

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: Interview with Ümit Ünal

AUTHORS: Gökhan Ugur, Serdar Öztürk

PAGES: 194-204

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/303646>



Interview with Ümit Ünal¹

Serdar Öztürk: Dear Mr. Ünal, welcome. First of all, we would like to thank you for your acceptance to conduct this interview with us for the second edition of SineFilozofi. When cinema is mentioned, usually, entertainment is brought to the minds of both directors' and of large parts of society. However, when we utter the word philosophy, a heavy feeling befalls on people and people tend to feel like Gregor Samsa, a character in Kafka's novella, under the pressure of concepts, theory, and totality. That is to say, they feel like an insect. Hence, intellectuality dominates us a bit more. Do you think that entertainment and intellectuality, and thus cinema and philosophy, are so much far from each other? Is there not a relationship between these two? Are these concepts mutually exclusive? I would like to hear your opinion about it.

Ümit Ünal: The cinema is an industry, a big industry and a part of the entertainment industry. That is inevitable. I always tend to make an analogy with architecture: The cinema is similar to architecture to such an extent that architecture is an art and a functional area of industry. Some highly special architects can turn architecture into art. There is something similar in cinema too. In addition to the movies produced for daily entertainment and for certain demands, some people can come further and turn it into a work of art. Nonetheless, that does not mean that some entertaining movies cannot become a work of art. Many years ago, Ertem Eğilmez said, "What is an art-house movie? If a movie is good, it is already a work of art" - which I never forget. That is to say, why should a well-made entertaining film not be called

¹ Translated by Tamer Ertangil. This interview was held in November of 2016. You can watch the interview from the following link:
https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCA00De0KhjIMgYkyxo_POoA/about

“art”? I do not see a huge difference. First of all, there are well and badly made movies. Nonetheless, some films are produced according to the expectations of the market and that is the case not only in the “commercial” cinema but also in art-house cinemas, in which, again, some are produced according to the expectations. There is a certain market there, too. Moreover, movies are made according to those expectations. However, I think, art is defined based on the grounds that it is made neither for the expectation of the people nor for the market. It is something that comes from within. How to say, art is something done in accordance with the impulse of the artist. Art tries to express its own matter. It tries to show something that nobody else sees. Still, cinema, be it art-house or huge commercial ones, in the end, it is an industry with certain expectations. Naturally, each time, we try to go in accordance with the desires of the industry and our inner voice by complying with the aims of the industry and by listening to the voice within us.

S.Ö: So, from your description, we can infer that cinema has a paradox within it. The industrial dimension on one hand and the higher intellectual and artistic dimension on the other. Art and mass, the coming together of art and industry are a paradox within itself and this paradox perhaps also reflects onto the images. The conflict, clash in the images could be originating from there. Moreover, when we look at your films we come across interesting images which leave us in doubt or in conflict and makes us ask intense questions. I can call them new and creative images. And in this sense, your films come closer to philosophy. I mean, they make us think about philosophical questions. What could you say about that? When you produce your films, what are the sources that you benefit from?

Ü.Ü: First of all, I was somehow born into commercial cinema. However, in my first film and script *Teyzem*, many personal elements had strong influences and I was trying to come into terms with my family's traumas through the eyes of an artist. I was rather trying to settle up a trauma that was experienced by my family. And, according to me, it was a huge event to produce that film under such commercial circumstances and within such a commercial cinematic atmosphere. But the Turkish cinema of those days was allowing this. Many films were being made at that time. And the directors somehow had the opportunities to try new things. Nowadays, commercial cinema has rather become violent and it is so difficult to make a film like *Teyzem* today. The commercial demands have become even harsher. But, somehow, as a scriptwriter, I have tried to primarily exist in commercial cinema. Furthermore, considering the era in which I came, the idea of independent cinema did not exist under those circumstances. Nuri Bilge, Zeki Demirkubuz, and others came forward in the 90's. I came to the cinema industry in the late 80's. And the only chance one could have at that time was to gather some experience from Yeşilçam and grow up there. I, somehow, tried to primarily exist by writing scripts. And when I began producing my own movies, I suddenly decided to try something different, much different from the patterns of Yeşilçam. That is how *9 (Dokuz)* emerged. What inspires me? I suppose I benefited from literature most. I mean, throughout my childhood and adolescence, cinema was not a place I could visit oftenly. Of course, we used to go to the cinema, but we hardly had the opportunity to find or watch any movie. Nowadays, a university student has the opportunity to watch even the most unknown, marginal and experimental movie, only by searching through the internet. That was not the

