

On The Relationship Between Cinema and Philosophy*

Serdar Öztürk¹

I have divided my presentation into three parts: thought, cinema and philosophy. I will begin with thought. Then, I will focus on the relationship between philosophy and cinema. Finally, I will dwell on the prospective response of cinema to the crisis of our age.

I want to begin with thought because it is one of the most essential topics. What do we understand when we talk about thought? It is still a controversial issue and is heatedly discussed among philosophers and scholars. When we talk about thought, first, we may think of Kant's classification. Human beings have the abilities of understanding, knowing, feeling pain and pleasure and imagination. And we can claim that any human being has all these powers. It means that all people are thinking creatures. Or we can remember Aristotle's definition of a human being and we may say that a human being is a rational animal, adding that the basic distinction between a human being and other creatures is the former's ability to think. But at this point, there is critical question: Is thought synonymous with opinion? Is opinion the same as thought? From discussions, we learn that these two terms, I mean thought and opinion, are different from each other.

Opinion is comprised of expressions about which all people can talk. Therefore, there is nothing shocking for us. As you know this issue was debated in the cave allegory of Plato. He distinguished two worlds. You know, the apparent, phenomenal world and the world of ideas and forms. The basic argument of Plato is that the apparent world involves opinions and images and we need, one way or another, to go beyond this apparent world to reach the thinking world, and to the contemplative world. But, thought has another dimension. Here it is: all of us probably have heard Bourdieu, Pierre Bourdieu, a distinguished sociologist. He has a famous concept, the fast-food thinker. In this respect, is opinion only in connection with layman or does it also cover the people we often see on the media like television? I mean the ones who give us framed and standardized messages. I wonder if some people, like academics, professors, so-called intellectuals... telling the same stories on television every day, transmit

* Made in 17th of January, 2017, this speech is revised in line with the journal's format. You can reach the complete speech with English subtitles here.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pujmX86htIE&t=423s>

¹ Prof. Serdar Öztürk; Gazi University; Faculty of Communication; Radio, TV ve Cinema Department
Contact: iletisim2008@gmail.com

something in an enframed approach as Heidegger pointed out. Can we view these kinds of these as thoughts? Do they bewilder us? As you can see, in this case, there is a problem as well.

At this juncture, while discussion thought, I would like to move on to another point. After all, the things I have been speculating on are topics of social sciences and philosophy, and they do not reflect definite facts. They are just questions related to thought. Here is my question: Can we see the beings around us. I mean, first, can we see ourselves? Second, are we able to see the person in front of us? Third, can we see and perceive other objects, beings, and actually sense them, experience them? Or rather, under an automatic gaze, do we make a journey with them? Are we living beings who suppose that they see, perceive and experience? The thought issue I am discussing here, in fact, focuses on this third dimension. In other words, "Can we really experience? Are we aware of the things we supposedly experience? Is this the meaning of thought?"

We can't discuss these matters only from the philosophical standpoint. They involve many other aspects. One of the books I have recently read claims that consciousness emerges under two circumstances. It says, "Consciousness is in fact and an exception, subconsciousness or our automatic behavior and thinking are general situations. As far as I understand, consciousness comes out in two conditions: First, when a problem occurs, it results in failure, and then consciousness activates. For example, I am walking on the road, and suddenly, I see cars are coming towards me. This is a problem. And at this point, we start to think differently. Accustomed thinking and behavior begin to change. We should protect ourselves from the passing cars. Consciousness takes an initiation. Secondly, our consciousness emerges while making a choice. What does it mean? For instance, I am walking on the road. It is a nice sunny day, and I want to eat an ice-cream. I stop in front of an ice-cream parlour and look at the kinds of ice-cream. I need to make a choice. At this point, our consciousness works. Other than these two situations, our life generally goes on in accordance with what we have been taught. We are presented with frames. What does it mean? Let's take a swimming example. All of us can swim. swimming initially requires a technical process, but then, it becomes automatic. While swimming, we are not aware of our action. The moment we start thinking on our action, we may sink. Like riding a bicycle. I wonder if we experience our life, do we really sense our actions?"

Let me illustrate this point with reference to a scene from an Akira Kurosawa movie, *Ran*. The scene of "Who am I?" It's an adaptation of Hamlet, no, sorry, King Lear. For me, it is one of the best movies of Kurosawa. The King has three sons. He believes it is time to retire from his position, and so he divides his Kingdom into three parts. He offers much more opportunities to his eldest son than the others. But he is betrayed by him. The youngest son doesn't betray the King. The King has destroyed many places and harmed many people until then. Actually, he has been unaware of his actions. And his past assaults him. Only after being betrayed, the king begins to perceive his acts. There he asks the main question. And another scene is very interesting as well. We can grasp the essential issue from this scene. I think this is one of the best scenes in this movie, *Ran*. We understand the meaning of the thought.

(The subtitle of video)

- *Father. Is he alive? Father?*
- *Our lord.*
- *Look at that sky! Is this the other world? Am I in this paradise?*
- *Father!*
- *How can you be so cruel? Why do you drag me out of my grave?*
- *Father! Father! Father!*

Who am I? What did I do? And the sky is so beautiful! Actually, the sky is not that beautiful in the scene. But for the first time in his life, the King has experienced the sky. He senses the sky. Before this incident, he had never seen the sky because of his prejudices and his passion for power. His instincts and his social position had masked his sight and his vision. He had never been aware of his acts. For the first time in his life, he has begun to experience the world around him. Is this experience of the world only concerned with the King?

Now, let's have a look at another movie by Kurosawa, *Ikiru*. It is the story of Watanabe who has been a civil servant for thirty years. He is like a character in the novels by Kafka. As you know, Kafka's main issue was bureaucracy and oppressed individual in the cog of bureaucratic machine. Remember an individual [Gregor Samsa] who transforms into the insect. While Watanabe, the main character in Kurosawa film, has been dealing with trivial jobs at his workplace, he has never been aware of his acts. He has not been sure whether or not he is alive. One day, he goes to a doctor and learns that he has just six months to live. He has stomach cancer. He asks himself a question: "What is life?" "What is the meaning of life?" For the first time in his life, Watanabe begins to contemplate. He encounters a young woman called Toyo. She is a poor woman working at the same workplace as Watanabe. Yet, she takes pleasure from simple things. From her, Watanabe tries to learn how to live. The scene I want to show you is similar to the scene in which the king looks at the sky. Watanabe senses the meaning of life. How does he sense it? He says "No!" He shows his will to make a difference in life. He helps others. He constructs a park, or rather leads the construction of it. Moreover, he makes a contribution to the efforts of people who have drinking water problem. The final part of the movie lasts about thirty minutes showing Watanabe's funeral service and memories of the people attending the funeral. Kurosawa shows these. Different memories open spaces. These memories are like "crystal images" Deleuze coined. There are different memories about Watanabe, and by following them, we make a journey into his identity, and learn how he spends his last days. Here is one of the memories.

