

Critical Realism and Socialist Realism in Cinema: The Example of “Yol Ayrımı” Movie

Authors

Sıdıka Seda Katun^{1*}

Affiliations

¹Master’s Program in Radio Television and Cinema, Yeditepe University Graduate School of Social Science, Istanbul, 34755, Turkey

*To whom correspondence should be addressed;

E-mail: sidikaseda.katun@std.yeditepe.edu.tr

Preprint

Abstract

Realism in art, when associated with political economy and philosophy, is not a field that has received much academic study. A work of art necessarily reflects a particular ideology or a particular worldview and is therefore political. The motion picture also reflects a particular worldview and mainstream motion pictures are often shaped by the dominant ideology, which is the reality of an idealistic worldview. When the production phase of a movie, the director and the director's worldview, the script, the budget, the advertising relations, in other words the production relations, are evaluated as a whole, it is seen that they are shaped in line with the dominant ideology and the capitalist system. Therefore, production relations have an impact on the reality reflected in a movie. Since mainstream cinema films are made with commercial concerns in mind, films with class representation in mainstream cinema does not contain an alternative political and philosophical critique when the relations of production are taken into account. This study shows that the socialist realist approach to art is integrally linked to philosophy, content and form, political economy and materialist philosophy as a worldview, while the critical realist theory of projection only ensures the reproduction of the existing system and the continuation of the dominant ideology. In this study, first of all, the relationship between artwork and realism will be evaluated and then the relationship between artwork and philosophy will be discussed. In conclusion, the film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) will be analysed through the representations of realism in art.

Keywords: Critical realism; idealist philosophy; materialist philosophy; realism in cinema; socialist realism; yol ayrımı.

INTRODUCTION

Although art is a means of reflection and a form of production, it reflects the production relations of the society in which it exists and the world view of the artist. So much so that the basis of a society is the production relations of that society. When art is considered as a form of knowledge, the function of reflection is also attributed to art and with this, the concept of reality emerges. If art is a reflection of social life, the way in which social life is reflected is of primary importance (Belge, 1989:41). Marx argues that art "is absolutely impossible to comprehend only from its own internal laws of development". "The essence, origin, development and social function of art can only be understood by analysing the social system as a whole, in which the economic factor, the complex interaction of the development of the productive forces with the relations of production, plays a decisive role" (Marx & Engels, 2009:13).

Criticism in art can be realised within the framework of a certain world view. Here, 'world view' is the expression of the artist's approach to realism. As the subject of this study, in order to analyse a film in line with materialist philosophy and dialectical method, it is necessary to evaluate it within Marxist theory. The basis of Marxist theory is to base events on a material basis without abstracting them from their social and economic connections. In Marxist criticism, political economy, relations of production and class conflicts are taken as the basis, thus the causes of social events are also investigated. Marxist criticism is not limited to investigating all these reasons, but also judges the social reasons for the creation of the work of art. "Because it judges politically what it explains and interprets for social and economic reasons" (Moran, 1988; 74).

As Plekhanov (1967;176) states, "literature and art are mirrors of life". As a means of reflection, cinema films often function as a means of oppression and control of the dominant ideology in the society to which they belong. A work of art can politicise art while criticising the dominant ideology, or it can aestheticise politics and reproduce nationalist elements, status quo, fascism, class differences, violence and marginalisation. According to Benjamin (2007:58), the politicisation of art has the potential to make the public aware of the economic and social conditions in which they live and to create an impact on them to think about them. Thus, it will contribute to the liberation of the masses. According to Gürbilek (2012b:29): "this is why Benjamin argued that the masses can transform and "become wise"".

In the criticism of a cinema film, considering that art is a reflection of reality, two different concepts of realism, critical realism and socialist realism, emerge in line with two different worldviews, idealist philosophy and materialist philosophy. The importance of the concepts of critical realism and socialist realism in the analysis of the work of art, as two basic forms of criticism shaped by these two different philosophies, which are literally opposite to each other, should be evaluated within their historical, social, class and theoretical relations. Since materialism and idealism represent two different classes and two different ideologies, and since the concept of class and ideology serve certain politics, it can be said that every film is political. Mainstream cinema films cannot be considered independent from the interests of the dominant ideology in line with the relations of production they are in. In this context, the mode of production and relations of production also have an impact on the reflection of reality in mainstream cinema films. Therefore, while the artist produces his own world view, the material conditions that have an impact on this world view also come into play. Even if a mainstream film claims to deal with class relations in a way that serves the interests of the working class, if the work does not have a materialist understanding of art in terms of content and continues to pursue the interests of the dominant ideology with an idealist understanding of art, it becomes clear which class the artist has created a work in accordance with the interests of which class. The worldview reflected by a director shows which class he belongs to and thus his position within the relations of production.

This study examines that in the film “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017) directed by Yavuz Turgul, the criticism of capitalism and class conflicts are reflected in a fragmented manner in the context of purely critical realism, abstracted from the historical and social context of reality. The film ““*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017) is political like any other film. However, the film fails to offer an innovative or transformative perspective in the political context and, like all mainstream cinema The film “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017), directed and written by Yavuz Turgul, has been evaluated by many film critics and columnists as a film that, compared to Turgul's other films, contains criticism of capitalism, criticism of the ruling power and class conflicts. Therefore, if the film “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017) touches upon issues such as criticism of capitalism and class conflicts, it also reflects the director's political stance in line with his world view.

