnational business masculinity¨ (Connell, 2000, p.52). In this sense, transnational business masculinity appears at the top of the class pyramid, and it is a form of masculinity that does not belong to any place or nation, embodied by men who fly first class and spend most of their time in hotel rooms and airport lounges, and whose family lives take very little of their time. In Connell's account, transnational business masculinity is portrayed as tolerant towards differences, in other words, this form of masculinity does not function through homophobia and does not seek to suppress women as a masculine practice. It is, however, self-centred and competitive.

Christine Beasley, however, criticizes Connell's formulation of hegemonic masculinity. She believes that the term has come to stand for a monolithic masculinity and also criticizes Connell for being unable to explain why transnational business masculinity is the globally hegemonic form of masculinity (Beasley, 2008). In return, she offers a new formulation for hegemonic masculinity. Firstly, she proposes to narrow the term and argues for ¨a more focused characterization for hegemonic masculinity as concerned with a political ideal or model, as an enabling mode of representation, which mobilizes institutions and practices¨ (Beasley, 2008). Then she offers to expand the taxonomy of the term by suggesting two new concepts of hegemony. She divides hegemonic masculinity into two new categories; sub-hegemonic and supra-hegemonic masculinities. In her formulation, supra-hegemonic masculinity falls under the category of the global because it regulates the economic, politic and cultural circumstances of a given society. It also subordinates other masculinities with a determining power of shaping and transforming masculinities. It can function as a masculine ideal that creates a sense of solidarity around profit, what

Connell asserts as the patriarchal dividend. Sub-hegemonic masculinity, on the other hand, signifies a more local and limited hegemonic position, it does not possess any institutional power that can be constructed or exercised through this type of masculinity.

From a similar perspective, Demetrakis Z. Demetriou objects to Connell's concepts of hegemonic masculinity and non-hegemonic masculinities (Demetriou, 2001). Demetriou offers the term ¨hegemonic masculine bloc¨ and formulates it by borrowing another Gramscian term, the ¨historical bloc¨, in order to underline a type or form of masculinity ¨that is capable of reproducing patriarchy¨. According to Demetriou, this type of masculinity is in a constant process of negotiation, translation and hybridization, and reconfiguration (Demetriou, 2001). By doing that, she enables us to locate masculinities in historical, ever-changing contexts.

In this study, a combination of Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity and Beasley's supra- and sub-hegemonic masculinities are taken as explanatory terms in order to analyse which masculine traits are considered to be hegemonic in contemporary Turkish cinema. Rather than locating one type of masculinity as the hegemonic one, this study aims to extricate the components of masculinity and its interaction with other social structures. Following Beasley and Cenk Özbay, I offer the term ¨locally hegemonic masculinities¨ as a useful tool to analyse different types of masculinities in the aforementioned movies. As Connell, Kimmel, Beasley and Demetriou pointed out, multiple masculinities can co-exist in different contexts. By expanding the term hegemonic, I intend to apply the dynamic concept of hegemony to locally constructed masculinities, and demonstrate that the key struggles that take place between the protagonists of *Winter Sleep, Upon a Time in Anatolia, Majority, Beyond the Hill* arise from their failures to attain supra-hegemonic positions. From

this perspective, the concept of hegemonic masculinity is adapted into this study as the general framework to underline the interactions between masculinities. Crucially, the study argues that when the interaction itself becomes a masculine strategy, the quarrel to attend the hegemonic position is what these films emphasize.

3.1 Homosociality and homophobia

As both Kimmel and Connell state, masculinity is constructed not only in relation to women but also in relation to other men. Kimmel also argues that masculinity is demonstrated for other men's approval, he states that ¨masculinity is a homosocial enactment¨ (Kimmel, 2005. P.33). From this perspective, masculinity is constructed and reproduced through relations with other masculinities, a process that exercises the ability to classify, assess and approve these other masculinities. Similarly, Meuser also argues that while homosociality becomes an expression of male dominance, it also excludes women from important realms of society by strengthening the cohesion among men (Meuser, 2004, p.396). In this homosocial setting, it becomes possible for men to determine the correct attributes of masculinity. Meuser also identifies two interconnected features of the homosocial settings through which masculine identity is founded: these are their distinction from women and their conjunction with other men (Meuser, 2004. P. 397). In this sense, women's acknowledgment of masculinity is less pivotal than men's, as ¨only being acknowledged by someone who is seen as being on a par with oneself counts (Meuser, 2004. P.397). Meuser argues that men often perceive homosocial settings as relaxing, as a place where masculine authenticity can be experienced and where men's inner selves can be expressed in a more open and honest manner (Meuser, 2004. P.397).

In the Turkish context, Sancar similarly argues that prevalent masculinity codes such as heterosexuality, the oppression of women and homophobia are experienced as collective practices in homosocial settings. She also argues that homosocial male groups are the settings in which different masculine strategies are taught, learnt, internalized and revised (Sancar, 2009, p.260). In their study, Hilal Onur and Berrin Koyuncu identify different social settings with their homosocial characteristics such as coffee houses, pubs, stadiums, gyms and martial art schools (Onur and Koyuncu, 2004, p.60). In these social environments, while hegemonic masculinity is emphasized, other masculinities and femininity are suppressed. Kandiyoti and Sancar both describe the military as a key homosocial setting in Turkey, as men's compulsory military service emphasizes the already existing difference between men and women. On the one hand, it functions as a disciplinary tool for men and on the other, it eliminates and degrades notions that are attached to femininity.

Consequently, these homosocial structures in which masculinity and hegemonic masculinity are formed, also often promote homophobia. Kimmel argues that homophobia is strongly related to sexism and racism (Kimmel, 2005. P.37), which underlines the fact that it signifies more than a fear of homosexuals or being labelled as one. According to Kimmel, this fear inhibits men from generating intimate relationships with other men through homosocial structures and it has to be re-enacted continuously (Kimmel, 2005. P.35). Thus, homophobia must be engendered in every homosocial environment. David Plummer underlines that homophobia is not triggered only by sexual behaviours but also by nonsexual behaviours such as the way a man dresses, or how he walks (Plummer, 2004, p.390). The concept of homophobia then, expresses a double character. The first aspect

underlines its inward character, as men do not want to be perceived as homosexuals or as feminine men. The second aspect is an outward strategy because it can mark other men as homosexuals, and therefore as less masculine. Kimmel explains this;

> Homophobia is the fear that other men will unmask us, emasculate us, reveal to us and the world that we do not measure up, that we are not real men. We are afraid to let other men see that fear (Kimmel, 2005, p.35).

From this perspective, homophobia exposes how masculinities are formed through certain strategies and how although they appear to be firmly grounded in biology, they are actually ambivalent both physically and psychologically. The fear of being perceived as homosexual drive men to implement exaggerated masculine behaviours and attitudes. Women and gay men thus become the ¨other¨ against which heterosexual men project their identities and suppressing the other becomes a masculine strategy for men to claim their manhood. In the Turkish context, army, certain fields of vocational school, coffee-houses and traditional inns are predominantly male and homosocial environments. In certain homosocial environments, such as the military, and certain type of sports, men who do not conform to the hegemonic codes are also condemned through homophobia as well. The focus on homosocial contexts is employed in this study in order to frame the groups within which masculine interactions take place. This framework becomes especially useful when homosocial enactment tries to form masculinities, as exemplified in *Majority*.

3.2 Masculinity and class

Class difference plays a pivotal role in how men perform their masculinities, and this difference is widely represented in the new Turkish cinema. For instance, in Nuri Bilge Ceylan's *Three Monkeys* the hierarchy between the employer and the

employee is illustrated by the protagonist Eyüp (Yavuz Bingöl), who agrees to take the blame for a murder committed by his boss, in exchange for money. His boss not only ¨buys¨ his freedom through Eyüp's incarceration but also sleeps with Eyüp's wife. More importantly, when Eyüp comes out of prison and realizes the situation, it is his class position that restrains him from retaliating against his boss. In the film, being a man or masculinity itself has a certain social and exchangeable value: masculinity is both possessed and embodied because it is a status or a phase that one must achieve through certain passages in their lives, and it can be ¨sold¨ in exchange for economic capital as Eyüp's case demonstrates. As pointed out earlier, class is a highly dynamic concept, which makes a categorical analysis in the Turkish context especially cumbersome. In order to locate classes and their interaction with masculinities, it is imperative to focus on different dimensions of class status. All of these dimensions related to masculinity find a resonance in Bourdieu's conception of capital. Before turning to the Bourdiesian concept of capital, however, it is imperative to locate masculinity within a broader context in the society.

As previously argued, masculinity is not a subject position or an identity that functions by itself, in this sense it cannot be reduced to individual behaviour. In a broader sense, masculinity is a subject position and a state of being which is constantly informed, shaped and reshaped by social structures. Pierre Bourdieu explains this complicated web of relations as a habitus. In his explanation, habitus firstly underlines the individual's conceptualization of the social structure, secondly, it exists or finds its meaning within an individual's actions and their interaction with others, and lastly it is embedded in the physical body (Bourdieu, 2003). Richard Jenkins explains how Bourdieu exemplifies the embodiment of a gendered habitus in his early work in North Africa:

> in Kabylia, the politics of gender shape and are revealed in ways
> of walking, looking, even standing still. The female ideal of
> modesty and restraint orients her body down, towards the ground;
> the ideal male, however, moves upwards and outwards in his
> hexis (embodied habitus) his body oriented towards other men
> (Richard Jenkins, 1992, p.46).

Habitus, then, does not signify only consciously learned practices but it signifies how these practices are laden with unconscious significations that are reproduced in daily life. These daily life practices take place in a social arena and different strategies and struggles occupy this domain, which Bourdieu calls a 'field' (Bourdieu, 2003.). Individuals conduct their lives in these fields through their habitus, which includes the imprints of gender (Sancar, 2008.). Cengiz, Tol and Küçükkural also assert that the ¨habitus is a form of being which includes past, present and future¨ (Cengiz et al., 2004). Through its embeddedness in specific social fields, a person's habitus is directly connected with their class identity. Jenkins explains that;

> A field, therefore, is a structured system of social positions –
> occupied either by individuals or institutions- the nature of which
> defines the situation for their occupants. It is also a system of
> forces which exist between these positions; a field is structured
> internally in terms of power relations (Jenkins, 1992, p.53).

Where power is concerned, individuals or institutions stand in relation to each other. Similar to masculinity, their positions are also construed in relationships of domination or subordination. What creates this hierarchical structure is their access to certain resources, which Bourdieu calls ¨capital¨. Along with economic capital, Bourdieu identifies two types of capital: cultural and social capital. Both cultural and social capital are convertible into economic capital under certain circumstances. The term cultural capital refers to accumulated resources of symbolic elements, including skills, possessions, how one conducts his/her life and the networks in which they circulate. These resources or symbolic elements are obtained through one's social

class. For instance, studying at an Ivy League School can provide certain values that can be useful resources in the field.

Bourdieu further states that cultural capital can exist in three forms: the embodied state, the objectified state and the institutionalized state (Bourdieu, 1986, p.243). The embodied state of cultural capital refers to cultural resources that can be conducted through one's body, such as an accent or as Bourdieu exemplifies, ¨the acquisition of a muscular physique or a suntan¨ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.244). The objectified state refers to possessions that can be ¨objectified¨ in material objects. Bourdieu explains the objectified state by noting that "the cultural capital objectified in material objects and media, such as writings, paintings, monuments, instruments etc., is transmissible in its materiality¨ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.244). For example, owning a personal jet signifies one's economic capital and it would also signify their symbolic, cultural capital. The institutionalized state endows certain qualifications, such as academic degrees or titles and allows individuals to generate cultural competence and authority in relation to others.

In this study, Bourdieu's multi-dimensional concept of capital is used to identify how male characters embody their class through masculinity. The concept of capital allows us to disentangle certain components that surround the performance and representation of masculinity and class, and to locate them in the social stratum.

3.3 Masculinity studies in the Turkish context

Before the study of masculinities began to draw attention in Turkey, research on men primarily focused on patriarchal systems and their effects on society in general and on women in particular. For instance, Deniz Kandiyoti argues that patriarchy is not only a system of social domination but it also functions as a socio-cultural ideal and

she pays attention to various types of patriarchy from the perspective of women's

subordination to men (Kandiyoti, 1988). Later, she applies the concept of

masculinity in her rereading of male narratives from the nineteenth century Middle

East as well as her own observations of local masculinities in southwest Anatolia

(Kandiyoti, 1994). She acknowledges the difference between patriarchy and

masculinity, in which the former functions as a system of profit, governance and

dominance and the latter offers both a collection of different personalities and a

subject position to other masculinities (Kandiyoti, 1994). She also points out the

intricate relationship between hegemonic masculinity and the institutionalization of

patriarchy:

> Although I still believe that patriarchy finds its starkest
> expression in relation to the subordination of women, an adequate
> explanation of the reproduction of patriarchal relations requires
> much closer attention to those institutions which are crucially
> responsible for the production of masculine identities (Kandiyoti,
> 1994, p.198).