case for us. I reached the ability of preparing a presentation on Buñuel without watching his *Un Chien Andalou* movie. I came to watch most of Buñuel's movies years later. As I said, literature was more of a resource to me than cinema. There are many writers whom I love and they affected me as a human being and affected my point of view towards life, art, literature, and cinema. Kafka and Nabokov are of primordial importance to me. Nabokov's narrations, his black humor and visual details have always fascinated me. And I tried to do something stemming from this literature. I was mesmerized by theater too. I read lots of play at that time. I liked the idea of establishing a story and expressing that story within limited space and dialogues in the theater. I guess these are my sources.

S.Ö: Interesting. And these are the elements involving intensified conflicts.

Ü.Ü: Of course.

S.Ö: That is, by feeding on art, you are actually inventing a cinema that creates conflicts within images. And the novel is one of the branches of art where different characters, classes, social segments encounter with each other and the conflict becomes intense. However, Alain Badiou, a philosopher who is still alive living in France, says; what we refer to as cinema is one of the branches of art which contains an intensified conflict within itself. You play with images. In fact, you are exercising thinking through images by feeding yourself with literature and cinema. I have always wanted to ask a cinema director the following: The issue of nihilism and skepticism emerged in the 19th century. The tendency of suspecting everything, in general, seems dominant in our age and people sometimes position themselves as supposedly-thinking beings. Are there any responses of cinema to an age of skepticism, let's call it extreme skepticism and nihilism, i.e. passive nihilism where people are in delusion that they are actually thinking but in reality, they only think based on opinions on the context of nihilism, extreme skepticism and a society of opinions.

Ü.Ü: I think, first of all, not only scriptwriters but all artists have to do away with nihilism as soon as they start to write, paint, film or compose. They are already doing something against it. Because writing means that a person has to write no matter how far he is from his age, environment and position. Actually, it means to do something towards the future. And it also proves the artist's belief in humanity, that is, his or her trust. Just as we enjoy reading a two to three-thousand-year-old or a new writer, you think that "somebody is going to understand me." There is something called humanity. Human beings can understand one another. It is not going to be that bad till eternity. In the end, even the most hopeless and darkest writer develops such kind of a belief as soon as he or she begins writing. I think Kafka believed in something like this when he used to write on his own till dawn. Someday someone is going to read and understand this. Therein lurks a belief that at least some of those human beings are "good" and will stay as "good" people. Thus, I think, just as I said, even the most seemingly hopeless and nihilist artist is working against those as soon as as he or she starts doing his/her job. Cinema, beyond all of these, is a form of art done together with others. It does not resemble a painting, writing or composing in a room all alone. You need to convince a lot of people if

you want to do it. Even for the cheapest movie, or for a movie that requires only a few thousand liras, you need to find that money. You need to find someone to provide you with that. Aside from that, even the cheapest movie actually begins with a few hundred thousand liras and you need to convince the people who are going to provide that money. In the creative group, you'll need to convince the people who are in charge of using the video recorder, those to find the accessories and those to make the costumes. You need to convince the actors and actresses. Therefore, you need to create a team and convince each member in that team that you are doing a nice, future-oriented and interesting job. You do not need to be a nihilist in order to do this. After that, during the consumption of the product, -let's say- in even the most limited environments, it's consumed in mass. You know, when a poetry book reaches one thousand people it is regarded as a good sale; but when it comes to a movie with three thousand viewers, it is said very few people watched it. A movie can reach millions of people. Millions of people may talk about that movie. Some movies reach millions of people within years and what you presented in that movie plays an important role in the lives of those people. *Teyzem* was made thirty years ago. For the last thirty years, I kept coming across a lot of people who kept on saying that, the dream scene had been part of their lives, you know, the woman in the movie was just like one of their female relatives and so on. As you see, what you do coincides with people's lives. It is impossible to be a nihilist when you do cinema.

S.Ö: It is so interesting here that we have to reach millions of people, contrary to a book. And we are talking about the concept of mass. Mass is something a concept which includes different social categories such as children, different social classes, etc... In the sense that, when you regard cinema an art, there is the mass on one side and art on the other. It has a paradox here. That is, on the hand an extremely high-level intellectual activity and on the other hand a common category, mass. Perhaps people who comprise large society and do not go to a film gallery, get together at movie theater. The so-called highly intellectual people watch the simplest movies which appeal big audiences, -for instance, I saw *Doctor Strange* last week- and there is such an interesting paradox regarding mass and art. What are your thoughts concerning this?