Although the film “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017) pretends to criticise capitalism and the system based on capital accumulation order through production relations and class representations, it reproduces the dominant ideology with an idealist worldview. The main purpose of this study

is to show that the reality reflected in the film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) is a fragmented reality that is detached from its historical and social context and that it remains within the limits of critical realism. In other words, this study aims to show that mainstream cinema fails to reflect social reality in its criticism of capitalism and class representations. In the study, the relationship between the work of art and realism and the relationship between the work of art and philosophy will be evaluated and the differences between socialist realism in cinema and critical realism in cinema, idealist philosophy and materialist philosophy will be classified. In conclusion, it will be examined through which worldview the concept of realism, class conflicts and criticism of the capitalist system are handled in the film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) and how the concept of realism in art is reflected.

Relationship between Artwork and Realism

What is reality? What is realism? These questions have been asked by many artists and philosophers throughout history. Although the reality reflected has different meanings by each artist, the theories of reflection are divided into two different periods. According to Moran (1988:16-17): "those put forward until the middle of the eighteenth century can be placed on the line of the same tradition and can be considered as various interpretations of Aristotle. Since the nineteenth century, on the other hand, the theory of reflexivity has been put forward without proceeding directly from Aristotle". It can be said that the concept of realism emerged when people abstracted themselves from the fact that there was a creator and internalised the idea that their actions could be based on material, not divine, foundations (Suçkov, 1982:12).

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the most important theory that uses the concept of reflection to explain art is Marxist criticism (Moran, 1988:31). Art is a means of reflection and arises from social relations. As Marx (1996:10) states: "art is a method of knowing and reflecting reality". In this context, the work of art, as a means of reflection, reflects the social conditions in which it exists in line with its own reality. What is meant here by reflecting in line with its own reality is that while some works of art reflect reality in line with the dominant ideology, some works of art reflect reality for society. Lenin's approach to this issue is as follows:

"It is of no great importance what art brings to a few hundred or a few thousand people out of millions. Art is the property of the people and must be

deeply rooted among the working masses. Art must be understood and loved by these masses, it must unite their feelings, thoughts and aspirations, it must raise their cultural level. Art must encourage and develop the artists among these masses" (Lenin: 1976: 278).

As a form of reflection, art has helped the artist to convey his/her own reality to the public for centuries. The phenomenon of reality in art has not emerged to create a representation or a similar copy of reality. The work created by the artist reflects that artist's own world view, philosophy, political attitude and most importantly his/her own character. Reflection methods in art are divided into two as "naturalistic reflection" and "realistic reflection". According to Moran (1988:47), while naturalism reflects a fragmented reality with an idealist world view, realism, in line with a materialist world view, deals with events in their entirety. In this context, while naturalism cannot reflect social reality, realism can reflect social reality. Moran (1988:47-48) explains the difference between "realism" and "naturalism" as follows:

"The first [realism] can reflect social reality, the second [naturalism] cannot. In realism, the author's task is to grasp the historical forces that determine the direction of development of society in a certain period, that is, the internal structure and dynamics of society. In other words, to understand the historical situation typical for that period. Therefore, the people, events and situations in the work must be typical so that they can reflect social reality. In Lukacs' aesthetics, the typicality of a person means that the deepest part of the person is determined by the objective forces present in society. (...) The copy presented in the realist work is incomplete, it does not include all the details; but it is such a copy that, despite its incompleteness, it still reflects the whole, because in this incomplete copy there is a truthfulness that comes from having selected and taken the essence of the original (...) Naturalism, on the other hand, is the opposite of realism. (...) The main characteristic that distinguishes naturalism from reality is its inability to distinguish between the important and the unimportant, that is, between the determinant and the non-determinant of reality. The naturalist thinks that it is possible to reflect reality by multiplying the number of details; long, detailed descriptions, detailed descriptions of a person, an object or an event are the result of an aspiration to the accuracy of a photograph. With this method, the surface reality, the phenomenon may be conveyed exactly, but the typical is not described. Neither the relations between the individual and society nor between the individual and nature have any connection with historical significance (...) The writer who tries to describe the subject he has chosen in a consumerist style, since he cannot do this, will only be content with giving the details

that first catch his eye. By piling up details indiscriminately without relying on a certain perspective, that is, without distinguishing between what is important and necessary and what is not, only surface reality is reflected" (cited in Özonur: 2016:102).

According to Suckov (1982:10), art, as a special mental and intellectual form, as an effective expression of human creative powers, is eventually deduced from reality. In this context, every work of art reflects the reality of the artist who created it, but this does not mean that every work of art can reflect scientific reality or the whole of reality. Art must be based on the real life of a society and the masses that make up this society. In reflecting reality, the artist must take into account the relations of production and the political economy of the society in which he or she lives. An artist who moves away from society moves away from reality, which leads to the alienation of society and the artist from each other, and the artist alienated from society thus begins to adopt and convey the reality of the dominant ideology (Çalışlar, 1986:98).

Realism is an artistic method that includes a knowing and objective style in art. At the same time, it is the reflection of human personality in a realistic way, depending on the truth (Frolov, 1991:188). It is important to reflect realism in art, but it is also important what kind of reality it is. Realism, which is one of the ways of knowing reality, is also a creative way of reflection and has existed in history both as a method and an orientation. If we cannot see realism as a creative method of reflecting reality, of course, we cannot explain realism in the history of art (Çalışlar, 1986:13).

The concept of realism, which developed in the nineteenth century as a reaction against the Romanticism movement after the Neo-classical era, which tried to convey the world and daily life perfectly, has taken the form of an understanding of art, especially in art and literature, which tries to convey individuals and events with their flaws and natural forms and is based on the principles of reflection. The concept of realism, which continued its development, took its final form in the art of critical realism in the nineteenth century (Frolov, 1991:188).