Similar to Connell's explanation of how masculinities are in relations of complicity

because of the patriarchal dividend, Kandiyoti turns her focus to masculinities in

order to disentangle the system of dominance. From this perspective, she analyses

the main institutions responsible for the production of masculinity with a keen focus

on the historical moments during which these institutions undergo changes, arguing

that specific masculinities express themselves in those contexts. She also points out

the intricate bond between masculinities and other social structures such as class,

ethnicity and sexual orientation. Following this thread, she focuses on how society is

segregated and how all-male institutions shape, re-shape and maintain masculinities.

In the same vein, Pınar Selek analyses how the Turkish military, as an all-

male institution, is shaped predominantly by male or masculine codes and how in

return, it functions both as a milestone in the journey of becoming a ¨man¨ and

homogenizes different individuals and characters into a collective masculinity (Selek, 2008). For example, Selek and Kandiyoti underline how narratives about military service prepare the following generations to reproduce similar experiences, and therefore fortify the military's character as a masculine institution. In return, men who complete their military service are entitled to use that masculine currency. On the other hand, Selek accentuates the double character of the army and masculinity: young soldiers have to go through humiliating, degrading and shameful experiences in order to gain the right to use that masculine currency, but those experiences are far from being ¨masculine¨ experiences as they occur. Military service, in this sense, becomes a space where behaviours are marked as masculine and feminine, and consequently feminine practices are shamed, punished and ultimately effaced.

Serpil Sancar places masculinity in a larger context and asserts that hegemonic masculinity does not only emerge from cultural practices and traditions, but through economic and public actions within institutions such as the government, law, business corporations, labour unions, the heterosexual family and the national army and as a result of this, homophobia and heterosexuality become legitimized and desirable (Sancar, 2008). Following this thread, Dolunay Şenol and Sezgin Erdem narrow the concept and focus on the role of social processes in the formation of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. They locate five social processes that engender and reinforce the existing social structure, including circumcision, military service, job possession, marriage and paternity (Şenol and Erdem, 2017). They claim that these are the five steps necessary for obtaining a hegemonic position in the gender order.

It is important to underline that in order for hegemonic masculinity to be sustained, it ought to be transmitted from one generation to the next, that is why it is

important to study marriage and paternity dynamics. As Sancar points out, another integral part of masculinity is its socio-cultural aspect and its political ramifications. In this context, she points out that masculinity in the gender stratification is deeply rooted in power relations. She suggests that it is imperative to focus on how masculinities interact with political institutions. Deniz Kandiyoti focuses on the intricate relationship between gender politics and ideology in general for this purpose (Kandiyoti, 2016). She asserts the idea that the politics of gender in Turkey is intrinsic rather than incidental to a characterization of its ruling ideology (Kandiyoti, 2016). She observes that the family does not form and maintain masculinities only because of the socio-cultural aspects of gender, but politics also enforces conservative family values because it assures its continuation.

Like Kandiyoti, who identifies hegemonic masculinity as one of the central components of the contemporary political arena, Fatih Keskin investigates masculinity in the political sphere and its hegemonic position in the state (Keskin, 2018). Although he mainly focuses on how the predominantly masculine structure of politics has excluded women from the political sphere, he illustrates certain strategies among men that signal their collaboration in politics. In this context, fellowship and companionship refer to a collaborative political connection between the state and men. He also points out that men's collaboration refers to a kind of societal and political order that functions ¨not only for the political and societal environment, but also as a way to construct masculine self-identity¨ (as cited in Keskin, 2018, p.102). In the Turkish context then, politics constructs masculinities and in return masculinities frame politics and gender relations.

Cenk Özbay and Ozan Soybakış similarly focus on how political actors, traditions and discourses shape ordinary men and their masculinities. Like Keskin,

they underline the correlation between hegemonic masculinity and political

masculinities, as well as how their interplay creates gender relations and hierarchical

masculinities (Özbay and Soybakış, 2018). To emphasize the dynamic and multiple

aspects of masculinity, they study four major political parties and how their voters

consider masculinities. They conclude that conventional party-related masculinities

tend to imitate the party leader's masculinity performance as their own. On the other

hand, they also underline the emergence of a new type of masculinity that they call

cosmopolitan masculinity. They state, ¨What makes cosmopolitan masculinity

unique is its more holistic attitude toward embracing social differences and taking an

active stance against forms of social injustice, including but not limited to anti-

neoliberalism and non-violence¨ (Özbay and Soybakış, 2018, p.17). Cosmopolitan

masculinity, therefore, is distinguished by its global and more egalitarian character.

Connell's concepts of subordinated and marginalized masculinities and their

relationship to hegemonic masculinity have also been key issues for masculinity

studies in Turkey. For instance, Cenk Özbay's study of rent boys in Istanbul

underlines the complexities of identity construction. In his analysis, Özbay discovers

that although rent boys have sex with other men for money, they consider themselves

to be ¨more masculine¨ than others (Özbay, 2010). They compensate through a

strategy that Özbay calls ¨exaggerated masculinity¨, since same-sex sexual activities

threaten their masculine selves, they act or emphasize their manliness to a greater

extent. Moreover, he points out the inextricable relationship between class and

masculinity; in this context, this relates to the fact that rent boys are often from the

socially-disadvantaged outskirts of the city, which are called *varoş*. Özbay states,

¨Rent boys repetitively state that they are 'real' men because they are coming from

varoş. In this way, *varoş* is naturalized and linked to an inherent masculinity that gay

men do not and cannot have¨ (Özbay, 2010). Furthermore, rent boys emphasize their differences between themselves and their gay clients by positioning the *varoş* as a more masculine class position. Özbay's study demonstrates how marginalized masculinity and hegemonic masculinity can be juxtaposed in the same relationship.

3.4 Hegemonic masculinity in the Turkish context

These studies manifest that masculinity permeates the Turkish social structure in various ways, but masculinity itself as a social structure is shaped by a variety of socio-cultural factors. Following Kandiyoti and Özbay, Kurtuluş Cengiz, Uğraş Ulaş Tol and Önder Küçükural put hegemonic masculinity under scrutiny. Their study indicates how masculinity is at the centre of societal structures, especially in cultures in which patriarchy, the family, and close ties with relatives and community are the backbones of the society (Cengiz, Tol, Küçükural, 2004). Yet they also point out that the reason masculinity studies did not emerge in Turkey until the late 1990s and early 2000s is because hegemonic masculinity deliberately withholds itself from being discussed openly. From their perspective, hegemonic masculinity occupies the hegemonic position not only in its oppression of women but also through its operations on men. Certain traits obtain their masculine character in relation to others and subsequently those traits engender hegemonic codes. Male subjects are expected to conduct their lives according to those codes, and the strategies they employ overlap with Connell's theories. For instance, inclusion and exclusion mechanisms force all subjects in a group to exclude and punish those men who do not possess and employ hegemonic codes; if they do not follow this strategy, they face the danger of becoming a ¨softy, fag, henpecked¨ (Cengiz, et al., 2004). This constant threat to one's masculinity from others prevents men from forming intimate, emotional

relationships with others and in return it fortifies the hierarchical system of relations. Through that, the scholars point out the hollow space between the masculine ideal and actual masculinity practices and how this space creates a tension.

In the same vein, Cenk Özbay analyses which form of masculinity surpasses other masculinities in the Turkish context. Areas such as the military, the body and age, geographical location, popular culture, religion, politics, sports and heterosexuality all carry some of the necessary hegemonic codes, but none of these emerge as the defining hegemonic form of masculinity (Cenk Özbay, 2013). Just as Connell suggests that the current global hegemonic masculinity is transnational business masculinity, Özbay also locates hegemonic masculinity in neoliberal codes. Although his formulation does not overlap with Connell's model completely, he asserts that neoliberal logic and neoliberal subjectivity are the prevailing traits of current hegemonic masculinity in Turkey.

3.5 Masculinity and class in the Turkish context

How do masculinity and class interact in Turkey? If we return briefly to Özbay's example of rent boys, their masculinity is related not only to their sexualities but also to their class position, which is encompassed with their location (*varoş*). In this sense, urban space is fused with class identity and in return, it is embodied by rent boys as a marker of their ¨natural¨ masculinity. In other words, their class defines how masculine they are. Arat (2010) and Keskin (2018) focus on the political aspect of gender in general and masculinity in particular. Arat claims that with growing conservative, right-wing policies, the gender hierarchy is being aggravated. In terms of masculinity, Keskin asserts that the structure of the governing system and its control are predominantly operated by men and through political practices and

discourses, gender hierarchy is reconstructed and reflected. The political aspect of masculinity cannot be separated from class relations because, as Özbay and Soybakış (2018) point out, gender hegemony is legitimized through the ¨intersection of class, race, ethnicity and religion¨ and the consent for the hegemonic order is created through politics. Cengiz, Tol and Küçükkural thus suggest that class positions cause masculinities to be performed in many different ways. For instance, men from lower classes are usually required to express their masculinity with physical force, whereas members of the upper classes are portrayed as feminine, soft, and womanlike. The upper classes, on the other hand, build their masculinity through business, financial success and careers (Cengiz et al., 2004). Kandiyoti also underlines the relationship between class and how it effects the way masculinity is displayed (Kandiyoti, 2004).

Similarly, Sancar asserts that gender relations function as political power because power relations that are based on emphasized class differences are intertwined with existing gender differences (Sancar, 2008). In other words, different masculinities that are informed by class enter into circulation through existing power relations, as a result, they are perceived to be natural. Moreover, she demonstrates how hegemonic masculinity can be performed in different class contexts and family models. Similar to Cengiz, Tol and Küçükkural, she claims that among the upper classes, families focus on men's career success, thus they keep men's self-esteem high because they want men's careers to be sustainable. However, in working class families, since men are not capable of pursuing careers, they can achieve masculine domination only through providing for the family. Sancar underlines the direct connection between entrepreneurial skills and masculinity in the marketplace: ¨ the successful 'man' who earns the most money and organizes employees in the best possible way, will influence the definition of hegemonic masculinity in a market oriented, capitalist

setting¨ (Sancar, 2008, p.38). Both Connell and Sancar argue for the possibility of different masculinities being hegemonic in different contexts and that while investigating their constructions, it is crucial to focus on the formative power of class because it helps in determining how different masculinities (e.g. working class masculinity, ruling class masculinity etc.) are formed and differentiated. In this sense, masculinity does not only signify an individual identity but it also signifies a collective class identity, thus, it is vital to analyse the connection between masculinity and the masculine character of that particular class because class difference is also represented through different masculinities. Sancar points out how working class men are represented through their muscle power and bodily strength but middle class professionals are represented through their expertise, which underlines their mental faculties (Sancar, 2008).

In the films analyzed in this study, the contrast between the "physicality" of working class masculinity and the financial, non-bodily power of upper-class masculinity will emerge in a number of ways. However, my point is not to follow body and mind dichotomy but instead to pay special attention on how editorial and framing choices demonstrate masculinities and their strategies. As Connell states, this study also aims to point out how masculinities are exercised through male bodies.

3.6 Masculinity in Turkish cinema and media

Masculinity has also been a topic of research for scholars of Turkish film, and the general outline of their research can be sorted into three main categories: the construction of masculinities, masculinity in crisis and the relationship between masculinity and violence. In her analysis of 1970s and 1980s Turkish Yeşilçam

Cinema, Umut Tümay Arslan (2005) juxtaposes hegemonic masculinity with the figure of the father. In her analysis, paternal relations are compared with the relations between the state and the individual, and with the interactions between different types of masculinities. Arslan describes the father figure as a formative power that is capable of punishing and rewarding the son into the ¨correct¨ pathway.

Similarly, Deniz Morva Kablamacı analyses Orhan Aksoy's 1981 film *The End of Fame* (*Şöhretin Sonu*) through the lens of hegemonic masculinity and its construction. Kablamacı asserts that hegemonic codes of masculinity are established through the strategy of marginalizing others. Moreover, she points out how hegemony is not established by suppression alone but also through women's appropriation (Kablamacı, 2014). From a similar perspective, H. Bahadır Türk (2011) and Aydan Özsoy (2011) focus on hegemonic codes of masculinity and how they occur both in cinema and on television. Türk's comparative analysis between 1970s Turkish film actor and director Yılmaz Güney's working-class protagonists and the more recent character of Polat Alemdar, the intelligence operative from the popular TV series-turned-film *The Valley of the Wolves*, demonstrates that certain hegemonic codes of masculinity operate independently of the genre or the artists' political orientations. He places Yılmaz Güney's movies and the millennial Turkish hero characterization of Polat Alemdar on each side of the political spectrum and points out that they both represent similar kinds of masculinities (Türk, 2011). Similarly, Aslı Gön focuses on how masculinities require homosocial environments to sustain themselves (Gön, 2014). She asserts that in *Beyond the Hill* (Emin Alper, 2012) the family functions as a homosocial environment, and masculine interaction is one of the key elements for the appropriation of masculinity and its components.