(Subtitle of English)

- *Say. Speaking of that. I've got another one like that.*
- *How beautiful. How truly beautiful. In the last 30 years, I'd all but forgotten about sunsets. But I haven't got time for this now.*

That's exactly what I want to mention. Are we able to see objects around us well enough? In this respect, we need to remember Heidegger's view about separation of thinking. He reminds us about thought: There can be two kinds of thinking: One of them is calculative thinking and the other one is meditative thinking. Meditative approach to thinking is somewhat similar to the concept of intuitive sight Bergson suggests. It somehow resembles Kant's aesthetics gaze. The second one is a calculative approach to thinking. Heidegger argues that in our age, with the domination of science and technology over our life, we have begun to think everything in line with numbers. We have started to think everything in a predictable way and sense all things in quantitative style. Finally, this technical approach spreads everywhere. Of course, the rationalization of science has some kind of effect on this approach. It has an effect of spreading of the technicians' gaze. We forget the existence of being. Are there beings around us, if so, how? But if we present an empathetic gaze, as Bergson suggests, and as Deleuze utilizes, to this view, it is possible to sense or rather intuit or feel it in itself.

I might explain this point with an example because illustrations are essential. Let's leave two people to nature and let's say one of them is a builder and the other one holds an aesthetics approach to life. If they both walk in the countryside, I wonder how the builder sees the landscape. It is very probable that he begins to see this area as something to be transformed, mathematized, quantified and calculated land. Yet, the other person most likely views it very differently, he casts an aesthetics sight to the nature. He sees the landscape in itself. We should conceive how these two ways of looking at the nature are different from each other. I am going to illustrate this issue, but if you don't mind, I would like to talk about cinema first. I need to combine all of them, meaning thought, cinema and philosophy.

What is cinema? Why does it have any relation with our problem?

In fact, cinema can't be defined easily as Kurosawa told in one of the interviews he gave. He said, he had been thinking about the definition of cinema for a long time and eventually decided that cinema was a composition. Yes, cinema is a composition. What kind of a composition? Sound, colour, light, narrative, scenario, camera, angles and many other components like music come together and are objectified in art product. Philosopher Jacques Ranciere has ideas on cinema as well. He argues that cinema is a paradoxical art. What does it mean?

Cinema is in some sense a representational regime as Aristo termed. It is like telling stories. There is a story and this story is represented in cinema. Cinema also has an aesthetics regime, a regime in which deviating moments take place. Aesthetics regime, like some scenes I have just shown you, involves different and purified instants. For instance, if you have watched Godard's movies, you may have come across this regime. A person in the movie suddenly looks at the camera. Let's take *My Life to Live as an example*. A philosopher and Nana talk to each other at a cafe for about ten minutes. Being familiar with conventions in cinema, we can be surprised by this talk. We expect them to engage in an ordinary dialogue. The philosopher tells the story of Porthos in *Three Musketeers*. Let's remember the story of Porthos: after placing the bomb in the vault, Porthos begins to run away. But while doing this, he thinks and asks: "Why do my legs act so harmoniously?" After thinking this, he cannot move any

further. Thinking of his running action, he cannot run anymore. The moment he thinks becomes his death. Through the philosopher and Nana's talk to each other, Godard presents us a highly interesting art performance. He makes Nana look at us. What the philosopher did at the cafe, Godard does with cinematic possibility. Nana looks at us and we are shocked. We start to think at this moment. This is the aesthetics regime Ranciere referred to. Differences of moments. But Rancier writes on the ethical regime as well as aesthetics regime and representational regime. Ethical regime involves good and bad. What is good? What is bad? We begin to ask moral questions. It is one of the possibilities cinema offers.

Probably you have watched *Rashomon*. There is an element in this movie which has not been discussed enough. Many people focus on the relativity issue in *Rashomon*. Let's remember the story. While a woman and her husband are walking through the forest, a man rapes the woman and kills her husband. The defendant and witnesses are taken to court. The same story is told from a few vantage points. The woodman is the witness. I mean he has observed the event. The suspect of the criminal event appears in court. Even the late husband tells the story through a medium. In this regard, we ask whether or not life is so much full of relative things. If so, what is wrong? What is right? Yet, at the end of the movie, Kurosawa helps us to answer this question. This is an interesting point and this ending scene shows ethical regime as well. Let's have a look at it. We hear a baby crying. After hearing it, the woodman who has six kids adopts this baby. The monk living next to the woodman is surprised. He asks, "Why do you adopt this baby, you have six kids?" The woodman says something like this, "Because I have to. Because he is crying. Because he is left alone." This is so simple. This is an event which can never leave us in doubt. We can doubt many things. Yes, there can be lots of different perspectives, yet there is a place where we cannot doubt. This is to adopt the baby. Ethical regime requires this. The ending scene of Kurosawa's film shows it to us. That means relativity comes to an end at one point.

Alain Badiou's definition of cinema is very interesting. I highly regard Alain Badiou's definition of cinema. He says cinema cannot be defined. But, he gives some clues about cinema. He claims that cinema is an impure art. It is an art which is comprised of many different raw and impure materials, and which purifies them. Cinema is also a mass art. We should stop here. Mass art... What is mass art? In the contemporary world, you produce art and millions of people consume it. It is not belong to the past. Mass art belongs to the present It is a paradoxical situation. Why? Because normally a work of art is normally not watched by millions of people. Art ontologically contains aristocracy. Art's position is high. It begins from the top. In order to reach art, people need to have some capabilities. They need to know something about art history. They should have an art background to internalize a piece of art. The concept of aristocracy involves this. Let's take painting. No matter how beautiful or terrible a painting is, it doesn't make much difference. Millions do not demand it. Likewise, we can speak of other kinds of art. The difference of cinema from other arts is that cinema juxtaposes both aristocracy and democracy. The mass concept refers to cinema's democratic aspect whereas art concept shows its aristocratic way. This is a paradoxical situation. Since cinema brings mass and art together, it continues the paradoxical aspect of the cinema I have

just mentioned. For the first time in history, we begin to speak of bizarre art in which “mass” and “art combine.