In this context, it can be said that there are two main criticisms today. The first one is critical realism and the second one is socialist realism (Çalışlar, 1986:5). Both theories of realism aim to reflect reality in art, but there are distinct philosophical differences between them in terms of class and theory. Critical realism detaches reality from its historical context and presents a fragmented reality that does not reflect the whole and social reality in line with the dominant ideology. According to Çalışlar (1986:5-6), critical realism conceals its class characteristic and

is theoretically tied to either subjective or objective idealism. The methodology of critical realism is semi-scientific and non-systematic. The importance of the concepts of critical realism and socialist realism in the analysis of the work of an art should be evaluated within their historical, social, class and theoretical relations. Because the concept of class has been shaped by certain ideological concepts within a historical and social process.

Although there are points where the concepts of socialist realism and critical realism are compatible with each other in the historical process, critical realism continues to reproduce bourgeois ideology in art, thus eliminating the concept of reality. Socialist realism, on the other hand, is in constant change in accordance with the laws of dialectics. Critical realism, which appears as the self-criticism of bourgeois-modernist criticism, which is a party to idealist philosophy, is replaced by socialist realism as the opposing force in the struggle of opposites (Çalışlar, 1986:5,43).

As a result of all these, of course, it cannot be said that critical realism does not reflect reality. Critical realism also reflects reality. The realism mentioned here includes the reflection of a certain part of reality (Çalışlar, 1986:44). While critical realist theory may be limited to the question of what art is, socialist realism answers the question of what art should be rather than what it is. Socialist realism is not to know the current reality, but to know where it is heading, and at the same time it should aim to change and transform it. The socialist realist work is the work that indicates where the contradictions that the author sees in life and reflects in his work will lead. Because socialist realism takes its place in art from historical and social contradictions (Moran, 1988:47). Although socialist realism means the realistic reflection of the life existing in reality, it was possible in the twentieth century in a period of time when there were real possibilities for socialist transformation in reality itself and the forces to realise these possibilities (Pospelov, 2014: 490).

According to socialist realism, the reality reflected by art is social reality, but this reality is seen in revolutionary development and is accurately reflected in historical concreteness, taking into account the education of the working class (Moran, 1988:46,47). In this context, as long as a work of art is socialist, moreover, as long as it can serve to change and transform the world rather than merely questioning it, it can be said to provide information just like science. Moran (1988:49) has made the following approach in this regard:

"The appearance of the external world is not the same as its essence. We cannot perceive the essence of the material world with our senses; we learn by discovering the laws of nature. Science provides this in an abstract way. Socialist realism uses this theory of knowledge to include aesthetics. Art, like science, sometimes provides information, i.e. reflects the external world, but in a different way from science. The essence that science reflects through abstraction, art reflects through concretisation; instead of the natural laws of science, it presents us with concrete generalisations. This means that, in contrast to the laws of nature, art presents such concrete examples that their condensation and reflection of what is seen as scattered and blurred in reality enables art to play an informative role".

In conclusion, the world view adopted by socialist realism, i.e. materialist philosophy, is the world view of the proletariat. In a work of art, socialist realism is a form of reflection aimed at establishing a new social order and change. In this context, it can be said that critical realism, even if it focuses on class conflicts, cannot take this problem to a progressive analysis, but only focuses on its social nature and reveals a one-way criticism.

The Relationship between the Work of Art and Philosophy

In the course of history, class conflicts have naturally arisen in class societies, and thus two basic world views and two basic philosophies have emerged in class societies. Idealism and materialism (Malinin, 1979:30). Therefore, in class society, these two basic philosophies should be taken as a basis when reflecting realism in art. Therefore, it can be said that in order to reflect realism in art correctly, the relationship between realism in art and idealist and materialist philosophy should be evaluated together (Cornforth, 1987:19).

When realism in art is considered in the context of philosophy and political economy, it can be said that philosophy is a world view and the artistic should be realistic. In this context, fundamental differences will emerge in the approaches of idealist philosophy and materialist philosophy to realism in art. While idealist philosophy bases itself on naturalistic reflection and critical realism and thus on the dominant ideology, the reality of materialist philosophy is based on realistic reflection, socialist realism and the interests of the proletarian class. This is because idealism assumes that only the ideas we have shape the way of life and the way society is organised. This distances reality from its historical and social context and therefore from being scientific. Materialism, on the other hand, teaches that real social progress is possible through

the development of productive forces and science. Materialism is not a dogmatic system, but a way of understanding, explaining and interpreting every problem. The materialist way of interpreting events and understanding their connections is opposed to the idealist way of interpreting and understanding the same events (Cornforth, 1987:29).

According to Şeptulin (2017,18): "philosophy analyses the relationship between matter and consciousness, between nature and mind, and decides which is primary. The relationship of matter to consciousness is the fundamental question of philosophy". Idealism and materialism are rooted in philosophy. Philosophy is a general sum of views about the world, but this definition does not reveal the distinctive characteristic of philosophy. In society, there are other views besides philosophical views. What is important is how philosophical views differ from non-philosophical views. Philosophy, then, develops a system of ideas that treats the world as a whole and offers a general explanation of the processes in the world. Philosophy is people's worldview (Şeptulin, 2017:17). Şeptulin (2017:18) continues as follows: "philosophers are divided into two groups according to their answer to the fundamental question of philosophy: materialists and idealists. Idealists argue that the mental is primary and fundamental. According to them, matter is a by-product of consciousness".

Class conflicts exist in societies where the capitalist system exists. In this context, expressing or showing the negativities produced by the capitalist system, the social, social and political economy effects of these negativities and class conflicts in a work of art does not mean that reality is reflected holistically. This is exactly what an artist based on idealist philosophy reflects. In brief, idealism generally functions in favour of the interests of the ruling exploiting class and plays a reactionary role (Corforth, 1987:21-22-23). The works of art produced in accordance with this worldview endeavour to ensure the continuation of the capitalist system. Materialism, on the other hand, is the main movement in philosophy that is the opposite of idealism, and, contrary to idealism, it argues that consciousness does not determine matter, but matter determines consciousness. Materialism is the expression of the attitude between matter and consciousness. The history of materialism actually begins with the history of philosophy and tries to explain the world scientifically and on the basis of its own natural development, in contrast to metaphysical ideas that try to explain the world with mystical forces (Politzer, 1998:135-137).