She also underlines that masculinity operates as a surveillance mechanism (Gön, 2014).

The relationship between masculinity and violence is another prevailing theme of masculinity studies in Turkey. Burcu Şentürk (2017) focuses on Yavuz Turgul's two movies, *Hunting Season* (*Av Mevsimi*) (2010) and *Lovelorn* (*Gönül Yarası*) (2005) in which she explains how violence is one of the most common formative functions of masculinity. She also asserts that violence not only wounds others but it also hurts the perpetrator. More importantly, in these movies, violence occurs when male characters cannot establish their masculinity over their families or loved ones. In this context, violence functions as a strategy that can restore and re-establish masculinity for those characters; however, the urgency with which masculinity is restored reveals a crisis within masculinity itself. Ahmet Oktan (2008) and Eren Yüksel (2013) address the juncture in which hegemonic masculinity fails to resolve the crisis but rather incorporates the crisis within hegemonic codes to ascertain their continuation. Oktan analyses Uğur Yücel's 2004 film *Toss-Up* (Yazı Tura) from a twofold perspective. Firstly, he underlines the hegemonic codes that surround masculinity, such as toughness, hostility, success, a constant longing for confirmation and endorsement, having a ¨manly¨ body and refraining from feminine associations. Masculinity that is formed with these codes justifies violence over other genders and identities both in the family and in public. Through that, masculinity replicates itself and it starts to function not only as a gender identity but also as a location of authority. Oktan's second argument stresses how this authoritative aspect of masculinity operates as a source of oppression and violence for men as well. Whenever men fail to perform these hegemonic codes or when they feel threatened by other identities the tension gives way to paranoia (Oktan, 2008).

In a similar vein, Eren Yüksel (2013) analyses *Breath: Long Live the Homeland* (*Nefes: Vatan Sağolsun*) (Levent Semerci, 2009) and he asserts that in Turkish cinema in the new millennium, masculinity crises have taken the form of victimization. Through victimization two types of discourses around masculinity have emerged: the first one tries to create a sense of sympathy for the masculine characters whose positions of authority have been shaken by political, economic and societal changes, and the second one tries to raise questions about the current gender order by emphasizing the struggles of men that occur because of masculinity (Yüksel, 2013). He concludes that in the movie, crises of masculinity are represented through hyper-masculinity and the inability to embody satisfactory masculine codes but in return, the crisis of masculinity generates a desire for the re-establishment of hegemonic masculinity through victimization (Yüksel, 2013).

In *Winter Sleep, Once Upon a Time in Anatolia, Beyond the Hill* and *Majority*, the dynamics of class and masculinity become visible through juxtaposition and contrast. In order to disentangle the relationship between masculinity and class status in these films, it is imperative to consider the relevant historical context of Turkey. From this perspective, the impact of twenty-first century neoliberalization and the pervasiveness of free-market values become visible through Aydın in *Winter Sleep* and Kemal in *Majority*. Although other movies also support the same aspect, the economic perspective is not as prevalent as in these movies. The comparison between local and urban masculinities are articulated through all four movies, especially *Beyond the Hill* and *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia*. However, the questions of what engenders the difference among them and whether they all follow the same pattern or not, are answered by juxtaposing the concepts of gender with class. As argued earlier, the dynamic characteristic of class

status in the Turkish context hinders us from locating class denominators categorically, therefore, Bourdieu's concepts are borrowed in order to pinpoint how class functions apart from its economic feature. Consequently, this study illustrates that if upper class status is associated predominantly with economic wealth, then the representation of their masculinity tends to divert from the above-mentioned theoretical framework. Thus, the following analyses urge us to consider other constituents of both masculinity and class in order to comprehend these differences as well.

CHAPTER 4

LOCALLY HEGEMONIC MASCULINITIES IN *WINTER SLEEP*, *MAJORITY*,

ONCE UPON A TIME IN ANATOLIA AND *BEYOND THE HILL*

Hegemonic masculinity is reproduced culturally, historically, socially and

economically. Serpil Sancar locates hegemonic masculinity in the domain of power

relations and asserts that hegemonic masculinity is a form of masculine power

(Sancar, 2008). Power can be as effective as its domain. Sancar illustrates this

through the family: in working class families, men can exercise the power associated

with hegemony because they cannot do so in the public sphere. Similarly, as Beasley

suggests, there are masculinities that their power can disseminate through certain

domains, but they cannot be accepted as globally hegemonic masculinities because

once they are in a different social, cultural and economic context they face the

danger of losing their hegemonic positions. If we consider this aspect of any specific

hegemonic masculinity, we can locate it in the immediate circle to which its forms of

power have access. The extent of their hegemony is limited to their domains; thus,

they are locally hegemonic masculinities. The movies chosen for this study

problematize the concept of masculinity and hegemony by locating their constructing

forces. In each movie, a dominant trait is attached to masculinity and these traits

signal how they are utilized with and for sustaining both masculinity and hegemony.

This chapter aims to evince which masculinities are hegemonic or dominant in the

movies *Winter Sleep*, *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia*, *Beyond the Hill* and *Majority*

and then examine their functions in the interaction with class.

    Hegemonic masculinities are both the effects of the system of production and

the cause for the stratified social structure. During the process of gaining the

hegemony, certain masculinities are marked with their relations to hegemonic masculinity. The relationship between different masculinities are conducted through the concepts of alliance, dominance and subordination. As a result of their interactions, certain masculinities are reified in the social structure as hegemonic, subordinated, complicit and marginalized. This chapter aims to identify non-hegemonic masculinities in the aforementioned movies by focusing on other masculinities' relations to hegemonic ones. Since hegemonic masculinities are located within the mode of production through class indicators, identifying non-hegemonic masculinities in this web of relations also underlines non-hegemonic masculine traits.

4.1 Economic capital and masculinity

From an economic point of view, the hegemonic masculinity of the upper classes becomes secured through their wealth because they are not required to validate their masculinity as long as they are affluent. Therefore, its lack also underlines its masculine character. From this perspective, a person's class status acquires a standing that is equivalent to their masculinity in a social interaction.

How economic welfare surrounds the intersections of class and masculinity is depicted in Nuri Bilge Ceylan's 2014 film *Winter Sleep* and in Seren Yüce's 2010 film *Majority*. In these movies, Aydın (Haluk Bilginer) and Kemal (Settar Tanrıöğen) represent the hegemonic positions that are acquired through economic welfare and demonstrate that affluence functions as a component of masculinity. Wealth does not only signify the characters' masculinity but it also becomes a formative force for their masculinity. Aydın's relationship with his immediate family, his guests and employees and lastly with his tenants are all marked by his

aspiration to build and maintain his relationship with them in an asymmetrical manner. These asymmetries are engendered through manifold social phenomena that are intrinsic to some of the relationships. For instance, Aydın has a one-sided relationship with his employee Hidayet and with his tenants İsmail and Hamdi, as he enjoys the elevated social status made possible by his economic wealth. On the other hand, Aydın's former profession as an actor also signifies cultural competency. Acting is historically associated with effeminacy, fluidity and changeability, considering how actors perform diverse characters on the stage by wearing different costumes and with the décor. Although these traits are not traditionally masculine ones, in the Turkish context classical stage acting signifies a Western-oriented sociality, through this Aydın is allowed to construct a cultural superiority over his workers and tenants.

Similar to Aydın, Kemal in *Majority* also manages his relationships within a hierarchical system. He is the unquestionable authority of his family and his job. It is important to understand the relationship between his masculinity and the class character of his profession. Kemal is a successful contractor, which signifies his close connection with the capitalist mode of production; more importantly, however, his profession is marked with its masculine character. Contemporary Turkey in general and Istanbul in particular has been witnessing an urbanization process in which both private and public sectors have been working jointly. In line with neoliberal urban policies, urban regeneration has rapidly transformed the appearance of inner-city areas with great revenue-generating potential. From this perspective, urban regeneration brings forth different socio-economic and socio-cultural consequences. For instance, contractors have been working jointly with the public sector, and enjoying special incentives and privileges, which underlines the close

relationship between policy making and the construction sector. In *Majority,* Kemal is one of the beneficiaries of this relationship, and although he employs day laborers he himself is rarely present at the construction site. The binary opposition between manager and the managed not only functions as a class marker but it also informs their masculinity.

As pointed out earlier, class difference, in relation to masculinity, is established through the character of a specific profession. The lower classes are generally associated with manual labour and muscular strength, in other words, their labour power. The middle and upper classes, on the other hand, represent professional titles and expertise, which are based on or derived from knowledge and ability. This co-dependant aspect of masculinity and class also exposes its vulnerability. If a member of the upper class, such as a businessman, goes bankrupt or fails to earn enough money, he is faced with the danger of descending the masculine hierarchy. However, as long as they keep earning money and maintain their statuses, they are not required to validate their masculinities because they are already regarded as hegemonic in the society. Kemal's profession is unique in that it signifies the masculine power associated with the expertise-based and also the manual labour-based dimensions of the construction sector.

Economic welfare's masculine character is illustrated in different dimensions in *Winter Sleep* and *Majority*. One of the ways that the difference between lower and upper class masculinities are emphasized and demonstrated in the films is through physical and emotional distance, the strategies that men use to secure their masculinities and their emotional states. This occurs especially if the scene or sequence is embedded with an economic context. In *Winter Sleep* the retired actor Aydın goes back to Cappadocia, which is a touristic location in central Turkey, to

manage his father's boutique hotel. Apart from his hotel business he has also inherited a few houses, which he rents out. One day Aydın and his employee Hidayet go shopping for a horse, since it is an important landmark of the region, which can have a positive impact on his business. On their way back to the hotel, one of his tenants' little sons smashes his car window by throwing a rock. The little boy İlyas is the son of the former convict İsmail, who, upon getting out of prison, has not been able to land a job. He faces financial difficulties and his brother Hamdi's income is not enough to pay the rent or the expenses caused by İsmail's felony. Therefore they are sent to the bailiffs by the court after Aydın's lawyers file a suit. Aydın and Hidayet pay a visit to the tenant and explain the situation but this causes a quarrel between Hidayet and İsmail.

In this scene, Aydın positions himself on a higher ground than where the duo is fighting and observes them with disdain. The house is located in a small valley and there is a higher ground outside the house. At the beginning of this scene Aydın stands up on this higher ground, slowly walking towards the edge where he can look down on the house, the action and the people. When he reaches the edge, the camera pans across the front yard of İsmail and Hamdi's home and the discarded objects and junk scattered across it. But the movement of panning starts from a focus on Aydın as he gazes at the front yard. After establishing that it is Aydın's point of view, the camera continues to pan to different objects and then its movement ends with a focus on Hidayet's face, who looks into the camera, suggesting that he has caught Aydın's eye. It is worth noting that Aydın associates the junkyard with his subordinates because the same relationship later occurs with İsmail. After İsmail slaps his son for smashing the car window, he takes a look slightly to his left, to the implied and off-screen space and then the scene cuts into the old, broken, clunky and rusty household

goods that are scattered around, indicating that İsmail is actually looking at them, after which he looks down for a brief moment and turns his face left and stares for a few seconds. It is clear that he stares at Aydın because the previous panning had established Aydın's location with a close-up on İsmail's face and on his stare.

Both masculine and economic hierarchy through the relationship of landowner and tenant are represented in this sequence and revealed through the symbolism of the junkyard. Firstly, Aydın's disdainful gaze at the scattered clutter and his look towards the house implies that he scorns the objects but also despises the people collecting them. He reiterates this when he converses with his sister Necla in the scene where they talk about the articles that he has written for the local newspaper. Necla refers to one of his old articles, which is titled ¨The Aesthetic Poverty of Anatolian Towns¨, upon which Aydın comments: ¨It is not about poverty or richness, there was poverty in old times too but if you have three olives, there is a difference between eating them nicely from a plate and getting them from the bottom of the bag with your hands¨ (*Winter Sleep*) (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2014). This comment shows that Aydın associates poverty with a lack of aesthetic taste, demonstrated by his disdainful glance at Hidayet and İsmail's home and front yard.

Both physical and emotional distance between Aydın and the other characters manifest their hierarchical relationships and how they are embedded in their economic circumstances. The physical distance between Aydın and İlyas when he breaks the car window and between Aydın and rest of the men in the fighting sequence empower Aydın's position in the hierarchy. Since his disassociation with this group of men is generated through his economic wealth, how it affects his masculinity also becomes visible. Through his wealth, Aydın is not required to

¨prove¨ himself in terms of his physical power. In other words, in this homosocial setting, Aydın signifies the position of approbation.