Ü.Ü: Actually, I did not exactly point out the number of viewers that commercial cinema reached when I said that cinema reaches millions of people. Some films take a step at a time. They reach certain people in a particular time. It is completely different to want to reach six million people within one or two months. That is really being commercial. It could only be done through huge amount of expenses for advertisement and an intense promotion. And with a much widespread distribution, for instance, a big commercial film comes with one thousand and five hundred copies, in the end, there are less than two thousand theaters in Turkey. In most cases, big commercial films come in and make huge publicity. And what we used to call, a commercial movie, makes a huge investment to the television. Its actors, actresses, scripts etc. come from the TV, hence it has the chance to reach six million people in a very short time. What I mean is a good film can reach millions of people within no time. There is also mass there but it is what we have been talking about. There are usually babies when a movie is made but they grow and catch up in the course of time. This is very interesting for me. Besides, I enjoy it.

S.Ö: Here at this point, I would like to ask you a specific question about your films. In your films, it is usually seen that people pushed out of the margins of the society are being focused on. We also see how to deal with some of them through your movies. For example, the lesbian relationship portrayed in your films like *Nar* and in some films like *9 (Dokuz)* we see “others” who cannot fit the neighborhood profile. What is your concern towards “others”? I mean, why do you want to represent others in your movies? Do you have a subjective reason or any other kind of comment regarding this?

Ü.Ü: First of all, I have never been comfortable since my childhood. If I had been that comfortable, I would not have felt the need to write. I have always felt as a stranger to the society we live in. I have not still established extraordinarily good bonds with where I live. But this is not specifically in Turkey. I tried to live in England for sometime, I suffered a similar kind of estrangement there. Apart from the times I am writing something, I guess I have a defect, a distortion in communication. Otherwise, writing and filming are difficult jobs. You need to force yourself, in order to start and persevere. I always say that somehow I do it under a compulsion from within me. And since I wrote my first film, *Teyzem*, all the things I wrote from my way of thinking, I mean what I wrote with my own will, some were inspired from outside, but, the movies that I made by complying with my inner voice, I think, can all be collected under a theme of unrighteousness. Like an uprising against injustice. This can be an uprising against the suppression of human beings, beginning with protecting the lady in *Teyzem*, but all characters, one by one in *Anlat İstanbul*, a revolt against the demise of that hedgehog in *9 (Dokuz)* and at the same time a revolt against the termination of all characters, one by one. For instance, one of the reasons I accepted the film *Ses* was that the woman in it was silenced. And since I found it so close to what I wanted to do, I accepted it even though it was a horror movie’s scenario. In my opinion, it is possible to see what I wrote under such a title. In this, I was always attracted by outsiders, the people who were out of the social norms, people who stayed on the margins either with their sexual choices or their stance, their attitudes within life, people looking from the thresholds. In fact, it is hard to make an interesting story out of a person who has a normal life and a normal job. I do not say it is impossible, but there are more stories on the flip side.

Gökhan Uğur: Now I would like to ask some questions if you do not mind. I want to continue with the analization of the movie *Nar*. Let me share my personal opinion. When I watch films I feel more excited, since, I think, they pull us towards the concepts. I mean while watching a movie, the feeling of being pulled towards the concepts that exist in several academic discussions rises a certain kind of excitement in me. In *Nar*, a number of concepts appear in the mind. For example, concepts like domination and contempt. I see these concepts appearing in a visualized manner and absorbed in fiction. That is, a woman who works as a cleaner, going somewhere as a fortune teller and being scorn there, at the end of the film, everything’s turning upside down and this shows that a human being carries various structures within himself, just like a piece of pomegranate carries various structures within itself. To expand this subject a bit more, what can we say about the concept of domination? It seems to be related to

injustice. I suppose domination is a concept that yields the concept of injustice, which is the base and the essence of all your films.

Ü.Ü: Yes.

G.U: Can we elaborate this a bit more?

Ü.Ü: Actually what you have just said exists in both *Nar* and in *9 (Dokuz)*. The characters are trying to seize and destroy one another. There is a similar thing also in *Ara*. For instance, in *Ara*, there is a scene where two men go through a dense payoff which is calm and destructive at the same time. There are the things they do to each other in that friendly relationship. Both love and sex solely become a means of domination. This catches my attention a lot. This has become even more classical in *Nar*. A payoff, perhaps a burst is the correct description, is experienced by people from four segments of the Turkish society who come together. Yes, I am mainly interested in this among all my films.