Marx and Engels (1971:28-30) expressed the negative impact of capitalist production on art as follows: "capitalist production is hostile to certain manifestations of intellectual production,

such as art and poetry". Therefore, art is adopted by the bourgeoisie when it is presented as the producer of material wealth, thus reflecting the bourgeois critical realism and ensuring the continuation of the capitalist system. Therefore, in philosophical reflection on realism in art, the world view that can essentially reflect reality is materialist philosophy and its reflection in art is socialist realism. A work of art reflected in the context of Marx's concept of dialectical materialism can reflect a reality independent of the reality of the dominant ideology. Cornforth (1987:62) explains dialectics as follows:

"Dialectics, in its proper sense, is the study of the contradiction in the essence of things, development is the conflict of opposites. Wherever there is contradiction, there is the force of development. This materialist dialectical understanding is the key to explaining the forces of development within the material world itself, without recourse to external causes".

Since a work of art inevitably reflects a certain world view, in class societies based on the capitalist system, class conflicts arise as a result of the exploitation of the capitalist system and the dominant ideology on the classes, which causes contradictions between the classes and thus art is separated from the social. As the class differences between the idealist world view and the materialist world view become apparent, conflicts arise from the reflection of this on the work of art in the context of two different philosophies. Dialectical materialism and the concept of socialist realist art are focussed on the problem between art and realism, and therefore on the ruling system and the class conflicts arising from it, to produce solutions, not problems. In other words, it does not aim to repeat the existing capitalist system and the problems arising from it, but to change it. Materialism and a work of art based on this worldview grounds art on objective rather than subjective foundations and links art to the social and the relations of production. Therefore, a work of art can only reflect the holistic reality when all these conditions come together.

Yol Ayrımı

An approach to themes such as class and social conflicts in cinema will inevitably reflect the ideology of the film and thus have a political content. Yavuz Turgul's "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017), which was both written and directed by Yavuz Turgul, has been interpreted by many critics as containing a criticism of the capitalist system since it deals with the dominant relations of

production, criticism of capitalism and social conflicts, and gives the impression that it prefers a narrative from the perspective of class conflicts. In this context, “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017) is unquestionably a political film. This discussion, on the other hand, raises questions about what kind of a worldview the way class conflicts and dominant relations of production are handled reflects. Some comments and criticisms on the handling of class conflicts, criticism of sovereign power and criticism of the capitalist system in “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017) are as follows:

"I think Yavuz Turgul proposes a solution to all political and social turmoil through this film by looking at it from above, calmly and maturely. He invites and even encourages those from the privileged class who hold power and money to take an anarchist attitude and resist with the workers by saying that the solution to the gas eaten on the streets, the destruction of workers' rights, the sell-out of unions is not only in the working class resistance." (Tuğçe Madayanti Şen, 2017). <https://www.birgun.net/haber/yol-ayrimi-tolstoy-musun-sen-189880>

"This is a very impressive film.... It is as if, after all these years, it is a radical attack on the basic structure of capitalism.... and the reintroduction of its cruel logic that opposes real life, the right to live life in the most natural way" (Atilla Dorsay, 2017). <https://t24.com.tr/yazarlar/atilla-dorsay/soray-paneli-imza-gunumve-7-yil-sonra-sener-sen,18479>.

*"Turgul has a very good aim: to make the viewers experience an awakening like Mazhar did. The film tells us not to live our lives without compassion, conscience, love and self-sacrifice, to empathise, and not to get caught up in the greed for power and money. The film "*Yol Ayrımı*" dictates this beautiful idea centred on class conflict and social justice to us with every scene of the film" (Burak Göral, 2017). <https://www.sozcu.com.tr/2017/yazarlar/burak-goral/mesele-iyi-insan-olmak-2085158/>*

*"Class struggle is a subject we are used to seeing in Yavuz Turgul films. Even in *Av Mevsimi*, which is a detective story, there was still an economic reason behind the murder". (Pelin Helvacı, 2017). <http://www.filmelestirisi.com/elestiri/yol-ayrimi>*

*"*Yol Ayrımı* has good intentions in terms of trying to draw attention to social issues by focusing on class conflict - struggle. It is even brave and guiding in the sense that it underlines the need for boss-worker cooperation to change the current system" (Serkan Baştımar, 2017). <https://www.sinefest.com/elestiri-yol-ayrimi.html>*

Here, considering the title of “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017) and the director's position in the relations of production, "Film's Title: Director: Yavuz Turgul Producer: Erol Avcı (TMC Film) Executive Producer: Gülen Arlier Executive Producer: Arda Erkman, Emrah Gamsızoğlu, Cem Bağlar Distributor: UIP Turkey Screenplay: Yavuz Turgul Director of Photography: Uğur İçbak Editing: Niko Music: Anjelika Akbar Cast: Şener Şen (Mazhar) Çiğdem Onat (Firdevs) Rutkay Aziz (Altan) Nihal Yalçın (Emine) Mert Fırat (Barlas) Tilbe Saran (Nur) Ruhsar Öcal (Belgin)

Defne Kayalar (Defne) Şerif Erol (Besim) Duration: 150 minutes Date: 2017 Awards: Nuremberg Film Festival-Germany (Yavuz Turgul/Audience Award, Şener Şen/Best Actor) It is obvious that the film is involved in a collective production, distribution and screening process that goes beyond the Yeşilçam tradition.