Moreover, İsmail is also aware of the unbalanced relationship between himself and Aydın. This is underlined by his decision to turn his gaze towards the clutter littering his front yard. Since İsmail is deprived of economic means, he cannot match Aydın economically and his desperation is present on his face. In return, he employs a masculine trait in concordance with his status in the hierarchy of economic relations. As pointed out earlier, lower class masculinities often emphasize the physical aspect of manhood. Ismail uses his body as a masculine strategy in this instance to confront the danger. The situation is dangerous for Ismail because the house also functions as the last resort in which he can achieve a position of hegemony, therefore any attack on his home also endangers his masculinity. Also, the bailiffs have already confiscated his household goods and he was also beaten in that incident. Aydın's presence creates another danger for him through their landlord and tenant relationship. Thus, he employs his body as a masculine trait.

In this sequence, his utilization of the body is illustrated through bodily movements and swearing. When İsmail's brother Hamdi walks into the scene, the frame presents three men through a medium shot and a long shot, which draws the viewer's attention to how they conduct their bodies. Both İsmail and Hidayet lift their arms upward and sideways while fighting and this situation extends their bodies in the frame. These big bodily movements are conventionally highlighted as masculine traits. Along with this body language İsmail swears and his swearing consists of references to phallic imagery and sexual intercourse. Although lots of Turkish swearwords are similarly endowed with sexual undertones, here verbal

language functions as an accompanying element to his body language, which already performs a certain act of masculinity.

İsmail's brother Hamdi, who is an imam, on the other hand, usually speaks in a soft voice in a preachy manner but in the fighting sequence and after the fight, he bids farewell to Aydın and Hidayet with an insincere smile on his face, as he moves away from the car he swears but no one is around to hear. It is evident that this speech act is directed inward, which indicates that it functions as a coping mechanism. If economic welfare was the only constructing force of masculinity, then Hamdi would have been expected to perform the same type of masculinity as his brother. However, he portrays a more submissive and meek character. At this point, it is vital to remember the characterization of certain professions as well. As an imam, Hamdi bears certain local codes in which he is not allowed to fight and curse. Although he swears to Aydın immediately after they leave, it is almost inaudible. From this perspective, Hamdi's profession is located at a different juncture of masculinity and class, which is also analysed in regard to intellectual capital. This demonstrates that the association of lower class masculinity with physical prowess is not universal. However, from the economic point of view, money's function as a masculine trait in economic relations is represented through Aydın's interaction with İsmail and Hamdi. In these interactions, Aydın represents the hegemonic position in accordance with his economic capital and the destitute states of İsmail and Hamdi demonstrate how its lack affects masculinity.

Aydın's physical distance from his subordinates is demonstrated through the framing and editorial choices in *Winter Sleep* and his emotional distance, which is portrayed through his disdainful stance against his employees and tenants, characterizes economic capital as a masculine trait which constrains Aydın from

48

developing a mutual relationship with them. However, in *Majority,* a different

characterization of economic capital as a masculine trait is represented. Kemal is a

successful contractor. His adolescent son Mertkan (Bartu Küçükçağlayan) is

reluctant to take more responsibility. He gets involved with a waitress whom his

father despises because she is from Eastern Turkey and Kurdish, so he tells Mertkan

to break up with her. Mertkan is caught in the middle of his feelings and his father's

ultimatum. After he breaks up with her, one night when he goes out with his friends,

he crashes into a taxi. After that, his father sends him to another town and Mertkan

has to be the man his dad wanted him to be in order to return home.

Although economic capital indicates a person's class status in a given social

system, it does not engender a singular hegemonic masculinity. In *Majority* the

hegemonic masculinity is portrayed differently than in *Winter Sleep*. In the movie,

Kemal occupies the hegemonic position through his successful business but the

contrast between him and Aydın arises through the differential role of intellectual

capital. It is vital to understand the relationship between the characterization of one's

occupation and masculinity. In this sense, Kemal's profession as a contractor

signifies his masculinity mainly through his economic success and the job's

character as being predominantly male. As pointed out earlier, during the last two

decades, Turkey has witnessed a boom in the construction sector, which has been the

flagship of the country's economy. More importantly, in the major cities, such as

Istanbul and Ankara, the urbanization process has been dealt with mainly through

private contractors. The close ties between the political milieu and construction

businesses urges us to consider Kemal and his masculinity differently. As Hidayet

points out in the scene in which he chats with Aydın about the tenants, ¨…they [the

tenants] take you as a little bit softy Mr. Aydın, that's why they act so¨ (*Winter*

Sleep) (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2014), thus indicating that Aydın's masculinity isn't constructed through his firm and harsh attitude. In contrast to Aydın, Kemal performs a more ¨hardy¨ masculinity. He tries to solve problems by using his economic capital but he does not refrain from using his body as well.

The incorporation of masculinity and economic capital, and how lack of intellectual capital diverts masculinity are further represented in the taxi sequences in *Majority*. After having a night out and drinking with his friends, Mertkan crashes into a taxi. They go to the police station to file a report and Kemal comes and picks up Mertkan. After they have the car fixed, the taxi driver comes to Kemal's office to complain about it. Kemal blames the driver for being a beggar and without listening to the taxi driver's reasons for coming, he takes out his wallet and gives him money. When the taxi driver says that he did not ask for money, Kemal dismisses him firmly. In this scene, the economic difference between the two characters is established through clothing, posture and attitude. When Kemal greets the taxi driver, the camera cuts to the room and the positions of Kemal and the taxi driver are in contrast to each other. Kemal stands erect and keeps his hands in his pockets, which signifies his dismissive and dignified attitude towards the taxi driver. Alongside with his posture, his almost non-existent facial expressions until he gives the money underline his incapability of expressing any sympathy with the taxi driver, which emphasizes the emotional distance that is set by Kemal. Moreover, when the taxi driver throws the money back at Kemal with a firm stance, Kemal swears and they fight.

Kemal's inability to maintain his physical distance as he does with emotional distance, is grounded in the dual nature of Kemal's profession and his access to different forms of capital. In another instance, when Mertkan returns home by a taxi,

he does not have enough money to pay, so the taxi driver forces him to call his home and bring money. When Mertkan calls his mother, he is apologetic. Kemal comes down and after Mertkan gets out of the taxi, Kemal throws the money at the driver. While Mertkan's apologetic attitude signifies how the lack of money effects how he is perceived by the driver, Kemal aspires to maintain his and his son's social position not only by paying the driver but also by preventing a humiliating situation. In both sequences economic capital's masculine function is underlined through its practical aspect. Kemal uses money to solve these problems but when the situation turns into a confrontation, he also uses his body. This also shows that economic status and masculinity are amalgamated concepts, thus, they can be used interchangeably. In other words, money as a tool can be employed to prevent attacks on masculinity on certain occasions. From this perspective, economic welfare as a masculine trait takes different forms; on the one hand it has a symbolic power that is related to its function as a class denominator, on the other hand it has a practical power that can solve everyday problems.

Class-inflected masculinity's symbolic aspect is also represented through Kemal's relation with Necmi. After Mertkan crashes the taxi driver's car, police officers file a report that states that Mertkan was drunk and driving. Because of this, even if the insurance company pays for the repairs, they will ask the family to pay it back. In order to fix this, Kemal tells Mertkan to pay a visit to the police officer and convince him to change the report. Mertkan fails at this task and after the fighting scene with the taxi driver, Kemal sends Mertkan to get the report from his friend Necmi, because he himself had it fixed. From this perspective, the importance of homosocial enactment ought to be re-emphasized. In the scene in which Mertkan and Kemal go to the steam room, the movie presents different male characters and Necmi

is one of them. On the one hand, the all-male scene underlines the importance of male bonding as a masculine strategy, on the other hand, Necmi's questions to Mertkan about his military service demonstrate that it is an environment in which masculinities are forged. Apart from that, although Necmi runs a shop in which he sells traditional Turkish rugs to tourists, since he can have a legal document fixed, it is ascertainable that he has a network. More importantly, the relationship between Kemal and Necmi is generated through both masculinity and economic capital. This can be deduced from that fact that when the movie presents the steam room, the scene is marked with business-like conversations, as well as informal chatter about Mertkan's military service and his love life. From this perspective, the economic capital that Kemal has enables him to develop relationships that he can employ strategically, which underlines economic capital's symbolic aspect.

Masculinity is disseminated throughout different domains or positions of social structures. It informs and in return, it is informed by these domains and positions. As pointed out earlier, class difference effects how masculinities are formed and performed. Class in this sense is the broad conception of one's social position, which includes the economic, social and cultural dimensions of one's status. None of these accounts can indicate an individual's class without remaining in conversation with the other ones. By locating hegemonic masculinities in the power hierarchy and economic relations, their expressions in the social field become visible. However, different social domains may affect how masculinity functions in different contexts. From this perspective, the domain of the family functions as an extension of the capital accumulated by its members. As Bourdieu argues, ¨every group has its more or less institutionalized forms of delegation which enable it to concentrate the totality of the social capita, which is the basis of the existence of the

52

group¨ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.251). Following the same thread, it can be argued that members of a group (or the member of a family in this case), can utilize this capital.

Considering this, in *Winter Sleep*, when Aydın's estranged wife Nihal secretly decides to give a donation that Aydın has made to her charity to the impoverished İsmail, the poverty-stricken man throws it into the fire. In this scene, which takes place in a dimly lit room, the characters' emotions and actions are foregrounded through close-up shots. The scene also underlines their stances through juxtaposition; Hamdi sits opposite his brother and Nihal, and when the camera captures him with a close-up shot, it reveals that he disapproves of his brother's attitude. On the other hand, Hamdi's collaboration in these stratified masculine relations becomes clear through the focus on the money's meanings. In this instance, the money takes the form of an expression of power and it is the extension of Aydın's hegemony because it derives from Aydın's economic capital, therefore, it poses a symbolic threat. İsmail thus refuses to take the money by throwing it into the fire.

When he throws the money, the camera focuses on Ismail's face through a medium close-up shot in order to highlight his emotions. At first, he gazes at the crying Nihal with a firm manner and his slightly leaning head with his eyes looking upward suggests a defiant stance. Then he directs his gaze to left, and the camera cuts to İlyas, who is peeping through the door, which has been cracked open. Then, when the camera zooms in to İlyas's face, it suggests İsmail's gaze to him because the shot before this one established that İsmail turned his gaze there. İlyas takes a very quick look at the money in the fireplace and then looks at his father again. His facial expressions are in contrast with the scene in which his father slaps him. In the former one, when he faces his father, he is portrayed as angry through his frowning

53

eyebrows. However, in this sequence, he looks rather approvingly at his father's action. Then the camera cuts back to İsmail, whose eyes are filled with tears, which suggests his dilemma between securing his masculinity and his economic relief. It is crucial to point out once again how local masculinities encapsulate and internalise local cultures and symbols in order to distribute their hegemony. The masculine imagery that arises from this process generates itself through a bifurcated gender context. Through that, certain acts are assigned gendered roles. From this perspective, accepting Nihal's offer would relieve İsmail's economic problems for the time being but it wouldn't be befitting with the local hegemonic masculine imagery that surrounds him.

With this in mind, when İlyas's presence is considered, it becomes clearer that masculinity is also passed on through teaching and appropriation. Following the same thread, İlyas's presence compels İsmail to act in a certain manner because he is accountable for his son's masculinity as well. This notion evinces itself when İsmail's tirade is considered. When he counts the money that Nihal has brought, he says that this amount of money for the little İlyas who has witnessed his father being beaten up by the bailiffs. Both sequences underline different aspects of masculinity and its relation to economic capital. Firstly, as it is laid out, Aydın's affluence extends to his family, which means that any member of his family can employ economic capital. What makes it a masculine trait is depicted through İsmail's firm refusal of the money. The interaction is complicated here by fact that it is Nihal who brings the money; while Nihal's offer is the extension of Aydın's affluence and it is exercised by proxy, the manner and codes through which İsmail constructs his masculinity allow him to defy a woman.

In a similar vein, *Majority* represents how money functions as a catalyst of power and masculinity and therefore, how refusing it can help to maintain other men's masculinity. In the scene when the taxi driver visits Kemal to complain about his car, the taxi driver's refusal indicates that turning down the money prevents subordinate masculinities from becoming marginalized. When Kemal blames the taxi driver for being a beggar, the taxi driver throws the money back at him by saying ¨what do you take me for?¨ (*Majority*) (Seren Yüce, 2010). Kemal's beggar remark indicates a marginal position, and the taxi driver's actions underline the fact that refusing money in this context is an affirmation of an honour-based conception of masculinity. The interaction between Kemal and the taxi driver is charged with a masculine confrontation through economic capital.