We can move from here to another point. Why does Deleuze pay attention to cinema? Why did this philosopher write *Cinema I* and *Cinema II* during the 1980s? What did he discover in cinema? Actually, his basic question was about thought, a matter I touched upon at the beginning of my speech. Thought... In our age, we, as Heidegger put it, are creatures who are supposed to think, but in fact, we don't think. We mix opinion up with thought. Deleuze argues thought has three modes or appearances. What are they? They are cinema, science and philosophy. Or let me put it in the correct order, art, science and philosophy. Cinema is of course an art. Art is a general conception. According to Deleuze, philosophy works with concepts. I will touch upon this issue later. It is one way of thought. Science works with functions, equations, and coordinates. Deleuze never put them in a hierarchical order. They are just different modes of thought. And all of them are essential. Intellect, senses or emotions as well as functions and equations... They need each other. Why was cinema important for Deleuze? Because according to him cinema was produced with images whereas philosophy worked with concepts. Therefore, a cinema director is actually a person who thinks with images. A director who thinks with images is as important as a philosopher who thinks with concepts. They are equal. That's why a philosopher cannot dominate cinema. He can just, at most, classify images. Deleuze said a philosopher like him just can classify images, only makes the taxonomy of them. Yet, Deleuze added something new. This expression is essential for me: Yes, in cinema there are ideas, whereas in philosophy there are concepts. Here, we need to ask this question: How does cinema contribute to philosophy? This is a very vital question. We don't mention the contribution philosophy makes to cinema any longer. On the contrary, to create a concept in philosophy, we call on cinema. That is one of the main issues. After having said that, at the end of my speech, I am going to think about what kinds of contribution cinema may make to philosophy. Discussing this issue, Deleuze, impressed by Henry Bergson, made a distinction between images as time images and movement images. To him cinema began as movement-image, but after the Second World War, because of disappearance of agents, the decreasing effect of the heroic stories, the crises of humanity and crises about the existence of the world caused the appearance of a new image. We witnessed a new image which works like plastic after World War II. This new image, time image, is a new thing to thought. What is it? For Deleuze, time-image presented time directly, and provided us with some signs of emergent society. It could show a new and creative society as well. Because when we think over indeterminacy and virtual, at the same time, we can become aware of bifurcations in the future, too. In order to illustrate how time-image works, you can watch *Silent Light*. It is directed by Carlos Reygadas, a Mexican director.

In the beginning scene, you should wait like in Bergson's example. You should wait for the melting of sugar in a glass of tea. It is Bergson's example. While waiting, some changes take place inside you. Is it a patient waiting or impatient waiting? Waiting for sugar to melt in some tea is different for everyone. Some can be patient, some can get impatient. That is duration. It is outside of chronological time and be flexible like plastic. The director, Reygadas, doesn't apply montage in this scene a lot. In the film, he applies montage in the required places.

The film opens up like plastic. I think this Reygadas' movie precisely shows time-image. Why is it important for us? Because we don't have any idea about how virtual results in new bifurcations. We don't know what the new society will be. There will be a miracle, a hope in any time. Unpredictability itself is the manifestation of this new image. However, when we see some Hollywood movies, we can predict from the beginning the progress and the final sections. There are lots of clichéd images, cuts and montage. Clichéd images have become permanent since they have been used a lot in cinema. But time-images are new and creative images. We don't have any idea about the next scene in the movie. I think this can be one of the best possibilities cinema offers to thought. I will sum up these issues, I will not take your time a lot, but now I would like to touch on philosophy in order to draw on the relation among philosophy, thought, and cinema.

What is philosophy? I agree with Bergson and Deleuze's interpretations of philosophy. Actually, there are many definitions of philosophy, but I think we shouldn't stick with definitions because to define something is like a mechanical process. Bergson tells us this about philosophy: Philosophy is an intervention in usual thinking. The thought goes on its own usual course and philosophy intervenes in it. And in fact, it helps us to understand that this supposed usual course is unusual. For me, this definition is one of the best expressions. What does Deleuze say? Influenced by Bergson, Deleuze claims that philosophy is to create concepts, to invent concepts. That is an essential point. To invent... because it emphasizes the creativity and productivity. Many social scientists argue that concepts are also part of social sciences. But Deleuze tells us that concepts fundamentally seem innate in philosophy and emphasizes that social sciences gradually evolve into a market mechanism. For Deleuze, to invent concepts, consequently, is a threshold for us.

When we talk about Alain Badiou's view on philosophy, we see that he presents an interesting explanation. He talks about philosophical situations. These situations are in some way in connection with cinema. I may refer to his book, *Cinema, in which* he tells explains philosophical situations. He argues that we should think over three philosophical situations. The first one occurs between Calicles and Socrates. In this encounter, Calicles claims a tyrant is always right. The person in power is just. According to him, this is the definition of justice. Now that you come to power you are fair. Socrates is against this idea. "No, tyrant is not just. Justice is right in itself." To sum up, Socrates defends the righteousness, not power, is just whereas Calicles claims that power means justice. So there is a difference between these two views. It has a split between the approach which assumes that power is right and the approach which defends that goodness is right. This is an important point. We need to make a choice between them. Either we will be in favour of Calicles or Socrates. This is the philosophical situation. Philosophy works on splits, on paradoxes. Deleuze, as well, emphasizes this point: philosophy doesn't work every time, it is only done on splits.

Philosophy is at work on conflicts, encounters and paradoxes, and there we must choose one of them. From here Badiou passes to the second philosophical situation. This one is also a highly interesting illustration. It is on Archimedes. How did he die? Archimedes lived in ancient Greece and continued to deal with mathematical equations when Rome conquered

Greece. Marcellus occupied Greece while Archimedes was dealing with math problems in his own creative path. Where? On the beach, he was solving math problems. One day a soldier went to him and said "Marcellus is calling you!" Archimedes didn't care. After being called a few times, Archimedes raised his head and replied, "Let me finish my equation!" Then the soldier fiercely took his sword and killed Archimedes. There is a second philosophical situation here. What is it? The distance between the power and the artist who wanted to go on his own path. There is a distance between the two. On the one side, there is the power which is equal with violence; on the other side, there is the artist who is going about his creative way. Interestingly, it is similar to a story happened during the Medieval Iran in terms of the meaning of the artist, even though in the Iranian story there was no power issue. An earthquake occurred in the Medieval Iran. Everything was destroyed. After the earthquake, everyone was looking for a famous calligraphist, who was at home during the earthquake. People removed the debris of his house. The first floor, the second floor... and finally, he was found on the ground floor. Everybody observed that the calligraphist focused on his own work. He dealt with his job. He didn't care about the earthquake. People asked, "What are you doing here?" He replied, "Look at this 'N' letter. It is one of the best letters I have ever done." It was one of the most interesting illustrations which showed the creativity path of the artist. The distance problem is also observable here.