Eşkiya was produced by local and foreign co-productions such as Artcam International (England), Filma-Cass (Turkey) and Geopoly (Georgia), and distributed by international companies such as K Film (France), Warner Brothers (Turkey) and Constantin Film (Germany). Similarly, Gönül Yarası (2004) is a film released through local and foreign partnerships such as Filma-Cass (Turkey) and Most Production (England). Kabadayı (2007), directed by Ömer Vargı, is a co-production of Fida Film (Turkey) and Filma-Cass (Turkey), distributed by the international company Maxximum Film und Kunst GmbH and released in many European countries. Av Mevsimi (2010) was also a co-production between Pro Film and Fida Film and distributed by Warner Brothers. Therefore, Yavuz Turgul started to produce films with specific actors that were shaped under the yoke of commercial cinema, which works in a professional production, distribution and screening process in order to reach a large number of copies and facilitate the film's release process. The film Yol Ayrımı (2017) is produced by TMC Film, which is owned by Erol Avcı and has produced many popular commercials, TV series and films. The distribution of the film was undertaken by United International Pictures. These conditions, then, reveal the film's approach to the way it reflects reality (Kılınç, July: 2019).

Therefore, to say that Turgul's films contain a criticism of capitalism or a transformational criticism and approach to class issues would not reflect the truth. Here, the director's approach to the criticism of the capitalist system and the reflection of social reality is only within the limits of the critical realist approach (Kılınç, July: 2019). In this context, what is reflected in the film is the world view of idealist philosophy, which is adorned with the director's own dreams. The characters created in line with this idealist worldview have no depiction in real life.

The film “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017) is about Mazhar, who is the head of a family company inherited from his father, who has spent his life working, albeit for the sake of not being able to live his childhood, and then becomes a much more moderate personality compared to his previous life as a result of a traffic accident and an enlightenment with metaphysical elements, as well as intra-family interest relations and class conflicts. In “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017), although Mazhar is portrayed as a character who helps the exploited class as a result of his accident, as in almost

all Yavuz Turgul films, unlike the heroic, kind-hearted, protective Şener Şen profile, he draws a character who is strict and can sacrifice everyone for the sake of his interests. However, afterwards he assumes his good, protective and heroic character again. Mazhar, as the owner of one of the leading family companies in the textile industry, represents a part of the production relations of the capitalist system, a system that exploits the labour of workers and enriches itself through this exploitation. However, from the grandmother's (Firdevs) point of view, this institution, which has risen thanks to the labour of the workers and the concept of surplus value, is an institution for which she cannot even establish family unity, which she cares even more than her husband, because her husband and her husband's father worked for years for this cause, picking cotton with their hands, in other words, it is an institution that has been established and risen with sweat and effort.

It cannot be said that Mazhar's belated questioning of the fact that exhausting working conditions transform people negatively after the accident he had is a conscious or obvious questioning. Therefore, there is a desire for change in a life characterised as boring rather than a system change. According to Engels (1882: 44), the utopian socialists, just like the enlightenmentists, wanted to save all of humanity, not just a certain class. What is lacking is "that single genius who can see the truth". In *Yol Ayrımı*, the representation of "that single genius person who can see the truth" mentioned by Engels is the character Mazhar. According to Tekin (January: 2018), utopian socialists before scientific socialism are conveyed precisely as the historical representation of the character Mazhar, brought to life by Şener Şen's acting. According to Marx (2007:108), it is the relations of production of a society that constitute the concrete whole. When art is evaluated through the relations of production, contradictions emerge. This shows that all ideologies expressed as false consciousness are a contradictory knowledge of reality. The relations within which the inequality between the rich and the poor arises and by which social relations it is created are not among the problems that the film deals with. There is no intellectual production or criticism based on the class origin of both sides. In other words, although the film seems to define the working class through Emine and the bourgeois class through Mazhar, it is about a rich man whose perspective on life has changed as a result of a major accident, paying his debt to the poor environment he has wronged in order to ease his conscience.

The distinction between rich and poor and class conflicts are already existing concepts and critical realism is limited to reproducing existing concepts rather than changing or transforming

them. These concepts are not presented in the film in an interrelated or holistic manner. The reasons for the existence of these concepts are reflected in a context that aims to protect the interests of the dominant ideology, not within the framework of production relations. In the film, in the encounter between rich and poor, it is the people representing the bourgeoisie who express their ideas about society, while the people representing the working class are characterised as silent, passive and unrepresentative prototypes. In brief, class representations are rendered invisible in the film.

In this context, the film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) deals with class conflict in the Weberian sense. In the film, the historical, social and economic ties of the classes are not handled in a holistic manner and the representation of classes in the film is handled through wealth and poverty and those who own property and those who do not. The film constructs class representations through the conflicts between the rich family owning the Kozanlı company and the poor working class. This is in line with Weber's view that "classes are dealt with at the economic level". (Weber, 2012:154). Therefore, the reality reflected in the film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) is reflected only on an economic basis. Everyone who has to sell their labour power, regardless of their world view, religion or language, is included in the working class. The problem here is that there is a class for itself and a class for itself. According to Swingwood (1998: 220):

"When the concept of class is examined historically, it is seen that there are basically two different class theories: Marxist class theory and Weberian class theory. Although both of them talk about class, there are important differences between them. What they both agree on is that property or propertylessness constitute "the basic categories of all class conditions" and that the factor that gives rise to class is "economic interest in a very bare form". However, where they differ most fundamentally is that while in Weber class is determined solely on the basis of economic status, according to Marx class is also a social category. The "condition of being a class" is differentiated according to the type of services that can be offered in the market. At this point, Weber differs from Marx by underlining that skill can constitute a form of property that can lead to class differentiation: Those who provide services are differentiated according to the type of their services, just like how they benefit from these services. Weber points to the "coincidence" in the structure of the market as "the decisive moment that offers a common condition for the fate of the individual" (cited in Özonur, 2016: 105).