4.2 Intellectual and institutional capital and masculinity

Aside from economic capital, masculinity can be secured, exercised and fortified through the utilization of intellectual capital. Intellect as a capital is located at the intersection of masculinity and cultural capital. In a fashion similar to economic capital, it can be materialized through different domains and it can also signify an individual's status. From this perspective, intellect can be cultural capital in the embodied state through utilizing certain qualifications, such as academic degrees or titles, which indicate the institutionalized state of cultural capital. Moreover, this embodied and institutionalized state can be objectified in materials, such as writing; in return it incorporates the objectified state into intellect and vice versa. Intellectual capital becomes a masculine trait when it enters into interactions to secure and reproduce masculinities. For instance, when it is employed in an interaction between two characters who do not enjoy the same rank, it reproduces the hegemony. This

aspect also enables us to locate its relation to masculinity when it is employed. Since lower and working class masculinities are distinguished from upper class masculinities through the utilization of the body and intellect, intellectual capital's hegemonic characteristic is already underlined in relation to class. However, intellectual capital is not utilized against lower class masculinities unless the interaction revolves around knowledge.

Both *Winter Sleep* and *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* portray how intellectual capital is implemented as a masculine strategy. In *Winter Sleep*, the main character Aydın is a retired actor, and is portrayed as an intellectual both through his former profession and his title as a columnist. His name, which means enlightened in Turkish, also signals his intellectuality. Aydın employs his intellectual capital in two different situations: either when he interacts with someone as affluent as he is or when he needs to establish moral superiority. For Aydın, intellectual capital thus becomes an alternative apparatus to economic capital.

In this sense, Aydın's interactions with his friend Suavi are remarkable because they illustrate how he employs intellectual capital in order to maintain his hegemonic position in relation to other people. In one sequence, he invites Suavi to his home to discuss an e-mail that he has received from a teacher who asks for his help in building a local vocational school. Aydın invites Suavi to his study room and then he invites Nihal to join them because she also does charity work. Aydın's motivation initially appears to be to question the validity of the young teacher's request but the reading of the e-mail eventually becomes a performance for Aydın as he tries to make it function as a marker of his importance for the community in the eyes of Suavi and Nihal. The duo first sits opposite one another, but Aydın is in the centre of the medium long shot frame in which the light from the window is cast on

him. This framing suggests that he is the focus point of the scene, because he is almost singled out and there is a certain contrast between him and Suavi because Suavi is back-lit, which makes him almost invisible.

The mise-en-scene also emphasizes Aydın in different ways. For example, behind Aydın's chair, there are three old swords on the wall, a setting that suggests not only his gender but also his past. This is intensified by a lamp next to Aydın's chair, which illuminates the mask on the wall. This theatrical mask not only refers to Aydın's former job but also underlines the notion that he is on a metaphorical stage as the scene unfolds. When he moves on to his desk, the camera cuts there with a medium shot in order to capture his books on his desk, which again underlines his intellectual side. When Nihal enters the room, rather than capturing her movement, the camera follows Aydın with a panning move, ultimately focusing on her face with a close-up when she sits on Aydın's chair and starts to converse with Suavi. It is remarkable that in contrast to Aydın's and Suavi's interaction, Nihal and Suavi's interaction is shot with a shot-reverse-shot strategy, which demonstrates a mutual conversation, also, although she sits on Aydın's chair the mise-en-scene is completely different than Aydın's because the details such as the swords and the mask are not captured. The medium shot places her in the scene and whenever she converses with Suavi, her reflection is on the mirror next to him. Then the camera cuts to Aydın with a medium long shot and establishes his place but also points out the theatrical masks next to his desk once more to underline his performance.

Apart from the editorial and framing choices in this sequence, the dynamics between the characters are also remarkable. The fact that Aydın is portrayed through theatre signals insincerity and pretence, because a contrast is generated through the juxtaposition of stage and real life. Moreover, audience members are invited to take a

step back from the diegetic world of the film through the highly staged nature of the scene.

When Aydın starts to read the e-mail aloud, the first part of the e-mail is filled with pompous language that praises him. As he starts reading, the camera starts to zoom-in to him until it establishes a close-up, which foregrounds his face and emotions. At the same time the zooming-in movement underlines that it is an inward directed action to his inner self, which suggests that the pompous language is actually Aydın's aspiration of how he wants to be seen by others. Meanwhile, the zoom-in also starts with Nihal's implied perspective, which also suggests that Nihal perceives him as self-obsessed and arrogant. This is established with a short cut, while Aydın continues to read the e-mail, the camera cuts to Nihal and it zooms-in for a few seconds on her and her facial expressions, underlining the fact that she despises Aydın. The whole sequence marks how economic capital and cultural capital are interwoven. The e-mail refers to Aydın's article in the local newspaper and it also identifies Aydın as ¨one of the most notable people in the area¨ (*Winter Sleep*) (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2014).

In order for intellectual capital to function as a masculine trait, it should be agreed upon prior to the context in which it is employed. It is important to note that intellectual capital's validity only matters if others challenge it, otherwise, as long as it is accepted by other participants in the interaction, its validity is not questioned. There are two sequences in the *Winter Sleep* that illustrate this precarity. The first sequence takes place in Aydın's study room, where he chats with his sister Necla (Demet Akbağ) about his latest column in the local newspaper. In this sequence, Necla congratulates Aydın for his writings, and she even suggests, ¨Wouldn't it be better to write for a widely known newspaper instead of writing for a local one that

no one knows about?¨ Aydın replies: ¨Never mind, although my kingdom is small, I am the king nevertheless¨ (*Winter Sleep*). Necla's compliment on Aydın's intellectual work validates Aydın's intellectual capital and Aydın emphasizes how this capital empowers his masculine stance by comparing himself to a king. In the next sequence, Necla criticizes Aydın's writings and questions the authenticity of his intellectuality by suggesting that he does not have any expertise regarding the topics he writes about.

In the first sequence, Aydın turns to face his sister while she compliments him and the camera captures the siblings through the shot-counter-shot technique in order to underline their conversation. Whereas in the next sequence, when Necla starts to criticise him, Aydın does not turn altogether to face her but he maintains a half open stance and the medium shot suggests that he is protecting himself. As the argument gets heated, the camera captures them with a close-up in order to show their emotions. Aydın is anxious and concerned about Necla's criticism and his fidgeting his chin obsessively underlines his agitative state. Aydın tries to defend his intellectuality by suggesting that Necla's opinions are not shared. Eventually, however, he admits that he is upset about Necla's remarks because ¨a writer is sensitive about his works¨ (*Winter Sleep*) (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2014)*,* and he proceeds to question Necla's motivation for criticising him.

When he fails to establish his hegemony over Necla through his intellectual capital, Aydın attacks her by referring to her failed marriage and her gender. He says: ¨After all these years, it is not surprising that you didn't learn to be well-behaved so you got divorced. If you don't stop being so sharp tongued, no men will put up with you, I warn you!¨ (*Winter Sleep*) (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2014). In this exchange is remarkable how Aydın evokes a generalized traditional masculinity which is formed

through local codes, such as a husband who desires a soft-spoken wife, in order to attack her when his economic and cultural capital fail to impress. It other words, brother and sister are brought together through class superiority vis-à-vis the local Cappadocia community, but their gender difference nonetheless creates patriarchal tensions when they experience disagreement as to the value of Aydın's intellectual capital.

Intellectual capital also denotes knowledge because it is engendered through certain qualifications. Therefore it can validate the competency of other masculinities. In *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia*, Doctor Cemal (Muhammet Uzuner) functions both as a validator and a comparison point for the other male characters. In the film, a group of policemen try to locate a dead body. The prosecutor Nusret (Taner Birsel), police commissar Naci (Yılmaz Erdoğan) and Doctor Cemal lead the group around a rural part of Anatolia. As the band travel around the town, it is not only the location of the body but their inner feelings that unfold. Although the culprit has confessed to the crime, he was drunk the night of the murder and cannot locate the dead body. His complicit, mentally challenged brother cannot comprehend the seriousness of the situation. As the events unfold, we learn that the prosecutor's wife has committed suicide, Naci's son is sick and Doctor Cemal has divorced his wife. Whereas each of these three characters enjoy the social benefits associated with their official titles, it is Doctor Cemal's medical degree that underlines a certain intellectual accomplishment and superiority. Because of his medical qualifications, the other men feel secure in their masculinities only upon ¨proving¨ themselves and their talents to him. In the movie, when Arap Ali (Ahmet Mümtaz Taylan), and the doctor engage in a conversation, Ali mentions that he visits that location quite often

and when he does, he brings his gun with him and shoots. Moreover, Ali associates guns and facing danger with masculinity:

> Ali: Everybody has a gun around here doctor. You cannot do without a gun. There are good people and bad people, you can never know. When it is necessary you have to shoot them in the forehead (*Once Upon a Time in Anatolia*) (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2011).

Ali accentuates his masculinity by pointing out masculine features such as courage and bravery that are catalysed with local cultural interpretations of masculinity. It is also important to note that when Ali talks to the doctor, he does not try to establish hegemony over him but he wants to be acknowledged as ¨one of them¨ as well as a local informant. The first part of the dialogue is captured with the shot-reverse-shot technique, which suggests a conversation, but when Ali begins to explain how satisfying it feels to shoot in the open air, the camera starts to pan across the field first to the Doctor's face and then to Ali's. The panning movement engages Ali and the Doctor with the land, which signifies the local culture and codes that encapsulate Ali.

On the other hand, Ali's inner feelings are depicted through a close-up, which turns into an extreme close-up as Ali continues to express his opinions. The movie also uses a linear axis as a symbol of local culture and its continuation. From a spatial perspective there are linear elements throughout the movie. For instance, all three cars follow each other in the field, the train goes through the valley in a linear manner, and more importantly, when the apple falls down from the tree it tumbles down and ends up in the creek with other fallen apples. The symbolism underlines the local culture and its continuation through spatiality. The manner in which local codes and symbols effect masculinity is analysed further in the next chapter. Nonetheless, the interaction between Doctor Cemal and Ali demonstrates that

knowledge about the local environment and intellectual capital can be juxtaposed. The overlap arises from the fact that both concepts are related to knowledge formations and intellectual backgrounds. In *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia*, however, similar to how sub-hegemonic masculinities are formulated in Beasley's study, local knowledge is limited to a certain geographic space, which is why it remains subordinate to an intellectual capital that is perceived to be universal.

Since cultural capital in its institutionalized state refers to qualifications, degrees or titles, it is validated by and associated with authority. After these are obtained, they provide certain advantages to their bearers in the relations of power and production. In public institutions, cultural capital functions as the marker of status in the hierarchy. In such institutions, it is possible to narrow cultural capital down to institutional capital because the hierarchy is generated through official titles. In other words, in public institutions the structure of hierarchy is established beforehand and whoever is appointed to the upper position is also entitled to exercise that position's power. From this perspective, other forms of capital become subsidiary to institutional capital. This is axiomatic especially if we consider how often people are regarded with their titles. From this perspective, having a medical degree would underline one's intellectual capital but practising medicine in an institution would signify it's institutional character. In *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia,* Nusret is regarded with his title throughout the movie. By doing this, his position in the public domain and his status in relation to others is underlined.

Most of the movie revolves around the culprit and public officers such as prosecutor and his assistants, police officers, military police and a doctor. All of these professions also function within a systematic hierarchy but when the position and the rank is amalgamated with masculinity, it provides certain advantages to its

bearer. At the same time, this amalgamation can be threatening for the lower ranking officers. In Bourdiesian terms they all exist in the scene with their habitus, they are informed by their rank and positions, which are formed with reference to different forms of capital. When these forms coalesce with their masculinity, the hierarchy becomes not only an institutional one but also a social one. Although the hierarchy is inherent to institutions, it can be employed by individuals through their titles. From this perspective, the prosecutor Nusret can be positioned as the bearer of the hegemonic position, because he possesses an institutional capital that cannot be matched by anyone else in the site that is represented in the movie.

Throughout the movie, Nusret is portrayed as reasonable and professional, as stated earlier, these notions are aligned with masculinity in gender relations through binary oppositions. Moreover, these notions are attributed as upper class characteristics in power relations. Therefore, whenever Nusret is required to handle a situation, he does not intervene with his body, rather he exercises his authority through his institutional capital. How institutional capital takes the form of masculine capital can be seen in hierarchical interactions. In the movie, police commissar Naci is juxtaposed to Nusret in some instances to underline their hierarchy. Although his rank suggests dominance over other police officers, the prosecutor's presence does not allow him to exercise his institutional capital since he is positioned as Nusret's subordinate. This is visible in how Naci positions his body in relation to the prosecutor. In the first location where they try to find the buried body, Naci informs Nusret that they couldn't find the body in that location. In this scene, Naci's hands are folded below his waist, which signifies not only respect but his deference. The prosecutor, on the other hand, stands erect with his hands in his trouser pockets. His

calmer and more direct behaviour signifies his dominance over Naci and thus the others.