G.U: There is one more thing, about location in that movie. You mentioned you benefitted a lot from the theater which is a state of expressing a matter in a single space. Are there other reasons for your perseverance for storytelling mostly in a single space? Because the trilogy of *9 (Dokuz)*, *Nar* and *Ara* are all movies with a single space.

Ü.Ü: The most primary thing is finance, monetary compulsions before all intellectual groundwork. That is, of course, the main idea, the story of *9 (Dokuz)* was always in my mind and I was willing to tell that story. But the main idea of telling it that way actually came from production. We had made an advertisement. Paul McMillen, who was my boss at that time, filmed an advertisement for a theater festival and I was his assistant on the film set and it was a film consisting only of close-ups and masks. We brought a few actors, they did various masks for us like an angry man, an upset woman, a shouting woman, and a crying man. But I was very impressed by the facial expressions while filming because you are petrified just by looking. I mean, faces have a hypnotic effect. I thought to myself, what if a full-length movie could be made out of it and we made that movie in one day. Then I thought, if we gave each actor a day and they came and told their stories to us, then we made a fiction out of it, would that not be an interesting thing? Thus *9 (Dokuz)* emerged. But I said to myself, how could I absorb it within a fiction, how, then I decided to make an interrogation, then, a police interrogation, then came murder and so on. The most money consuming aspect in making a movie is the increase of working days. And why does the number of days increase? It is because of the increase in shooting ground. You need to add one more day for each change in place. Since if we were to gather our crew to film a scene on a dock, we need to allocate one day for this each time. But if we were to film all of them here at the same place, maybe we could finish it in one day. The necessity for a single shooting ground is also rooted in this. However, on the other hand, I also love it. I'd still love to film *9 (Dokuz)* movie even if I had a lot of money. I mean, I was already willing to tell that story. I already wanted to tell the story in *Nar*. The sense of the loss of justice, the loss of social justice in *Nar* has been intriguing my mind for years. That's all.

G.U: The case of masks I shows up in this film, perhaps, in *Ara* too. I do not know if you will agree with me or not but there are actually masked individuals in *Ara*. I am saying this metaphorically.

Ü.Ü: Yes.

G.U: It seems to me there is a bourgeois crises in *Ara*. Would you tell these bourgeois society which is stuck and full of contradictions?

Ü.Ü: On the one hand, there are people who are not fully urbanized, like Ender in *Ara* comes from a low-middle class family. His father is a teacher, just like mine. I have many characteristics in common with Ender, more correctly, with almost all of the characters I wrote. My character contributes a lot to this genre of movies. Sometimes I express my feelings through the mouths of Veli, Ender, and the women in there. And perhaps all writers do the same thing but I guess I and Ender have similarities mostly in things concerning life stories. But there is a story telling how Veli does not get his toy, a way of talking about his poor times. There was no teddy bear bought for him before. Now he says, maybe we can start a toy shop but that will not compensate for the teddy bear not bought for him at those times. It cannot compensate for his pain. I mean, there are lots of things from me in the characters I use. Let's call it taking off the masks. I express the things I would never want to talk about in my daily life by writing them.

G.U: Let me tell you one more thing concerning these financial difficulties. Creative scenarios seem to be one of the methods for solving this. Because, a creative scenario, i.e. the agility of intelligence is something that makes us pass over the financial obstacles. But I suppose Turkey lacks this. That is to say, there are some shortcomings concerning creative, original scenarios which have sparkles in them. What do you think could be the reasons for this? Why is there an absence in the context of creative scenario and how can it be improved, how can this shortcoming be further developed?

Ü.Ü: First of all, we need to have a much freer cinematic and educational environment. Nowadays this has disappeared. Secondly, I do not want to say something oriented towards practice, since when the theoretical side is absent, an artistic education only oriented towards practice yields terrible results. But the thing people wrote, the scenario, becomes alive only when it is done and turned into a movie. In the end, a script is a text on paper and it is actually the first phase of preparing a film. Even the best-written scenarios cannot end. However, when a director, who can also be the writer, takes it into his or her own hands and turns it into a movie, when actors and actresses vocalize it, it becomes a work or art. Thus, in order for a scenarist to understand what he is doing, it is absolutely necessary for it to be filmed. Either he or someone else should film it. I have done this for thirty years but I still say if only I could do this that way and do that this way, the fact is, I am still learning. In the end, it is a never-ending process. But a cinema student needs to make at least 3 or 4 films so that he could understand what is happening, what is the written script becoming, what can or cannot be filmed, how can they precisely express themselves to the director, what do people understand