In addition, the film does not include any transformational phenomenon aiming to eliminate misery or to protect the interests of the proletarian class. Although the slogans at the beginning of the film such as "we want our jobs back, you have been eating our rights for years, how do you put your head on the pillow, talk to us like human beings, textile workers are not slaves, you are an enemy of workers, we are right, we will get our rights back, we want our rights back, do you sleep well at night?" may seem close to the socialist realist approach in art, they are actually the search for rights of a handful of labourers who appeal to the conscience of the boss. In the same way, Emine's speech in front of Mazhar's car alone, her approach of taking refuge in God, her curses could not go beyond a reading of opposition adorned with metaphysical elements, and in fact, in this scene, Emine serves to shape Mazhar's heroic utopian struggle.

This situation also stages the most fundamental encounter and conflict between two different classes, the rich and the poor, in the film. The action of the workers, which they characterise as a protest, is in fact a cry to the conscience of the boss and brings the interpretation that they leave their freedom to the monopoly of the capitalist, and therefore their weak resistance to injustice leads them to misery. However, the film's treatment of the search for rights of the workers after their dismissal, the conflicts of social and family interests and their role in the continuation of the dominant relations of production, the concepts of property and dispossession, wealth and poverty are all reflections of critical realism. This approach does not reflect the structural causes of misery, but rather the opposition of a group of workers who lost their jobs for various reasons at the time. As Garaudy (2015, 458, 459) puts it: "there is in fact a case in which it is necessary to raise the consciousness of those incited to revolt about the intention of the rich, with all their arrogance and swagger, to support the revolt of the helpless, and about the ultimate goals of this revolt".

Apart from the fact that the working class, class consciousness or class struggle is not represented in the film, the concept of class is ignored. Therefore, the film does not convey any message referring to class interests. There is also no solution, change or transformation on how to struggle against the current unequal conditions offered by the capitalist system. This clarifies the discourse of "class in itself" in the Marxist approach and creates a perception that is far from the phenomenon of being a "class for itself".

In the film, conflicting definitions such as property and dispossession seem to serve only the economic or only the social sphere rather than their concrete historical ties. This historically disconnected narrative style, rather than explaining the origins of wealth and poverty, presents

these categories as a casual occurrence, as a result of fate. Although at the beginning of the film, wealth is shown as the product of hard work and labour, in the following scenes it is revealed that the company is an institution that has been passed down from father to son and has been established through various tricks. Mazhar is an individual who exists as one of the cogs of the capitalist system in order to maintain the functioning. In this context, the Kozanlı family's position in the ruling class was realised thanks to the family members' correct use of the fate bestowed upon them and the continuation of this fate. The workers, on the other hand, are in the class where the distance to poverty is determined according to the mercy of the orders of the boss who holds this fate in his hands. This narrative form, which is far from the historical and social, perpetuates the bourgeois ideology and therefore the critical realist approach. In this context, the alienating effect of owning property is brought to the fore in the film.

According to Marx, the transformation of the working class into a "class for itself" is possible not only through the assimilation of their experiences in a capitalist society, but also through their conscious struggle against these experiences (Öngen, 2002: 17-22). The realisation of such a situation is undoubtedly possible with the existence of class consciousness. Although the scene in which Emine breaks a machine is a reference to the "machine breakers" of the 1800s, who are mentioned in the ludist movement, it is clear that this is not the result of an in-depth action plan. After Emine's quotation from Percy Shelley, Mazhar says "how beautifully said" and Nur states that this is a quote from the Declaration of Rights and gives the details, which shows that the ideology Emine adopts does not have a class consciousness that dominates her ideas. In other words, Emine and her group of friends, who tend to oppose the system, do not draw a conscious working class portrait. Therefore, the representation of the working class in the film is forcibly tried to be placed on a political ground.

Almost nowhere in the film is a general framework of the functioning of the capitalist system and relations of production drawn. In this context, the film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) reproduces the dominant ideology in line with the concept of realism, relations of production and, accordingly, the ideology of capital. The basis of capitalism is the dispossession of the majority in societies, i.e. producers, and the concentration of capital in a handful of people who own the means of production. In this direction, the ideology of capital has shaped individuals and their thoughts in the direction of earning more, competing and exploiting others in all times of society. Therefore, the film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) is also an industrial commodity and a source of production.

As Marx (2008d:37) wrote, "a black is a black. Only under certain conditions does he become a slave", it can be said that it is the modes of production and relations of production that make slavery possible. Therefore, emancipation is only possible through the change of the dominant relations of production. In this context, the film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) deals with class conflicts in the context of bourgeois critical realism instead of reflecting typical characters and thus classes are rendered invisible. Altan is represented as a character who has a place in bourgeois realism and who sees life as consisting of women, wine and reading books, who gives advice to people from his ivory tower and thus remains limited within bourgeois realism. Firdevs is a character who fulfils the requirements of the class and production relations she was born into. The character of Besim reflects the representation of a typical defender of capitalism who performs his duties in the context of his role in production relations. The reason for this is class conflicts, the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and the alienation of society from the labour and values it produces. In other words, the concept of surplus value. The only fact that can make Mazhar a typical character here is that he fails in his struggle against the relations of production. Although Emine is tried to be projected as a character built on the representation of the working class, she is limited to being a character created to shape Mazhar's heroic struggle. Another important character in the film, Nur, a trade union lawyer, introduces herself to Mazhar and refers to the trade union she works for as "the one without yellow". This way of expression suggests that Nur plays an active role in the class struggle. However, what is conveyed here is actually an effort of reconciliation rather than an opposition or change and transformation.