And finally, we come to the third philosophical situation: exception, that is a particular event. At this point, Alain Badiou illustrates it with a movie scene from Kenji Mizoguchi's movie, *The Crucified Lovers*. He focuses on the final scene of this movie. In fact, the story is too clichéd. We can see this kind of story everywhere. It happens in the Medieval Japan. During that time, if lovers committed adultery they would be punished to death. A woman gets married with a shop keeper. Her husband, in fact, is a pretty good person, but the woman is not in love with him. Then, a young man appears in the story. It often happens when the third one emerges in the story. You know... the story changes. As George Simmel claimed "two" doesn't convey a problem, but if the "third" appears, problems increase. Because in any case either you create a secure environment or you should create solidarity with one of them. Three is a pretty magical number. After the third joins in, a magic gradually grows. Anyhow the married woman and the young man love each other and they elope. The husband strives for them not to be captured. Yet, they are captured. Then, we see the final scene. They are tied to each other on a mule. They are taken to their death. At this scene, the camera focuses on their faces. A vague smile is seen on the lovers' faces. A vague smile.... You may perceive it from the polyphonic play of faces. Bela Balazs, a pioneer film theorist, in his *Visible Man*, argues face is a polyphonic play of feature, melodic variation.

Therefore, close-ups, particularly the one on faces, are very important...Well the importance of Carl Dreyer results from his skillful use of close-ups. You can notice the smiling of the woman and the man. This smiling is an exception. It is an event. What does it mean? It is a challenge to social structure in that period. These lovers, in fact, don't want their death. There is no melodrama here. You know, in some movies lovers want to die because of their love. Here, there is no such case. They don't have an aim of dying. Yet, when they are taken to their tragic end, they smile vaguely. This smile is the sign of a future society. We need to make

syntheses here. In the current society in movie, common people talk about them while they are led away tied. People ask, "Why are they smiling the way they do?" add, "Their faces are so strange."

We might analyze it, by referring to Raymond Williams. We might add sociology as well as philosophy in our analyses. As you know, Raymond Williams famously argues that in an art product, particularly in literature, there would be three kinds of value: traditional value, dominant value and emergent value. What is traditional value in literary works? It is residual value coming from the past. These values are traces of traditional society. What is the dominant value? Dominant values are available in current society. For instance, if male values were dominant in a past society, they emerge in current social structure, so classical and contemporary ones are mixed. What is the future society's value? It is a different value which challenges the current and past values. It is an emergent, a different value. To illustrate this, let's have a look at *The New Testament*. In the movie, God lives in Belgium. He is illustrated as a human being. But you see the Goddess, who is the wife of God, designs the world as an art product. She constructs a world which is not the best of possible worlds, an argument that is against Leibniz's idea. This world is not the best of possible worlds. What does she do? She puts flowers in the sky. She cancels the law of gravity and people climb on buildings. That is a strange situation. But the movie thinks the unthinkable. What is important is this: to think unthinkable and design life as a product, as Nietzsche said, as an artistic way, to invent a new existence. This is the essential point. Situated in the Medieval Japan world, the lovers' smile is a philosophical event. As we synthesize, we might say it is the seed of an emergent society. So, to sum up, the split as a distance, the split as an exception and the split as a choice. You see strange contradictions among them. Philosophy engages in them. Philosophy manages to explain these contradictions. Alain Badiou put emphasis on this issue.

From here, let me combine all these issues. In fact, cinema does two things. Here I refer to Kracauer's analyses. As you know, cinema both records and reveals. What is its recording function? It records movement. What is movement? Dancing, music, chase... but, there is another movement, the "nascent motion." What is nascent motion? We would see it in Dovzhenkos' movies. The motion suddenly stops while the movie continues. Even if moving images come to a stand, still the motion does not stop our inside. Our inner motion keeps acting. This is a nascent motion.

Now we might turn to a very important function of movie: revealing. What does it mean? Cinema reveals things that are normally unseen. What kinds of things that could not normally be seen? The small and the big. Faces, details of faces and smiling, I have mentioned before. We cannot see these details with normal sight. But, cinema shows these affection images, as Deleuze termed... We can see these details thanks to cinema. Cinema also shows us masses of people. Through wide angle lenses, we see masses of people who cannot be normally see. There is another revealing function of cinema which is called "phenomena overwhelming consciousness." Catastrophes such as a hurricane and fire, acts of violence, death, the atrocities of war... Even though we cannot experience them in daily life, we see all of them in movies. We begin to think them, experiencing all these things in cinema. We think over their meanings

and ask whether or not these phenomena are natural. We contemplate on them and perhaps we ask this question, "How can another world be possible?"

We might see this issue even in popular movies, or even in TV series. In *Star Trek*, I remember a scene. The alien challenges Captain Spike: "It is time to combat." Spike replies: "No, we don't need to make a war." The alien responds by saying, "But your species tend to fight. All throughout the history you have fought." Spike completes, "Yes, we have waged wars, but now we don't need to make a war with each other any longer." It means we can solve our problems in different ways. In fact, when we take "phenomena overwhelming consciousness" into account, we think over these kinds of things. You would see them in Bergman's movies. For instance, *Shame (Skammen)*. After committing the first act of violence, one can get accustomed to it, and then violence means mere quantitative data. Yet, the first one is too difficult to commit. We think over it while watching the movie.

There is another revealing function of cinema: special modes of reality. What does it mean? One might notice how life can be seen through the eyes of dogs, from the eyes of inanimate things, from the eyes of another person. Even popular movies show this last function. Let me give an example. *An Invisible Sign (2010)*. A woman has been passionate about maths. She sees everything with math and digits. In daily life, is it possible to see something with digits? Of course not. But we see how she sees things with digits on the movie. Because her sight shows digits and we see them. That is one of the possibilities of cinema as well. Cinema reveals beings as well.