In the next location when the culprit fails to recognize the place again, Naci runs after the prosecutor to inform him once more that their search has failed. In this scene, while the long shot incorporates multiple characters, it also underlines Naci's position in relation to Nusret. This is also established by having the two characters walk towards the camera, keeping the others at a distance, and following them from afar. Nusret maintains his haughty stance while Naci runs after him. At first Nusret does not turn to face Naci and this almost dismissive behaviour is accentuated by his critique of Naci's failure to locate the dead body. After Nusret walks offscreen, Naci is singled out in the frame for a second with a medium shot. His glance at the prosecutor in the implied space and his facial expressions suggest that he is disgraced in the eyes of the prosecutor.

However, intellectual capital does not function as expected if it is not validated by someone of a higher rank or if it is not supported by alternative forms of capital. This can be deduced best from Hamdi's situation. In *Winter Sleep,* Hamdi is an imam and as Aydın explains in the scene in which he chats with his sister, imams are supposed to be respected by others because of their profession. In other words, his job provides a certain local cultural capital through institutionalization. Hamdi tries to use the advantage of his profession and the intellectual capital attached to it on several occasions. However, he fails especially when he tries to communicate with Aydın because his intellectual capital is not validated by him. In other words, Hamdi's intellectual capital does not work on Aydın because of economic capital or lack of it.

Intellectual capital's institutional form may function as a regulatory tool through its ability to threaten others with punishment. This aspect of intellectual and institutional capital in relation to masculinity is demonstrated in *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia,* through the prosecutor and the police commissar. When the culprit repeatedly fails to identify the crime scene, Naci gets angry with him and starts to beat him. The prosecutor, whose hegemony over the others is established through reason and intellect, intervenes and retrieves Naci. Both Naci and Nusret's speeches indicate and reveal certain relations that are integrated with strategies. Naci tells the prosecutor that he wants to finish the job as soon as possible so that Nusret can go back to Ankara. Although Nusret's reference to Naci's profession and his use of a possessive suffix (*Savcım*) indicate Nusret's hegemony in relation to Naci, it also reveals a relation of dominance and alliance. Nusret embodies institutional capital and threatens Naci with filing a report of his actions. Moreover, Naci acknowledges Nusret's hegemony and his right to threaten him through institutional capital. In his scene with the culprit, he forbids him from smoking and says that he has to earn the right to smoke: ¨Look at the prosecutor, the man studied law and worked hard, so he can smoke and berate. Why? Because he earned it¨ (*Once Upon a Time in Anatolia*) (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2011). Naci's speech demonstrates that he acknowledges his status in relation to the prosecutor and it also reveals his subordinated state because of Nusret's threat.

Moreover, Nusret emphasizes the importance of being in the commanding position in the scene in which he orders the clerk to file the official report of the murder. Naci watches him from a distance with Arap Ali and he says: ¨In this world, you are to lead rather than follow Arap¨ (*Once Upon a Time in Anatolia*) (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2011). As far as his relation with Nusret is concerned, Naci expresses how

being subordinate feels and that is the reason he needs certain strategies so as not to feel completely emasculated. The fact that Naci beat the culprit, that Nusret threatened Naci and that Naci acknowledged Nusret's higher status, represent the institutional expression of power which is inherent to masculinity through power relations.

In this complicated web of relations, non-hegemonic masculinities employ certain strategies in order to secure, maintain and reproduce their masculinities. These strategies depend mainly on the specific relationships between agents. If they engage in a strategy against upper class masculinity, they usually emphasize their bodies or what the body stands for in the interpretations of local culture and symbols. When they interact with a peer or with their subordinates, they utilize strategies of appropriation and alliance. These are usually expressed through awaiting confirmation or validity, mockery and derision. For instance, after Nusret criticises Naci's failure, Naci seeks approval from the driver, Arap Ali, by implying that he is actually doing Nusret a favour and his job is actually more difficult than the prosecutor's. Naci tries to verify his position also by suggesting that his body functions better than Nusret's. In the scene where they wait for the prosecutor to urinate for the fifth time, Naci asks Doctor Cemal if he thinks this is evidence of a prostate problem. Although the doctor replies that he is uncertain, Naci suggest that the doctor should check him out. His remark makes the police officer and Arap Ali laugh. Prostates, in this context, are associated with youth, virility and potency. Since Naci cannot compete with Nusret in terms of capital, he can only maintain his status by positioning himself as more virile and therefore more masculine than Nusret.

Naci employs a similar strategy of collaboration with his subordinates in the scene in which they finally locate the dead body and Nusret starts to dictate the

proceedings to the clerk. In his conversation with Arap Ali, Naci implies that the prosecutor has taken advantage of the situation, even though it is Naci who has been striving all day long. In this long shot scene, Naci's triumphant attitude is portrayed with his posture, which is slightly more erect than when he is with the prosecutor but since Nusret is at the focal point of the scene, Naci's head is slightly tilted down to underline his victorious but proud state. When Naci mocks Nusret and his subordinates laugh, they also engender a certain masculine cooperation, in which they mark which actions are masculine and which aren't. This interaction endorses the concept that masculinities engender themselves through others.

4.3 The family and masculinity

For the upper classes, hegemonic positions are attained and secured through the cultural capital that is intricately related to their professions. For the lower classes, on the other hand, masculine domination or hegemony is engendered and maintained both in and in relation to the family. The family as an institution marks the social status of the male through economic and cultural contexts. For instance, providing for the family becomes a masculine trait through cultural codes because if the patriarch fails to provide for his family, he loses his status in the society. Hegemonic masculinities that are engendered within the family do not possess a power that can be exercised outside of its proper domain, unless they obtain other forms of cultural capital. From this perspective, they are the examples of hegemonic masculinity on a micro level because even if all hegemonic aspects are stripped off from masculinity, such as economic, intellectual and institutional capital, they still maintain a certain type of hegemony within the boundaries of the family.

In the family setting, hegemonic masculinities are formed through the binary opposition between men and women. In this context, men provide for the family and women do the housework without an economic exchange. The economic aspect of this formation is axiomatic but the practice of providing for the family signifies the man as the bearer of a certain masculinity, and as the breadwinner patriarch (*aile reisi)*. The patriarch's masculinity is also formed through their differences from other masculinities, by employing rituals and local cultural codes, such as morality and honour. Locating the patriarch's masculinity as a hegemonic one resonates with Sancar's study, which also underlines that there are multiple masculinities; from the point of view of class, however, belonging to the lower class does not necessarily mark those masculinities as subordinate. Both the patriarch's masculinity that stems from the incorporation of lower class and local codes, and upper class masculinities that are engendered through their capital capacities can occupy the hegemonic position in different social settings.

From this perspective, *Beyond the Hill* represents how hegemonic masculinity is formed through the family by juxtaposing three families in one context. In contrast to the other movies that are chosen for this study, *Beyond the Hill* is shot using a different style. The bucolic setting and lyrical modes of framing invite us to analyse the movie through symbolisms as well. In the movie, which is set in a valley of woods and creeks, Faik (Tamer Levent) has his son and grandsons as his guests. He has a footman, Mehmet (Mehmet Özgür) whose son herds the family's goats. Mehmet's wife does the housework for Faik. One day, Faik confiscates a goat from the nomadic people that live beyond the nearby hill and he butchers the animal and feeds it to his guests. Then, someone shoots Faik's son and kills their dog and spoils his crops. Faik bands everybody together and goes beyond the hill. They come back

having shot four of the nomadic community's goats. Upon their return, they realize that somebody has shot Faik's elder grandson Zafer. The film ends with them marching to the hill once more.

Faik represents the first family in which he has the unquestionable authority. His son Nusret's (Reha Özcan) family is the second one; although Nusret has certain hegemonic elements over his sons, as long as his father is around, he cannot obtain the hegemonic position. Faik's footman Mehmet and his family occupy the lowest rank on the hierarchy, because his wife Meryem (Banu Fotocan) is the housekeeper and his son Sülü (Sercan Gümüş) herds goats for Faik. From this perspective, Faik embodies the role of the authority that possesses the power of commanding his sons and employees. Just as Kemal's house and work demarcate his hegemonic area, Faik's property demarcates his hegemony. He is determined to defend his property against nomadic people. Through his protective instincts, the concept of authority is merged with his position as the head of the family and thus, his hegemonic masculinity is reproduced.

Faik's hegemonic position can be seen in the movie through his interactions with other men. For instance, in the sequence in which Mehmet prepares the goat for the barbecue, he stands next to Faik to catch his breath. Mehmet reminds him of his debt:

> Faik: Mehmet.
> Mehmet: Yes.
> Faik: I suppose you know what day it is today, right?
> Mehmet: Yes, I know.
> Faik: I told you before.
> Mehmet: Yes, you did.
> Faik: If you won't be able to pay, give me your goats. You can get
> them back once you have the money.
> Mehmet: You know I had to pay for the motorcycle …
> Faik: Whatever. Let's take care of this situation in a week or two.
> Mehmet: Okay (Beyond the Hill) (Emin Alper, 2012).

It is important to note that in this sequence, Faik does not turn his face to Mehmet, which underlines his superiority because he does not let a mutual communication occur. Moreover, although they are positioned side by side, the camera captures them from a different angle when it frames the conversation through a shot-counter-shot. In the following sequence, Mehmet goes into the woods and he starts to strike plants with his stick after he says ¨fuck¨ and then he continues to swear and strike. In this scene, the camera captures Mehmet from behind, which underlines his point of vision. It also reminds us of the opening sequence of the movie in which we only see a stick striking plants.

In another instance, when Faik is at home, talking to Meryem about what will happen to his property after he dies, he says that:

> Faik: Look, I think that if you could save a bit of money, you could buy this place and it would be better.
> Meryem: That is a bit difficult.
> Faik: If that husband of yours was a bit smart, he would have bought half of the land already. But with that mentality, he will probably lose everything (*Beyond the Hill*) (Emin Alper, 2012).

Although Faik is at home, Mehmet is on the stairs as this conversation takes place. He overhears Faik's comment about himself. The light that comes from the house illuminates Mehmet's face on the stairs. As he stands there and listens to Faik, the camera singles him out by focusing on his face through a medium close-up shot. The camera is positioned below him, which makes it possible to see his expressions clearly as he gazes upward. This positioning also underlines the hierarchical relationship between Faik and Mehmet. As he continues to listen, he scowls in the direction of the space that Mehmet occupies. This scene demonstrates that Faik can intrusively enter into another family's domain, a space which is supposed to generate Mehmet's masculinity according to local codes. However, since Faik occupies a hegemonic position in relation to Mehmet through their relationship, he extends his

70

hegemony into another family and in this context, Meryem signifies the entirety of Mehmet's family domain and its lack of autonomy.

Faik also maintains his hegemonic position through rituals. When his grandson asks for the family rifle, Faik teaches him how to shoot and when he aims at the empty bottle successfully he caresses his head. On the other hand, when Sülü appears behind the empty bottles that serve as targets, Faik tells him to wait but his grandson shoots anyway. Faik gets angry and takes the rifle away from him. Here, the ritualistic aspect of masculinity is merged with both male bonding and violence and since Faik represents the authoritative position he can punish and reward others' behaviours. In other words, he teaches and approbates his grandson on how to gain a hegemonic position.

Hegemonic masculinity in *Majority* on the other hand, functions in multiform ways. As stated before, Kemal's hegemonic position is reproduced through his economic capital, but his title as the breadwinner of the family informs his hegemonic position and secures it within the family's domain. In other words, he employs his title in his family to maintain his hegemonic position. Similar to Faik, he has the authority to send his son off to another city and order him to break up with his girlfriend. When he sends Mertkan to another city to deliver some lumber for a construction project, the site chief tells Mertkan that they didn't ask for any lumber, in fact they have a lot of it. After that sequence, when Mertkan converses with his brother in the balcony, he says that his father has sent him to Gebze for no reason, he claims that his father did so because he went to a café with his friends for a cup of tea. By looking from this perspective, Mertkan realizes that his father exercised sheer authority over him. More importantly, when he tells his brother that he got rid of him by getting married, he classifies his family as his father's dominion.

After Mertkan's accident, his father comes to the police station to get him and he does not criticise Mertkan in front of the officers or the taxi driver. However, when they get in the car his father gets angry with Mertkan and slaps him on the face and threatens him. Like Faik, Kemal also teaches his son through discipline. After that sequence, Kemal tells Mertkan to have the report fixed, upon his return Mertkan stands in front of his father's desk and his tilted head with slightly frowned eyebrows suggest his father's disapproval of him. The camera captures this scene from behind Kemal, which implies his point of vision, thus Mertkan's portrayal is also how his father perceives him. In order words, apart from economic capital, Kemal establishes hegemony over Mertkan just by being his father and the head of their family.