The fact that the place named Nur's ark corresponds to the image of Noah's ark means that God gave humans and all living creatures a second chance to live with the ark He gave to His prophet Noah after the flood He created to destroy all living things. In this scene where metaphysical elements are prominent, Nur's opening her place to women who are unemployed, conscientious objectors, draft dodgers and women fleeing from the torture of their husbands reflects that these people have earned their basic right to live through their own labour and solidarity. All these people that Nur gathers under her patronage and all the events that take place there are actually characters created by the screenwriter in order to represent Mazhar character heroically in line with his own world view, and these events serve to prepare Mazhar for the hero prototype. Therefore, these characters are portrayed within the framework of their current positions within the given order.

In this context, the locations, actors and dialogues used in the film show that the film contains a forced attempt to place the film on a political ground. Thus, as a result of the inability to determine the characters correctly, the reflection of reality becomes impossible, it becomes fake and the concepts of typicality and integrity cannot be in question in the film. In conclusion, the emphasis on class conflicts in the film remains quite limited. However, the idealist world view, which ensures the continuation of the existing social order and the dominant ideology, occupies a large place in the film. The film, which reproduces ideas about the functioning of the system and presents a reality in the context of critical realism, is status quoist in this respect. In addition, concepts such as being charitable, being conscientious and working are reproduced in the context of idealist philosophy and are not dealt with in relation to production relations or means of production. Staging these concepts and the worldview they address as mere phenomena leads to their ideological reproduction since they are not criticised together with the conditions of their existence in society. In this context, the unequal socio-economic situation of the characters in the film is left to the mercy of a capitalist who, by chance, experiences a conscientious enlightenment rather than the struggle of class-conscious people who rebel against capitalist relations of production. In brief, the film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) reproduces the dominant ideology and the capitalist system in line with the critical realist approach.

RESULT

In this study, the reflection of realism in cinema in Yavuz Turgul's film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) is examined in the context of two different concepts of realism, socialist realism and critical realism, and two different worldviews, idealist philosophy and materialist philosophy. It has been concluded that the social is reflected within the limits of critical realism in the way class conflicts and dominant relations of production are reflected and handled in the film. Within the scope of the subject of this study, it is important how a cinema film reflects the structure of the society in which it is located, consciously or unconsciously, positively or negatively. Considering that art and society are intertwined and art exists for society, it can be said that cinema has an important role in the functioning and change of society.

The film "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017) was written and directed by Yavuz Turgul. Considering Yavuz Turgul's films other than "*Yol Ayrımı*" (2017), although the dominant system, class conflicts, capitalism, heroism representation, social conflicts and contemporary cinema are discussed as subjects, these criticisms reveal a fragmented reflection of reality rather than a

holistic one, since they are connected to metaphysical elements in line with idealist philosophy and therefore critical realism. Concepts such as heroism, racism, nationalism, spirit and god are ideological elements and this prevents the social from being fully reflected in a work of art.

A cinema film is based on collective production and goes through many stages (production, distribution, production, montage, etc.) before it is released. As Engels (2009:35) states, "the mode of production of material life conditions the process of social, political and intellectual life in general". In capitalist societies, the class that holds the forces of production is the ruling class and the control of production relations depends on this class. Therefore, the reflection of the social on realism in art can be realised to the extent determined by the ruling class

In order to understand the extent to which reality in cinema can reflect the social, it is necessary to start from the method and the theme of realism that the film deals with. For this, the narrative language of the cinema and the world view it reflects are important. In a film, the subject that the work wants to convey, that is, the artist's basic idea, reveals which worldview the artist wants to reflect, and this will be either a materialist or idealist worldview.

The critical method adopted by the artist also determines what the work wants to convey. Here it is important which critical method is used. Critical realism, acting on bourgeois realism, separates the social from the human. It gives more importance to form than content, favours a naturalistic reflection and is reactionary in this context. However, socialist realism tries to establish a connection between human and society and thus focuses on reflecting social reality, evaluates form and content together, its method is dialectical, and as a result of all these, it has a progressive understanding.

The reality reflected by mainstream cinema films is critical realism in this context. Since the mode of production and relations of production have a significant impact on the reality reflected in cinema, mainstream cinema films, when class conflicts in society are considered, offer a reflection in the interests of the dominant relations of production in line with critical realism. Therefore, addressing the working class and class conflicts does not change the fact that this film generates profit and advertising share, that is, it reproduces the dominant relations of production. The point that needs to be addressed is the extent to which relations of production play a role in the creation of a work of art and how it reflects reality.

In a cinema film, social relations are as important as production relations. However, although social relations are tried to be represented through class in mainstream cinema films, class conflicts are reflected partially. The way mainstream cinema films are handled also determines

the political orientation of the film. The political aspect of the film “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017) is also evident in this context. What is important here is how classes are represented and this is related to two different worldviews. In the film “*Yol Ayrımı*” (2017), concepts such as social life, classes and class conflicts are reduced to the concepts of wealth and poverty, which only reproduces the existing conflicts in society.

DISCUSSION

As long as discussions such as why class conflicts exist, their origins, the position of wealth and poverty in the relations of production, why these concepts emerged, why the working class that produces surplus value in the capitalist system is poor, why capital is concentrated in the hands of a group of capitalists, and why the working class remains poor despite long working conditions if it is possible to make a fortune just by picking cotton, as exemplified in the film, the concept of reality reflected will be the critical realist approach that repeats itself and repeats its own criticism. Socialist realism, on the other hand, not only deals with these debates, but also aims to change and transform society in order to realise all these.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the film “*Yol Ayrımı*” is far from the concepts of typicality and integrity in relation to the director's previous works and films. The director's ideology and world view support the dominant production relations depending on the critical realist approach. Although the film is not original, it presents a concept of reality based on classical narrative. In the film, the representation of heroism is constructed through a single character (Mazhar) and the story of the film is tried to be placed in a political context based only on cause and effect relations. In this context, the film deals with class conflicts and criticism of the capitalist system in line with the critical realist approach and is not politically critical. Therefore, it serves the dominant relations of production.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Baştımaz, S. (2017). Yol Ayrımı. Sinefesto

<https://www.sinefesto.com/elestiri-yol-ayrimi.html>

Belge, M. (1989). Marksist Estetik. BFS Yayınları.