So cinema provides with us this: It shows beings. We see objects normally unseen. It is significant in some ways. By referring to Bela Balazs' in the *Visible Man*, we would argue that with printing press we began to make life abstract. We contacted life with letters. We totalized and abstracted everything. It resulted in a distance between us and beings. What intervened in? Digits. What intervened in? Writing. We could not answer how an image looked in real life. Now, the new art: cinema. Cinema has presented us with fragmented and detailed beings beyond letters and abstractions. It has shown us beings all the way. We have really faced human beings? Now, what does Bergson say? He says, yes, we have made everything abstract because of science and technology. By the way, these thinkers are not against science and technology. We should remember this point. They just point out that there is a difference between the perception of mind, the abstraction of science on the hand; and things themselves on the other hand.

We need to apply a different point of view: intuition. In fact, Bergson thinks cinema is an illusion. When we analyze intuition, abstraction and contradiction, we might tell those points: cinema would present things as they are. It might demystify the mystification mechanisms. We can mind to blind spots to some extended level. We can be a slave of our instincts. We can be a slave of greed for power as well. Besides, technology conceals relations. Science and technology make everything abstract.

All habits, customs, traditions, conventions and ideologies mediate between us and beings. We cannot see beings. This is one of the possibilities, contributions of cinema to us. If

I make a synthesis here, cinema teaches us a lesson of hope. Hope. What is it? It shows that hope may emerge even in the worst circumstances. There is hope, a miracle even in the worst conditions. You have probably watched *Journey to Italy* by Roberta Rossellini. A married couple visits Italy, and there they try to reinvigorate their marriage because they are about to divorce. They have a troublesome marriage. The husband tempts another woman whereas his wife seeks isolation. Finally, they make the decision to divorce. At the end of the movie we see a crowded area and at an unexpected moment the married couple perceives the meaning of their mutual love. While almost divorcing, they ask questions. They ask the meaning of divorce, of marriage by themselves; and in too short a time, they realize their love. What does it tell us? Rossellini gives a message with this scene: love is an event that happens to us. It has no connection with our willing. Even if you deliberate on it, it doesn't matter, love in fact happens to us. It is an exception. He tells this. A miracle can occur at any moment.

But let's have a look at another scene and see the different type of love.

After the husband reads his poem, his wife doesn't enjoy it. This is the last movie of the trilogy, *Before Midnight*. This is the the ending scene of the movie. They don't speak to each other for a while because the woman tells his husband that his action is too stupid. His husband replies whether she likes or not, they are so, life is like this. And we, the audience, are waiting for a miracle. It happens in the movie. The woman doesn't speak much, in contrast to some Hollywood movies, she just says something like this: "Tell me the time machine again, how is it?" The director's love concept here is different. Love is to produce stories, to leave ourselves into stories, and to intervene in ordinary flow through our wills. The concept of love here is different. Our will is at work here, Nietzsche's will to power.

There can be different love concepts. What is important is that we can see one of the basic issues of some philosophers and film theorists: in the world, where everything is commodified and invisible to us, what is the meaning of these kinds of human relations, which are supposed to be trivial, common?

Maybe, love and friendship are two of the most important responses to these commodified relations. Because love and friendship are not commodified, at least we should claim that they are not to be commodified. They should not be hidden or masked. As you see, we can develop different concepts. This principle is essential: even in the worst conditions, hope nevertheless will exist. Let's see two scenes from two movies.

Everybody knows *Modern Times*. The essential element here, you probably have seen *Modern Times*, is that the awful conditions are so heavy that Charlie Chaplin cannot reach his aims. Despite his real ability is to dance and to sing, he is a factory worker. Yet, despite everything he strives to achieve his dreams again and again. We are creatures thrown into the world. We need to make an effort for life to keep going on. And you see here in the ending scene the dawn, the road as well, journey to hope continues. By the way, let me promote my book. This is my last book, *SineFilozofi*. It scrutinizes this issue, this journey. And finally, let me show another scene. It is also related to hope. The way to hope.... You know *Germinal*.

Maybe some of you have not watched this movie. A nomadic worker and an unsuccessful struggle. But as you see, the main issue is that it is an experience. And this experience sows some seeds for the future society. These seeds give some information to us about how the future society will be. It provides, at least, some intuitions. One of the important lessons which cinema may give to philosophy is, as Badiou pointed out, hope. Hope. Philosophy learns from cinema that there can be hope even under the worst circumstances.

Thank you.

Question: Do movies other than arthouse ones, so-called low quality movies or mass movies, present anything to philosophy? We have generally seen artistic or intellectual examples here. But let's say *Recep İvedik*.² Is there anything of this movie to present to philosophy? Do you think any kitsch products of culture industry provide any possibility of thought similar to high quality products?

Answer: To some extent, I believe it does. *Modern Times*, from which I have shown you a scene has been seen even by Eskimos. Many people have watched it, and so Charlot has become a generic character. Charlie Chaplin represented a generic and a universal character. I think we can classify films under a few categories. The first one is *intensified-thought movies*. I don't call them art movies since if you name something as art, you should naturally accept the non-art. But when you make a film in some way, you enter into the area of art. Because you make a composition with different materials like light and many other elements. What does intensified-thought movies mean? Movies that are loaded with thought. The second film category, for me, is *hybrid movies*. These kinds of films are between intensified-thought films and mass films. I think *Germinal* can be thought as a hybrid movie. The film you have seen falls into this category. And the third category is comprised of *mass films*. In all films, there are lots of elements about humanity, about daily life and about the visibility of beings. As you may have noticed, when I mentioned thought, I put an emphasis on this point.

How can invisible things become visible? How can we face our passions? How can we face technologies which enframe us? You see mass films. One of the films that I have watched recently was *Tron: Legacy*. Some people enter computer world. While they are there, you ask some questions: what is reality? What are real human relationships? What will science and technology look like in the future? And, do they enframe us to some extent? I mean even in terms of these movies, we ask some questions. You may have seen *Dr. Strange*. What does it have? There are different layers. Darkness... On the one hand, you face a dark side; on the other hand, you see a bright side. While watching many Hollywood movies, we automatically assume that the dark side is bad. Yet in *Dr. Strange*, you also see the dark side's own existence. You need to leave its own existence as it is. Life means differences. If you leave things as they are, your journey in life can also be different. We ask this question as well. For me, the main issue is this: Dziga Vertov claims that our eyes are given to us, whereas the camera is not given. We can develop camera forever but not our eyes. We have to be against this view. Our eyes are not given to us, either. We can turn our optic sight into haptic sight, meaning multi-sensed

² A Turkish popular comedy movie series.