Throughout *Majority,* Kemal employs strategies that are similar to those of Faik. For instance, he positions the concept of the family as a moral category and the bearer of its members' social statuses. He forbids his son from seeing Gül, a girl from another city because she does not fit into his ideals.

> Kemal: Did you find out where she is from?
> Mertkan: She is from Van, dad.
> Kemal: Get rid of her then.
> Mertkan: Why? What does that have to do with anything, dad?
> Kemal: Son! We don't know who her mother and father are. We don't know what she eats and how she makes money. Nobody knows who the fuck she is. Just get rid of her. I didn't like her. I don't want to see her again at my house (*Majority*) (Seren Yüce, 2010).

While Kemal creates a discourse that surrounds the family through rituals and cultural codes, he also assures his son that one day he will be occupying the hegemonic position if he follows in his father's steps:

> Kemal: Look, my son. You are at an age in which you have to make bigger, more serious decisions. You are going to do your military service soon and after you come back you will get married. You will take over our family business. That's why you must be careful about who you choose to hang out with. You

must just hang around with people who are like yourself. Thanks
to God, we are all Muslims and Turkish, you must be with people
who are worthy of our family. Of course you are going to show
off and hang around but you have to watch the people with whom
you are hanging out. Look how each day I go to work for the
family and our nation to make something worthy and honourable,
to make more. You will work for your own wife and kids soon.
But you will watch out for the kind of people you are befriending,
so we don't upset each other. These kind of people seek to divide
our nation, that's why being with them will hurt us all. Alright,
my boy? (*Majority*) (Seren Yüce, 2010).

In order to strengthen his patriarchal position, Kemal employs a particular form of Turkish-Islamic nationalism. Although he never pronounces Gül's implied Kurdish origins, he creates a contrast between their family and an unnamed "these kind of people." In doing so, Kemal the father becomes the direct extension of both the Turkish state and the Turkish nation and these are all part and parcel of his specific masculinity. Kemal's masculinity is the most valued in his local setting, therefore, it is a locally hegemonic form of masculinity and the cultural codes that surround this masculinity are also most valued in the same local setting. These religious and nationalist codes are employed by him and turned into a masculine discourse. He achieves this by creating a bond between the family and the nation on the one hand, and being worthy and honourable on the other, and he underlines the fact that the family is the domain in which values and statutes are generated. His conceptualization of the family signifies that he does not talk about his family per se but he expresses the idea of the family in the larger context of the nation, and men's function in it.

Similarly, Faik in *Beyond the Hill* controls his son and his employees with reference to the unnamed nomadic people who live in their vicinity; they represent the "others" in that specific geography in the same way that Kemal juxtaposes the concept of otherness with Kurdish people. Although it is not clearly revealed in the

movie, it is implied that all of the problems that Faik associates with the nomadic people are actually brought about by his family members. He thinks that nomadic people feed their herd with his crops, they shoot his dog and wound his son Nusret. But in the movie, it is clear that Mehmet damages the crops on several occasions. Also, when Caner visits Sülü at night, he is afraid of the barking dog and he hesitates to walk by it and he aims at the dog with his grandfather's rifle. After that, the camera cuts to another scene but a gunshot is heard in the implied space. In the barbecue sequence, after they eat, Nusret goes home and he starts a conversation with Meryem. At the end of the sequence, Nusret sexually abuses her. After that the camera cuts to Sülü, who is on a hill, looking down at the house. The camera captures Sülü from behind, which implies that he can see what is happening in the house. In the morning, Nusret gets wounded on his leg. It is suggested through the previous scene that Sülü has done it. But Faik gathers his family and tells them that the nomadic people have gone too far. The group climbs over the hill and kills the nomadic people's goats.

As Cengiz, Tol and Küçükkural points out, ¨masculinity is also established through absent others¨ (Cengiz et. al. 2004): both Faik and Kemal homogenize their hegemonic masculinity by gathering their respective families and by excluding certain groups of people. *Beyond the Hill* contrasts settled and nomadic ways of living, but in the film, the nomadic people are never given a distinct identity, they are merely associated with a space that is both juxtaposed to, yet culturally distinct from Faik's household. In this context, masculinity becomes a catalyst of controlling the territory.

The process of constructing and cultivating masculinities in the context of the family and homosocial settings is not frictionless. Both *Majority* and *Beyond the Hill*

represent instances of this issue. From this perspective, Mertkan's situation presents complicated instances. He is a member of two predominantly male groups, the first one is related to his father, his business and their family, and the second one is represented through his friends. In these groups, a certain discourse about masculinity circulates and surrounds their members and indicates strategies of inclusion and exclusion. For instance, when Mertkan goes to a shopping mall with his friends, they despise the shoppers who are ice-skating. By creating a contrast between themselves and the others that they deem frivolous and even feminine, they include certain elements in their masculinities. This moment underlines how masculinities are constructed through others.

Additionally, both of these groups adopt nationalistic discourses into masculinity and by appropriating them, they justify their everyday stances on social and political issues. For instance, as discussed earlier, Mertkan's interactions with his father's friend Necmi are underlined with constant references to his military service. When Mertkan visits Necmi in his office, he immediately asks when Mertkan is going to do his military service and then he says, ¨You would make a fine commando, you know.¨ When Mertkan hesitates, he adds: ¨Aren't you going to combat on the mountains?¨ (*Majority*) (Seren Yüce, 2010). In his admonition, Necmi mirrors Kemal's earlier warning about the people that Mertkan hangs out with. Whereas Kemal marks Mertkan's girlfriend as the ¨other¨ through a nationalistic discourse and threatens him about the possible outcome, Necmi positions the other as Mertkan's personal enemy in combat. Further paralleling Kemal's statement, Mertkan's friend Ersan says that Mertkan should just have sexual intercourse with Gül but nothing more because, he says ¨you have nothing to do with her¨ (*Majority*)

(Seren Yüce, 2010). The discourse, which stems from these statements, demarcates Mertkan's choices.

Since these groups have the power to approve one's masculinity, instead of challenging these threats, Mertkan employs two strategies. First of all, he denies being in a relationship with Gül, he says that he just dropped her off a few times at her home. Secondly, when he breaks up with her after his father's intervention, he brags about having sexual intercourse with her. In other words, he turns the bond between them into a conquest; since heterosexual activity is one of the prevailing codes of that group, he thus reproduces his masculinity. Consequently, these scenes demonstrate how masculinities are homogenized by excluding other individuals, choices, and lifestyles. However, the scenes also underline that being caught in the middle of his feelings and hegemonic codes causes Mertkan anxiety. This can be seen in the sequences that follow Mertkan's conversation with his friend in the night club. At first, Mertkan brags about his sexual conquest but when they leave the club, he goes to find Gül. When he realizes that her family has taken her away, he gets home drunk, vomits and sleeps in the bathroom. The following day, after a business meeting, his father tells him that he has become a nuisance for the business and sends him away to another town. After a few days in Gebze, Mertkan starts to have vivid dreams and wakes up crying. His inner turmoil and its vivid, bodily manifestations suggest that he suffers from conforming to the hegemonic codes that are set through his father and his friends.

The fact that Mertkan is left alone in Gebze urges him to follow his father's example, thus, he asks him for a gun to protect the construction site. His initiative gets accepted by his father, so when he goes back home for the weekend, his father welcomes him with a smiling and approving gesture. At first, Mertkan gets punished

because he does not comply with hegemonic codes, but he is allowed to return as a result of his appropriation of hegemonic codes of violent masculinity. These scenes reveal that strategies of inclusion and exclusion are not just utilized against outsiders but also to rehabilitate insiders.

The manner in which adapting to local codes and symbols in order to collaborate with other masculinities creates inner struggles can further be analysed in *Beyond the Hill.* The local codes and rituals that surround masculinity are demonstrated throughout the movie. Some of these rituals function as rites of passage, at the juncture of the passage between being a boy and being a man. Therefore, when Faik allows and teaches his grandson how to use a rifle, and Mehmet secretly provides him with alcohol, even though he is a minor, they also initiate a rite. It is important to reiterate that these objects or notions do not carry any masculine value in themselves, they acquire these meanings through local culture and symbols. Thus, a rifle and drinking the local alcoholic beverage *rakı* symbolize manhood and masculinity only through local interpretations. These instances also reveal how inclusion strategies function within a group. Whereas Faik's obsession with the nomadic people who live beyond the hill demonstrates exclusion strategies, it also demonstrates how masculinities are reproduced through inclusion.

In contrast to *Majority, Beyond the Hill* represents the local codes through actions rather than discourses. When Caner imitates a gunshot while he is acting like a soldier and a movie hero, the viewer is urged to locate his action within the local cultural codes. Similarly, when Faik assembles his son, grandsons and employees, they maintain a soldier-like stance. In the first sequence, they all follow Faik and walk in a single line. In the following sequence, Faik appears on the veranda, which is higher than the ground where the other people are standing, and looks down on

them. The camera captures him from below through a low angle shot and singles him out with a medium close-up: he stands erect with his hands on his hips and his elbows bowed outward. After he takes a look around his surroundings with a haughty and cavalier stance, he orders his subordinates to follow him in devising a plan. Meanwhile, Mehmet, Sülü and Caner are watching him from below, which is underlined with the frame through the implied space and angle. The fact that they are waiting for him all lined up and Sülü carries his rifle on his shoulder denotes their servile and soldier-like stances. The closing sequence of the movie also portrays them in a single line and the marching music underlines the same notion. From a critical point of view, Faik possesses the power to mobilise his subordinates because he is at the summit of the local hierarchy, which is engendered through local interpretations of cultural notions. Subsequently, the discourse of exclusion that is generated through his actions, also functions as a micro-level example of nationalistic discourse akin to the one in *Majority*. Incidentally, with the exception of Faik, everyone knows that nomadic people did not commit the incidents that took place on Faik's property; this fact underlines how collective masculinity cultivates and legitimizes both masculinities and actions.

The same discourse and its effects can also be seen in Zafer's characterization. In *Beyond the Hill*, he is portrayed as alienated because he often strays from the group and wanders around by himself. His alienation, which is expressed through his psychological condition, manifests itself through hallucinations. He encounters a group of soldiers and talks to one of them. His interactions with his hallucinations motivate him to act. From this perspective, the movie juxtaposes Zafer and Faik, because Zafer also defines his purpose and identity with reference to the absent nomadic people. This juxtaposition creates a twofold

aspect. Firstly, it symbolizes the nationalistic discourse which buttresses the masculinity that is partly engendered through it and it also demonstrates that the very same discourse may alienate and marginalize men as well. The second part is illustrated through the sequence when Faik gathers the band and goes to shoot the nomadic people's herd. In this part, Zafer returns home screaming ¨They've killed them… They've killed my friends¨ (*Beyond the Hill*) (Emin Alper, 2012), which shows that Zafer's condition transpired through a trauma that had happened to him in the military or it appeared through the organization of the military service, which makes the experience traumatic in itself. Upon returning from the hill, Zafer encounters the soldier and receives his orders. In order to cross the field with them, he has to find a camouflage. He finds the goat's skin that they butchered last night and disguises himself with it. In this context, the herd becomes his squad but his inability to conform with hegemonic codes eventually gets him killed.

Beyond the Hill, *Majority* and İsmail's relationship with his son İlyas in *Winter Sleep* each demonstrate that the family is a domain in which masculinities are formed, learned and internalized. Similar to homosocial enactment, the elders of the family assume the position of teaching, approbating and normalizing the masculinities of younger generations. However, families are also institutions in which certain masculine strategies are employed against its own members. From this perspective, family members are perceived as being in solidarity against outsiders but they have their own complexities within.

These tensions become especially visible in the relationships between men and women. For instance, in *Winter Sleep,* when Aydın goes to Nihal's room to talk about the charity event that she is organizing, they argue and Aydın leaves the room by saying, ¨I kindly ask you to stop these secret gatherings and these meetings that

you organize in my house behind my back,¨ and he adds ¨I don't think that that penniless teacher cares about what schools are in need of, his only purpose is to entrap neurotics like yourself¨ (*Winter Sleep*) (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2014). Aydın exercises his economic capital by marking his home as his domain, but his last statement underlines the fact that this territoriality is also related to the teacher Levent, which marks his statement as a reaction to Nihal's cooperation with another man, thus engendering a masculine dimension. This dynamic becomes even clearer in the next sequence, when Aydın comes to Nihal's room again to take over her charity work. When Aydın asks Nihal to sit down so they could converse, Nihal reluctantly sits down on her bed; Aydın changes his position to face her and the camera captures Aydın through a mirror, which compels us to analyse the scene as a reflection of Aydın's inner self. At the end of this sequence, Aydın collects all the documents related to the charity and is about the leave the room, when he notices something on top of the cabinet and he takes a look at it. The camera cuts to a different angle which is shot from behind Aydın to underline his point of vision, and then as Aydın leaves, the camera zooms in to the photo on top of the cabinet in which Nihal and the teacher Levent are together with the students from the local school. Both sequences establish that Aydın's actions and his statements are about his image. That image is formed through his gender, thus, his masculinity. Therefore, his actions and statements also function as a masculine strategy.