Benjamin, W. (2007). Pasajlar. Çev. Ahmet Cemal, YKY.

Cornforth, M. (1987). Materyalizm ve Diyalektik Metod. Çev. Cem Gönenç. El Yayınları.

Çalışlar, A. (1986). Gerçekçilik Estetiği. İstanbul: De Yayınevi.

Dorsay, A. (2017). Şoray Paneli İmza Günü ve 7 Yıl Sonra Şener Şen. T24

<https://t24.com.tr/yazarlar/atilla-dorsay/soray-paneli-imza-gunumve-7-yil-sonra-sener-sen,18479>

Engels, F. (2000), Ütopik Sosyalizmden Bilimsel Sosyalizme, Çev. Yavuz Sabuncu, Bilim ve Sosyalizm (Orijinal metin 1882 tarihli.)

Frolov, İ. (1991). Felsefe Sözlüğü. Çev. Aziz Çalışlar. Cem Yayınevi.

Garaudy, R. (2015). Hatıralar. Çev. Cemal Aydın. Türk Edebiyat Vakfı Yayınları.

Göral, B. (2017). Mesele İyi İnsan Olmak. Sözcü.

<https://www.sozcu.com.tr/2017/yazarlar/burak-goral/mesele-iyi-insan-olmak-2085158/>

Gürbilek, N. (2012b), “Sunuş”, Son Bakışta Aşk. Walter Benjamin’den Seçme Yazılar. Metis Yayınları.

Helvacı, P. (2017). Yol Ayrımı. Filmeleştirisi.com

<http://www.filmelestirisi.com/elestiri/yol-ayrimi>

Kılınç, B. (2019). ‘Yol Ayrımı’ Filminin Politik Eleştirisi. Erciyes İletişim Dergisi / Journal of Erciyes Communication.

Lenin, V.İ. (1976). Sanat ve Edebiyat. Çev. Bülent Arıbaş. Payel Yayınevi.

Malinin, V.A. (1979). Marksçı-Leninçi Felsefenin Temelleri I Diyalektik Maddecilik. Çev. Veysel Atayman. Konuk Yayınları.

Marx, K. Engels, F. (1971). Sanat ve Edebiyat Üzerine. Çev. Murat Belge. BirikimYayınları.

Marks, K. Engels, F. Lenin, V. (1990). Sanat ve Edebiyat. Çev. Aziz Çalışlar. Ekim Yayınevi.

Marks, Engels, Lenin. (1996). Sanat ve Edebiyat. Çev. Aziz Çalışlar. Evrensel Basım Yayın.

Marks, K. (2007). Felsefenin Sefaleti. Çev. A. Kardam, Ankara: Sol Yayınları.

Marx, K. Engels, F. (2008b). Alman ideolojisi (Feuerbach). Çev: S. Belli. Sol Yayınları.

Marks, K., Engels, F. (2009). Yazın ve Sanat Üzerine. Çev. Necla Kuglin ve Yayınevi Çeviri Kurulu, Sol Yayınlarında yayınlanan Marks ve Engels yapıtlarından aktarıldı.Sol Yayınları.

Marks, K., Engels, F. (2015a). Alman İdeolojisi (Feuerbach). Çev. Sevim Belli. Sol Yayınları. (Özgün Eser 1832 Tarihlidir)

Moran.B. (1988). Edebiyat Kuramları ve Eleştiri. Cem Yayınevi.

Öngen, T. (2002). “Marks ve Sınıf”. Praksis. Sayı 8, Eylül.

Özonur, D. (2016). Bir Sinema Filminde Sınıfların Temsili ve Politik Duruş: Kış Uykusu. *Journal of Communication Theory & Research/İletişim Kuram ve Arastırma Dergisi*, 2016(43).

Plehanov, G.V. (1967). Sanat ve Sosyalizm. Çev. Selim Mimoğlu. Sosyal Yayınlar.

Plehanov, G. V. (1999). Sosyalist Açından Toplum Sanat Eleştiri. Çev. Asım Bezirci. Evrensel Basım Yayın.

Politzer, G., Besse, G., Caveing, M. (1998). Felsefenin Temel İlkeleri. Çev. Muzaffer Erdost. Sol Yayınları. (Özgün Eser 1954 Tarihlidir)

Pospelov, G. N. (2014). Edebiyat Bilimi. Çev. Yılmaz Onay. Evrensel Basım Yayın.

Suçkov, B. (1982). Gerçekçiliğin Tarihi, Çev. Aziz Çalışlar. Doruk Yayıncılık (Özgün Eser 1976 Tarihlidir).

Swingwood, A. (1998). Sosyolojik Düşüncenin Kısa Tarihi. Çev. Osman Akınhay. Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.

Şen, M, T. (2017). Tolstoy musun sen?. Bir Gün.

<https://www.birgun.net/haber/yol-ayrimi-tolstoy-musun-sen-189880>

Şeptulin, A. P. (2017). Marksist-Leninist Felsefe. Çev. G. Doğan Görsev, Fatma Pınar Arslan. Yazılama.

Tekin, V. (2018). Yol Ayrımı: Sınıf Mücadelesi Yerine Sınıf Merhameti. Sendika.org.

Weber, M. (2012). Ekonomi ve Toplum. (Cilt I) Çev. Latif Boyacı, Yarın Yayınları.

Preprint