sight. Multi-sensed sight. I mean, the body itself has the ability to see. I think one of the contributions of these kinds of seminars is to improve our eyes. We need to improve our eyes. The more we do this, the better points of view we catch. Thus, clichéd images may be decreased. By the way, cliché can never be lost completely. Why? Because both cliché images and non-cliché images, I mean, creative images must be in the same movie so that they clash with each other. You must show some cliché images as well. What kinds of cliché images? For example, as Badiou emphasized, gunshots, naked bodies. You turn the body into aesthetics style which purifies it. Rather than a pornographic image you turn it into love image in an aesthetics way. Or you can put different apparatus in order to purify it. But in order to see it, you should also see cliché image. One of the best illustrations of cliché image is (as Alain Badiou's said) cars. Notice that in Hollywood movies there are lots of images of chasing cars. We see cars in all kinds of movies and TV series. Driving looks similar in movies. But what does Abbas Kiarostami do? He shows cars in a different way. You may have watched *The Taste of Cherry*. In this movie, the car itself becomes a place of speech. I mean, inside the car we see a driver and people making dialogues with each other. The car's presentation is very creative, a very different image. This is what I want to say. Shortly, we should see all kinds of movies, but if we empower our eyes a bit more, if we become more selective, for me, it would be possible to produce much more intensified-thought movies and to make it possible for the independent movies survive as well as increase new and creative images. In this respect, I think we should improve our faculties.

Question: While closing your speech, you made a statement about hope and cinema. Would you like to repeat it, because I want to ask a question in this context? It is something like cinema's becoming of philosophy.

Answer: Yes, I remember that. That was a spontaneous sentence. Cinema gives a lesson of hope to philosophy. I agree with Badiou. Philosophy learns about hope from cinema, which is one of the most important points. It is a faith in hope's existence even under the worst conditions in daily life. That is the thing that Deleuze has emphasized. We don't need any information of the world any longer but now we must believe in this world.

Question: Well, is it because of philosophy's going down in despair or did you present this case as an alternative style because of shadows?

Answer: It is not related to that. What I want to point out is that philosophy generally starts from the top. I mean it extracts something from daily life... images and opinions, but it takes up issues with concepts. It tries to find out the logic in everything, the rationality in everything. Now that you approach issues this way, it is impossible to perceive the magic embedded in daily life. You don't believe in miracles. You don't think enough of signs about what will happen in daily life. Yet, since cinema is an art and an art refers partly to irrational situations. Cinema shows us acts which I have just shown some scenes to you. There we connect with belief in life again. Philosophy in this respect can go on its own course. By the way, let me emphasize this point. There are many conceptions about philosophy but for instance, Deleuze interrogates the view that philosophy is synonymous with intellect. Philosophy is between intellect and instinct. If instinct dominates all life, life flows in

blindness. On the other hand, intellect calculates everything. One needs to dance between them. Deleuze places philosophy between intellect and instinct. Philosophy in this sense can be much more creative. Deleuze, as you know, mentions about creators' community. This community exists and spreads interval between intellect and instinct; and the more this interval widens the more the number of creators community increases. I hope you got it.

Question: Yes, I get it. From these explanations, if cinema spreads among mass people, hope also will spread. I mean, now that philosophy stems from the top...

Answer: Philosophy makes an abstraction. Therefore, beings can be invisible. But in order to make an empathy with subjects in the material world and to see the small things, we must come close to them. That's why cinema is one of the important arts. For example, we suppose we see the surrounding area. I have been talking about this issue since the beginning of my speech. Let me illustrate it again. There is a scene, or rather I have a movie called *Hello, My Name's Doris* in my mind. It is a popular movie. A popular film, a new movie made in 2015. But it is a very interesting film. Why is it so? Normally, in literature or in movies, we don't judge an older man's love for a younger woman and his affair with her. Why don't we think the other way around? Is it impossible for an old woman to love a young man? This movie begins with this idea. It has a character named Doris. She is old. Sally Field performs this role. Her mother has just died. After her mother has died, you know, the basic explanation, classical Zizek interpretation which is, the mother figure has disappeared, an authority figure like the father or mother has disappeared. I am a little distanced from these interpretations. After her mother has passed away, Doris meets a young man on the street. He is standing precisely in front of her workplace. She perceives him. I mean, first, we perceive something. In fact, our perception works according to our interests. This is the point Bergson emphasized. Then, we pass to the next step. You get on the lift. The second exception starts here. Do you ever look at each other's eyes? There, the young man looks at old woman's eyes and talks to her. First, she is "the stranger" on the lift; second, he not only looks at but also talks to her. This is the second experience of Doris. After that, you pass to the other experience. Actually, Doris and the young man begin to work at the same place; or rather the young man starts a new job at the company where the woman works. He is the new art director. In this third step, the new guy is introduced to his co-workers. The old woman looks at him, and suddenly, the film shows her fantasy. While watching, you do not notice whether or not this is a fantasy. He says, "I've met a woman. She is a very important person" and approaches her. At that moment, it turns out that this is a fantasy of her. She makes an effort to make contact with the guy and to get him to perceive her.

What does she do? She learns his hobbies from Facebook. She shows courage, reveals her will to power, and says something like this, "It is not impossible. It is not impossible." Now we come to the end of the movie.

She can't succeed in changing the young man's perspective, and so she makes a decision to quit her job. As you see, the film combines fantasy and real. When it does so, you think as if it is real because there is no change in light, in colour, shortly in cinematography. It is like the crystal image Deleuze mentions. This is very essential. There is always some kind of

possibility in life. In the final scene of the movie you perceive it. It is a miracle like the one in the smiling in Medieval Japan, which I have emphasized before. Let us remember that that smiling was the seed for the next society. Here cinema thinks the unthinkable, shows the unthinkable. This is important.

Question: As you stated, cinema makes the invisible things visible and reveals phenomena overwhelming consciousness. I'm a high school philosophy teacher. Now, as a person just repeating your views, there are mass films, intensified-thought films as well as hybrid films. By the way, I am sure that many of the audience here are over a certain age, and have some certain aesthetics sense and enjoy an intensified-thought film. Yet, as a teacher, I have a utopia in which my students comprehend intensified-thought movies and comment on them. As much as I can, I adopt movie scenes in my lessons, or I show movies to my students. Yet, for example, let's take some films like *Truman Show* in the philosophy of ontology or *A Short Film about Killing* by Kieslowski in democracy and human rights topics. However, since these films are loaded with heavy thought, students face much difficulty in understanding them. Besides, they prefer to watch popular movies. How can we lead these students? The age group of the students is between 16-18 years old. So how can we lead these students to intensified-thought movies? You have stated that art or cinema requires aristocracy in some way, a certain cultural maturity. Yet until we reach this level of maturity, the society goes on its own way as well. How can we introduce intensified-thought movies to the youth?