Apart from this symbolic perspective, when Aydın takes over Nihal's charity work and he postulates her lack of experience and naiveté, he employs a practical strategy that is derived from his economic capital. In this scene the couple is represented in contrast; Aydın belittles the way Nihal organized the books and mocks her lack of knowledge about preparing the legal documents, which makes her cry.

Aydın's cheerful mode is represented through his laughter and careless demeanour. Although Aydın purports that it is about the safety of the family, this sequence underlines the difference between public and private domains. As argued earlier, with the capitalist mode of production the public domain has increasingly been characterized with masculinity because production and political relations have been predominantly male. In juxtaposition to that, the private domain, which is characterized through the family, has been considered feminine because it is the domain in which women's labour is prevalent. From this perspective, when Nihal tries to transition from the private domain to the public one, Aydın threatens her by taking everything she has. The fact that he brings all the documents back to her in the next sequence makes no difference, because the previous scene acknowledges his power over both domains.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study is formulated to address and discuss the representations of masculinity

and the effects of class on masculinity in Turkish cinema by focusing on four movies

that have been produced during the last decade. It aims to explore and critically

locate these concepts by focusing on the editorial and framing choices in *Winter*

Sleep, *Majority*, *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* and *Beyond the Hill* . The thesis

inquiries how masculinity is reproduced through its junction with class status and it

locates its theoretical foundations in the sex and gender dichotomy, masculinity and

hegemonic masculinity, and cultural and symbolic capital as class denominators.

In the analysis part, the interactions between the characters are highlighted

and analysed in order to detect the instances that construct and reconstruct

masculinities. From this perspective, in concordance with the sociological studies

that are reviewed in the opening chapters, it argues that class status plays a pivotal

role in the construction of masculinities. However, it also acknowledges the

fluctuating character of class status as it incorporates multiple factors. Thus, it

deconstructs elements of class in order to pinpoint certain characteristics that are

attainable as masculinities.

Consequently, borrowing Boudieu's theory of forms of capital, three forms of

capital are detected. Economic, intellectual and institutional capital each inform

masculinity in various ways. Economic capital engenders a type of hegemonic

masculinity that employs more direct strategies in order to secure and maintain its

hegemonic position. Intellectual capital underlines more subtle strategies that are

especially useful if the subject is interacting with someone as affluent as himself.

However, intellectual capital requires a validation in order to function as a tool. Subsequently, institutional capital as a form of intellectual capital in its embodied state is juxtaposed with masculinity. In contrast to intellectual capital, institutional capital is always already validated by a higher authority, therefore their validation is not necessary especially in an institutional context. In the four movies, and specifically in *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia,* institutional capital functions as the key marker of social status. With its juxtaposition to masculinity, institutional capital creates hegemonic masculinities that can then occupy the hegemonic position outside the institutional hierarchy as well.

The next part of the analysis focuses on the concept of family as an institution in order to evince that lower class masculinities can obtain hegemonic positions through the family. However, hegemonic masculinities that are constructed within the institution of the family do not possess hegemonic power that can be exercised outside of the family, unless they are supported by other forms of capital. Nevertheless, employing local cultural codes and pairing masculinities with them, help men secure their masculinities.

The last chapter of the analysis concentrates on strategies of collaboration, confirmation, inclusion and exclusion and how do they function in masculine relations. It underlines the fact that apart from class status, there are some strategies available to all masculinities. Following this, it compares and contrasts certain instances and how they affect masculinities. It concludes that hegemonic masculinities that are forged with local codes tend to exercise this power more directly and those who cannot conform with hegemonic codes are inclined to suffer consequences.

Additionally, this study focuses on how masculinities are learned and internalized in the previously mentioned movies and whether they correspond with the sociological frameworks associated with the study of masculinity. *Beyond the Hill* and *Majority* both show how masculine groups shape the masculinity of the next generation. Here, the argument underlines relations of alliance, dominance and subordination through their strategies. Through masculinity's relation with class, it discusses which masculinities are hegemonic in the four movies and why they are the hegemonic ones. It also asks if these hegemonic masculinities have any connection with social class.

It is important to point out that this study has only focused on four movies. Similar analyses can be conducted on different movies and genres. The study also principally focused on masculine relationships and their effect on other masculinities, from this perspective, women and femininity might be included in new studies. Moreover, it is important to underline that all of these movies are produced by male, middle-aged and middle class directors. Therefore a topic for future research might be how the directors' own social positions affected their representations of masculinity. Movies that represent different masculinities, whether hegemonic or subordinate, and that are produced by women directors during the same era might be a fruitful companion to this study.

Ultimately, these four movies represent the relationship between hegemonic masculinity and class. The analysis of these movies pinpoints this relationship through demonstrating their causes and effects. Although representations of masculinity in movies and other media have been studied vigorously, its conjunction with other social structures needs to be elaborated. I believe that this study will contribute to masculinity and film studies at one of these junctures.

REFERENCES

Aksoy, A. (2012). Riding the storm: 'New Istanbul'. *City*, 16(1-2), 93-111.

Arat, Y. (2010). Religion, politics and gender equality in Turkey: Implications of a democratic paradox? *Third World Quarterly*, 31(6), 869-884.

Arslan, S. (2011). *Cinema in Turkey: A new critical history*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Arslan, U.T. (2005). *Bu kâbuslar neden Cemil?: Yeşilçam'da erkeklik ve mazlumluk.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Atay, T. (2004). "Erkeklik" en çok erkeği ezer. *Toplum ve Bilim,* (101), 11-30.

Atiyas, İ., Bakis, O. (2015). Structural change and industrial policy in Turkey. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 5(6), 1209-1229.

Barrett, F. (1996). The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: The case of the US navy. *Gender, Work & Organization,* (3), 129-142.

Beasley, C. (2008). Rethinking hegemonic masculinity in a globalizing world. *Men and Masculinities,* 11(1), 86-103.

Beauvoir, S. (1956). *The second sex*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Boratav, H:B., Fişek, G.O., Ziya, H.E. (2018). *Erkekliğin Türkiye halleri*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2002). *Masculine domination*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2013). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butler, J., (1999). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York and London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2009). *Undoing gender.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Cengiz, K., Tol, U. & Küçükkural, Ö. (2004). Hegemonik erkekliğin peşinden *Toplum ve Bilim,* (101) 50-70.

Collinson, D. and Hearn, J. (1994). Naming men as men: Implications for work, organization and management. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 1(1), 2-22.

Connell, R. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Daldal, A. (2014). The concept of national cinema and the "new Turkish cinema". In Akser, M., Bayraktar, D. (Eds.), *New Media New Cinema: Reinventing Turkish Cinema* (pp.92-111). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Demetriou, D. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society*, 30(3), 337-361. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/657965

Enlil, Z. M. (2011). The neoliberal agenda and the changing urban form of Istanbul. *International Planning Studies*, 16 (1), 5-25.

Gön A. (2014). Tepenin ardı: homososyallik, aile ve erkeklik. *Sinecine*, 5(1), 53-74.

Hatchett, S., Majors, R. and Billson, J. (1993). Cool pose: The dilemmas of black manhood in America*. Contemporary Sociology*, 22(2), 234.

Hearn, J. (1990). *Men, masculinities [and] social theory*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Irigaray, Luce (1985). *This sex which is not one*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Jenkins, R. (2008). *Key sociologists, Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Routledge.

Kablamacı, A.D.M. (2014). Being the shame of society: The construction of hegemonic masculinity in the film Şöhretin Sonu. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi,* (I 46), 37-56.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, 2(3), 274-290.

Kandiyoti, D. (1994). The paradoxes of masculinity. Some thoughts on segregated societies. In Cornwall, A., Lindisfarne, N. (Eds.) *Dislocating masculinity, Comparative ethnographies* (pp.196-212). London and New York, Routledge.

Kandiyoti, D. (2016). Locating the politics of gender: Patriarchy, neo-liberal governance and violence in Turkey. *Research and Policy on Turkey*, 1(2), 103-118.

Keskin, F. (2017). Masculinity in gender Relations: Hegemonic masculinity and masculine power discourse in Turkey. *Public Integrity*, 20(1), 93-106.

Kessler, S. and McKenna, W. (1985). *Gender: An ethnomethodological approach*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kiesling, S.F.(2002) Power and the language of men. In Whitehead, M.S., Barrett, F. (Eds.), *The masculinities reader* (pp. 112-132). New Jersey, Wiley.

Kimmel, S. M. (2005) *The gender of desire: Essays on male sexuality.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kimmel, S. M. and Aronson, A. (eds.) *Men and masculinities: A Social, cultural, and historical encyclopaedia*. Santa Barbara, Denver and Oxford: ABC – CLIO. 396-397.

Mesure, M. (2004). ¨Homosociality.¨ *Men and masculinities: A social, cultural, and historical encyclopaedia volume 1*: A-J. Kimmel, S. M. and Aronson, A. (eds.) Santa Barbara, Denver and Oxford: ABC – CLIO. 396-397.

Onur, K. Hilal, K. Berrin, K. (2004). 'Hegemonik' erkekliğin görünmeyen yüzü: Sosyalizasyon sürecinde erkeklik oluşumları ve krizleri üzerine düşünceler. *Toplum ve Bilim* (101), 31-49.

Oktan, A. (2016). Metinden imgeye metinlerarası bir figür olarak "arafta olmak": "babama mektup." *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 4(45), 95-95.

Özbay, C. (2010). Nocturnal queers: Rent boys' masculinity in Istanbul. *Sexualities*, 13(5), 645-663.

Özbay, C. (2013). "Türkiye'de hegemonik erkekligi aramak". *Dogu Bati* (63), 185-204.

Özbay, C. Erol, M., Terzioğlu A., Turem, U.Z. (2016). *The making of neoliberal Turkey*. Surrey and Burlington: Ashgate.

Ozbay, C. and Soybakis, O. (2018). Political masculinities: gender, power, and change in Turkey. *Social Politics* (0) 1-24.

Özsoy, A. (2011) Yerli polisiye televizyon dizilerinde hegemonik erkek(lik): 'Bir Ankara polisiyesi Behzat Ç.' örneği. In Erdoğan, İ. (Eds.) *Medyada hegemonik erkek(lik) ve temsil* (pp. 125-161). İstanbul: Kalkedon.

Pleck, J. and Sawyer, J. (2010). *Men and masculinity*. New York: Prentice Hall Press.

Sancar, S. (2008). *Erkeklik: imkânsız iktidar: ailede, piyasada ve sokakta erkekler*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Segal, A. (2000). Masculinity, school, and self in Sweden and the Netherlands. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 8(2), 171-193.

Segal, L. (2002). The belly of the beast: sex as male domination. In Whitehead, M.S., Barrett, F. (Eds.), *The masculinities reader* (pp. 110-132). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Selek, P. (2008). *Sürüne sürüne erkek olmak*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayımcılık.

Şenol, D., Erdem, S., (2017). Türk toplumunda hegemonic erkekliğin inşasında süreçlerin rolü. *Turan: Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi*. 9 (33), 290-299.

Şentürk, B. (2017). Şiddet ve erkeklikler: av mevsimi ve gönül yarası filmleri üzerinden Türkiye'deki erkeklik biçimlerine bakmak. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(1), 27-44.

Turner, G. (1999). *Film as social practice*. (3rd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Türk, B.H., (2011) Hegemonik erkek(lik) ve kültürel temsil: 'çirkin kral, kurtlar vadisi'nde yürüyor'. In Erdoğan, İ. (Eds.) *Medyada hegemonik erkek(lik) ve temsil* (pp. 163-211). İstanbul: Kalkedon.

Unsal, O. B. (2015). State-led urban regeneration in Istanbul: Power struggles between interest groups and poor communities. *Housing Studies*, (30:8), 1299-1316.

West, C. and Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-151.

Wood, K. and Jewkes, R. (1997). Violence, rape, and sexual coercion: Everyday love in a South African township. *Gender & Development,* 5(2), 41-46.

Yüksel, E. (2013). Bir savaş anlatısı olarak nefes: vatan sağolsun ve hegemonik erkekliğin krizi. *Fe Dergi* 5(1), 15-31.