from what I write and how I write when I write it, or if I were making that film, how would I express myself to the crew. What can I do first and foremost, what can I film, which emotion can I transfer in cinema? Some emotions are impossible to transfer, some situations are impossible to convey. He needs to make many movies in order to learn when he can and cannot. In my opinion, the main reason for this is the lack of experience. But at the same time, people believe that they can learn how to make films only by watching lots of movies. I do not think so. In our age there is a generation who watch tv series rather than movies. Watching a movie is not the same as watching TV series. There are some things that watching films or TV series do not tell us and these are written in books, in old books. First of all, you need to read a lot in order to deepen a little bit. For someone to say something interesting today, he/she needs to reach a level where he can understand what old writers tell us.

G.U: It is perhaps one of the biggest benefits of literature. It feeds on a huge scale. When we watch your films, we see that, mostly, highly deep problems, phenomena that are difficult to grasp, such as crime, justice, prejudice and class conflict, are actually being told actually in an extremely ordinary way. We reach a depth through mediocrity. Do you think that our daily life practices, functions as laboratory for us to recognize and express those deep problems?

Ü.Ü: Well, I try to do that as much as possible. I try to catch a fluency in my scenarios as possible as they could be. My films, yes, especially *9 (Dokuz)*, *Ara*, and *Nar* can be evaluated art cinema but they are not hard-to-watch movies. Right after initial acceptance, a viewer who is accustomed to action movies could be surprised when he gets to watch *9 (Dokuz)*. He could, of course, ask “what is this? Is this really a film?” Nonetheless, once he accepts the logic in which the film is established and watches it for ten minutes, I believe that he will be carried away by the story. Lots of people all over the world watch and understand the story there. Thus, it is not difficult to watch. I try not to be boring. I try the same in real life, too. I think people perform works similar to themselves. The novel you write, the film you make somehow reflects your inner image. I try to be like that in real life too, I somehow try to communicate with people in my own language. Yes, but trying to explain certain kinds of trouble without bothering them and at the same time not manipulating. The most startling directors for me are the ones who try to manipulate me as a viewer. I try to conceive the viewer as though we were equals and clever. Most directors regard viewers as more stupid than them. I mean they think like “I can deceive and direct them”. Sometimes, some of them become successful, too. But that success lasts only for a short while. After a few years, when that kind of manipulation becomes obsolete, those movies lose their gilding. Whereas the directors who try to speak to the viewer on an equal level as much as they can and try to tell something sincere become long lasting. Not the directors but their works. What they do has a long expiration date.

G.U: I want to touch more daily issues. Turkish cinema seems to have gone into a new phase after the '90s. What are your opinions concerning the new Turkish cinema? What is new about them? What do you think is new both in your cinema, and in others general?

Ü.Ü: If what you call as the new Turkish cinema is Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Zeki Demirkubuz and so forth, I guess the biggest novelty they brought is that they have changed the world of film

production. That is to say, the movies used to be made in Yeşilçam in Turkey until the '80s and there were certain methods by which they were being done. The financial resources were obvious and films used to be produced according to those demands. Some directors had the chance to tilt those demands and they could make several different works. Still, everything used to develop within that world. But, Nuri Bilge created an idea of independent cinema which was absent until then, i.e. initially introduced abroad, fed with the forms in there but done here under small budgets. Similarly, directors like Zeki Demirkubuz, Derviş and Yeşim Ustaoglu came forward in the '90s. I think this was brand new. They changed the whole idea of filmmaking. Until then, the directors regarded as marginal used to be ineffective to the cinema and considered from a distance. Nuri Bilge and others, first of all, showed that artistic cinema could be respectable. You could do something apart from mainstream like Yeşilçam, and at the same time be quite respectable. You could earn money and reach channels that were useful to make your next film -they proved this. And there upon they brought about a great path. I think that was brand new.

G.U: Now I want to ask you something both within the limits of cinema and outside, neither within it nor completely outside of it, I would like to ask you a question about İstanbul. What does İstanbul tell you? Let's call it modern İstanbul, because there is a transforming İstanbul right now. I mean, it is not the same as we left it. Being a thirty-year-old person, for instance, I was born and raised in İstanbul, this city makes me say "İstanbul has changed a lot." There is a persistently changing and transforming İstanbul at the moment. What does İstanbul tell you now and what did it use to tell you? Could you share your thoughts?