Answer: To be honest, we've got together here in this meeting hall to achieve these kinds of aims. Aesthetics taste itself can be reached by discussion, debate and experience. I mean, if your students were here today, I am sure they would have learned the different aspects of the issue. It is an issue related to watching, reading as well as discussing. By the way, it is a debated issue whether or not films are means for something. If you had asked this question to Hegel, he might have replied "No!" Films could not be means of anything. If Hegel lived now, he would claim that films could not be used in philosophy courses. Philosophy is philosophy, art is art. They have their own paths. I think Hegel was wrong in this respect. We don't have to look at things with that much rigidity. Of course, we may apply movies at courses but we need to be careful on this point: Actually, philosophy teachers should read about cinematography. Well, what is the meaning of colour and light? How can a meaning be created? It is not only related to cinema narrative. Cinema is not only a story. If we wonder a story we can apply literature. Cinema is not a story, not a narrative. Cinema is the image as well. There are lots of images in cinema. And the sound is an essential element of cinema as well as music. Why? Because cinema doesn't take music in complicated composition. It applies some aesthetics elements in musi. It takes some beautiful pieces from painting. Cinema takes this beauty principle and works on it and purifies it. When we think about these issues, a student would see the meaning of camera's angle and perceive how the meanings are created. The more they see these kinds of cinematographic elements, the better they understand their meanings. This is one of the tactics I apply. You can be sure that the problem isn't only with your students. This is a common problem even among university students. I ask my freshmen which films they have watched before. Have you watched this movie? No. Have you watched that movie? No. Why have you entered this faculty then? They say: "Because there was this university

exam, and we had to study at a faculty. There is no aptitude test to before accepting students to communication faculties, to the department of radio, television and cinema. They come and we try to work on them. We ask, "Have you watched *Citizen Kane*?" They say, "No". Then, we start from scratch. I believe this problem is multi-layered. Therefore, I've begun to publish a journal called *SineFilozofi*. Our journal is international and peer-reviewed. You can download it from www.sinefilozofi.org. At the same time, we have "Sinefilozofi Channel" on youtube. We have recorded many of our activities in the journal and you will see them on *Youtube*. By using social media, we offer different perspectives to the youth. For example, the movie on which we discussed three weeks ago was *Interstellar*. It is among significant movies. Young people also enjoy these types of movies. Then, we need to inspire young people, I think. It was a pretty discussion and they can reach it on *Youtube*. In fact, we have to say somethings on *Iron Man*, as well. Maybe we should do this sort of thing, here is a method: a scene from *Iron Man*, let's say an encounter in which a child and a robot face each other and the child resists the robot by saying something like this: "I can struggle with you." After that Iron Man saves the child. What is the philosophical situation in this scene? Children can be creators and have much courage. However, take this scene and compare it with, let's say the case of the child in Akira Kurosawa's *Dreams*. There are some differences between them. In *Dreams* that I analyzed in my last book, the child plunges into the forest bravely. Bravely. So you see different images between these two movies. If you juxtapose them and emphasize differences between them, students can understand the meanings of differences between movies. Then according to me, they can pass to the next phase.

Question: After thinking a lot about the relationship between philosophy and cinema, finally, I reckon that so long as people imagine philosophy and cinema, cinema and philosophy will never disappear. Moreover, the first man who has imagined is both the first movie director and the first philosopher. Because I think, to normalize life means is to curb philosophy and cinema. As Foucault argues a normal person is a fiction. Because of this, normalizing life is to seal off philosophy and cinema. As I mentioned, the first man who imagines something is the first philosopher and the first cinema director. Therefore every person is both a cinema maker and a philosopher.

Answer: Yes, I partly agree with you. Well, we face a chaos. It is the eternal rhythm of the universe. Forms scatter everywhere and as Deleuze argues, we lay out a plane over chaos. What is this? Science with its tools throws over a plane over chaos. It is a functional plane and tries to fix it in some way. This is the feature of science. It has to work in this way. Philosophy, on the other hand, lays out a plane over chaos with a plane of immanence. It lays out a plane over chaos with concepts.

In fact, philosophy doesn't set a limit to chaos altogether. Let me make an analogy about it. Think of some waves on the sea and a surfer. Can this surfer stop the waves or surf with waves concurrently? If you pay attention to this analogy, you see that waves, meaning chaos, and the surfer, who tries to adapt himself to waves in some way, flow in eternity. What about art like cinema? I think art or cinema as an art makes infinity itself visible in finite object. It doesn't stop the infinity. If we think of them we see different modes, planes. Let me state

that I think many people misunderstand the cave allegory. Actually, the cave allegory is a human condition. A human condition. In fact, all of us live in our caves. What does it mean? I have asked this before. Do we see objects? What kind of things prevent us from seeing beings as they are? Here is the cave! Our prejudices, habits, abstractions, generalizations and symbols. All of them are real caves. To get out of the cave is only possible with getting into the cave. That means inside cinema. It is a paradox. To get out of the cave, to be aware of our existence inside the cave is only possible to plunge into cave consciously. To dark rooms, to dark cinema halls.... Like this place, a dark place.

Question: Hello. First of all, I would like to thank you for your speech. My question is about the difference between literature and cinema. I mean, in your opinion, isn't hope in literature enough? Any contemporary novel or a myth stemming from prehistoric times or a dramatic play; don't all of them convey hope as a main idea or message? Isn't cinema a continuation of them, can we suppose it? Does cinema have a difference only in terms of reaching large masses or is there any difference of it in terms of its messages? Thank you.