Ü.Ü: İstanbul is a prominent source of longing for those who grow up outside of it. One always wants to come here and there is no other real opportunity if you want to do cinema. There is no other option than coming to İstanbul and working here. I came here voluntarily too. I have been living in İstanbul since 1985 and I have always lived here and worked here. Except for a short break I took in England, I have always been in İstanbul. And I was in the middle of İstanbul. I used to live in Cihangir. Now we are in Büyükdada. I started living here since last year. İstanbul has always been a mess. That mess, the chaos stroke me the first time I came here. Nonetheless, to me its chaos today looks much bigger than before. It seems much more incomprehensible and a bit terrifying. Thus, I somehow ran away but could not run much far because I had to go back to work and live in İstanbul. That is why I ran to the Island. İstanbul is such a city from which you just cannot run away. I mean, once I tried to escape to England but my feet brought me back here again.

Kurtuluş Özgen: What has digital technology, let's say video technology, brought to the so-called new Turkish cinema? Can you answer in a brief way?

Ü.Ü: I have always been into the new film-making methods and you know, Nuri Bilge developed a method of film-making by filming 35 without using any actors or actresses and with a very small crew. At the time when I was filming advertisements, I made ads with a video recorder. We used to make all festival ads of The Foundation of İstanbul Culture and

Arts. Well, I filmed an ad for the theater and jazz festivals solely with an HI8 Video Recorder and strolling along the streets of İstanbul with it. Then, you know, these records were transferred to cinema in a professional manner. And the moment I saw those images on the screen, I said to myself: This is possible. So, one can finalize the production for a small amount of money. I thought If I could transfer the images to the screen that way, why wouldn't I film a full-length movie, and in fact, *9 (Dokuz)* came out that way. We filmed *9 (Dokuz)* solely with digital video recorders and transferred it to 35 -at that time, we did not have any chances of showing it at the cinema other than transferring it to 35. Now we have. You can show it only by filming it via a digital medium. What has this brought to the cinema? I think it brought the chance to make the first step of production much cheaper. It cannot be sufficient for all stories but at least for some stories it is sufficient with a mini DV or a good digital video recorder, maybe even with a smart phone's camera, to make a full-length movie. I have seen a full-length film made with a cell phone lately, it was an American film. A complete film made with mobile, mobile's camera. You take its camera where normal video recorders cannot go into and as I said, it makes the first production phase easier and a lot cheaper. However, the moment you want to take part in commercial channels, there is a certain expenditure each film needs to satisfy. They compete on the same level with a one-million-lira film and a fifty-thousand-lira film made with digital video recorder -there is no other chance. And you have to prepare a poster according to that. You have to make a relevant promotional expenditure. You have to go to certain relevant festivals and so on. But as I said it facilitates the first phase of production. And that is, you know the process of persuading those people, especially the ones who are going to provide you with the money. One person can convince them easily with small productions by using basic video recorders and technology... I would not convince anyone for *9 (Dokuz)*. I would not convince, let's say, a producer, even though I had the chance to do that. A young cinema producer could have a similar chance, too. Before persuading a producer, he or she could follow a path like filming in simplistic circumstances, when the filming is over, if something interesting comes out, sharing it with big companies and selling it to them.

S.Ö: Mr. Ünal, after all these tough questions, let me ask you one last question. Our film-philosophy journal leans towards a concept which regards cinema and philosophy on an equal level and which also believes that each film produces an action with its own identity and within its own intellectual framework. We began our publishing life six months ago and we already issued the first edition of our magazine and this is going to be the second one. What are your thoughts concerning this? What do you think about our magazine and its purpose? I would like to hear your opinions concerning the level of cinema criticism Turkey has reached.

Ü.Ü: I think it is going to fill a big gap. I hope so. I think art and philosophy are completely different fields but of course, art needs philosophy. An artist is a messy, disintegrating person who is also disintegrated. A philosopher is, on the contrary...

S.Ö: Just like Apollo and Dionysus...

Ü.Ü: Yes, I mean, a philosopher is someone who integrates everything with one another, puts them under a system and advances within a system of thought. Those two desperately need each other. But we have few cinema magazines right now. We do not have any popular cinema magazines left with an exception of *Altyazı*. Even *Altyazı* does not fill the big gap but I hope your magazine, you know, apart from the concept of popular cinema, is going to fill the theoretical gap differently.