Answer: During the 19th century, large masses were consuming Victor Hugo's novels. In fact, there are still many Hugo readers... But they are not as many as cinema goers. First of all, I would like to emphasize that this is not the negativity of literature. It never reaches the number of cinema spectators. This is the first dimension. The second dimension. There is a book called *Laocoon* by Lessing who was a romantic thinker. This book discusses a very important issue and I think it will be related to your question as this problem has been discussed there. According to an ancient Greek mythology, a father and his two sons don't obey the rules of Gods, therefore; they are punished to death with the wrapping of snakes. All of them are packed by snakes and killed. The story is told in a very lively manner. As for sculpture of this myth, we see a detail: it is a different art form. We see a muscular body which we have not witnessed in mythology. Second, as snakes wrapped them according to mythology the father didn't open his mouth wide enough. It is open a little. Well, why is it so? The discussion of Lessing starts with this question. He answers by saying that this art form requires this representation. I mean sculpture is different from than mythology. If you want to manifest this mythology, you have to have an aesthetics judgement. You should obey with sculpture's aesthetics form and represent mythology. We can conclude that every art form has its unique aesthetic style but cinema involves all of them. By saying cinema is impure art; (As Alain Badiou argued) what I wanted to say is this: It takes music, sound, literature and characters in literature, psychological situations in literature and composes all of them. It transforms them. With this aspect, cinema is different from literature. In the second edition of our *SineFilozofi* journal, we interviewed with director Ümit Ünal. He told us something like this: "I owe literature to visualize something skillfully. Because I didn't use to see many movies. After all, finding movies, particularly arthouse movies was nearly impossible. I feed on literature and try to reflect this source on my scenarios." Probably one of the most significant contributions of literature to cinema is this. Since literature deals with daily life, environ it with writing, people focusing on literature set up a little different bond with cinema, I guess. Let's see Haneke. He made *Chateau* differently. Some of you may have seen it. Zeki Demirkubuz feed on literature as well. His films are shaped according to it. There may be this

kind of relationships between them but at the same time *no relationship*. In any case, philosophy tries to find out the relationship between elements seemingly having no relations.

Question: You have mentioned the contributions of cinema to philosophy. Would you give a few examples of it? About concepts transferred to philosophy from cinema, I mean. Can you give some examples?

Answer: Of course, I can. Time-image, movement-image, crystal image, impulse image... The terms coined by Deleuze... the terms emerged with cinema's influence. We think the image is a shadow of reality, but what does Deleuze say about it? Image, in accordance with Bergson's view, Deleuze also refers to Bergson, is not a shadow of anything, it is in somewhat equal to the thing. I mean the thing we perceive is the reality itself. Thus images differ from each other. It seems a complicated issue, nevertheless let me illustrate it with a simple example. Bergson says perceptions works so: I see you, and you see me. But everybody's sight is different from each other because your sight, let's say your perceptions are determined by your interests and concerns. You perceive something according to your interests and your concerns. You cannot perceive the reality as it is. This perception is the image. Image... So... where do the other things that the body perceive go? They go to memory as virtual elements. The rest goes to memory. When do they emerge? Either when a problem occurs, or at moments when we are unconscious. I mean they do not disappear.

Question: Thank you very much. During your speech, you've touched on some arguments. One of them is the definition of the ethical regime and moral regime..

Answer: Let's call it the ethical regime since I think there are some kinds of differences between them.

Question: O.K. The definition of the ethical regime. You stated there would be a consensus at a certain point, at a deep point, and gave an example that everybody would have compassionate feelings about a crying baby. I disagree with this point to some extent because there can be subjective feelings and some people might not have compassionate feelings about this child. I think in every case there is some kind of subjective feeling. But the main point I want to ask is that other than this basic level it also has a top level, it is a limitation on moral issues, legal limitation on masses. For instance, the censorship structure of a state (the audience here mentions a high authority on media in Turkey) besides this, autocontrol, in terms of superego if you look at matters in the eyes of Freud. It also has this kind of limitation. What do you think about breaking these rules of an art piece or whether or not it should break them?

Answer: Actually, many social scientists neglect anthropology, a human science. If we read works on anthropology, we see these kinds of issues: Research on mammals, on all mammals including apes, shows us that empathy exists among mammal species. Let's look at this experiment on mice. Two mice are put into a cage. Whether a mouse can reach its food or not depends on its pushing an electric button, but when one of the mice touches the button, the other mouse feels pain. When the first mouse sees the other mouse's pain, it doesn't touch the button. It gives up eating food. This experiment shows that a living being's survival depends on empathy and emphatic energy. Why? Because otherwise, species become extinct.

This is the main explanation, and again you need to refer to Darwin. You can get into evolution psychology. Let me give another example. There are some researches on elephants as well as apes. All of them are mammals. It means that there is a point where you can go, but it has a basic circle, something like starting circle. You claimed this is nevertheless subjective, that is not the case, if so, it is a deviation from living beings. Generally, all living beings have to have empathetic feelings, otherwise they would become extinct. Where does empathy start from? Women in this conference hall may be happy when they hear my explanation: Empathy stems from females. Because females get pregnant and give birth to their children. A woman should breastfeed her baby. In order to carry the infant in her belly and to breastfeed it, the woman has to have energy. Empathic energy. Creativity emerges there. This energy spreads to male and from him to other members of a group. Rather than a subjective fact, it is anthropologically immanent reality. But you can add that there are also some mammals that deny their babies. Yes, there are. I witnessed it when I was a child. One sheep let's say among one hundred sheep deny its baby, in other words, rejects it. Why? Because it is abnormal. There are abnormalities in biology. But please don't misunderstand what I say I am not talking about abnormal in the meaning of Foucault's terms. I am talking about biological abnormal. A deviant of biology. We know that any deviant creature in terms of DNA has gradually been eliminated. I am not against differences or variations, but the main point on which philosophers also discuss is this: even though we doubt everything, which is vital, doubting everything, even if we adopt a nihilistic approach, so long as not to transform this passive nihilism into active nihilism and not to connect with life and world, not to show our will to power on this issue; I think in this case, we need to interrogate the meaning of being a "human being" or rather being a "living being". Therefore, I have doubts about subjectivity in this matter.

This is the the difference between ethics and morality. Morality is a transcendence and a given term, whereas ethics is immanent and involves breaking codes as well. I mean, I have stated before, in *Medieval Japan Society*, lovers' smile and their relationship with each other tell us that it is ethics. Why? Because they follow their love, it is a creative fact. Maybe we can connect a relation between love and social life. But if you asked people living during that time, what did they say? This action is immoral. The immoral situation, they would say. Therefore Spinoza is very careful about this distinction. As you know he says, like Nietzsche claimed, many of us live similar to camels. It means it has also ethical death. Many people are born like camels, live under camel stage, and die in line with this stage. Why? They take it for granted. These people claim that they behave morally, but among them, there are some who are seemingly alive but in fact living deads. This is another dimension of death. Death can be classified into two categories: ethical death, physical death. Ethical death is Watanabe's death, which I have shown a scene from *Ikiru*. Watanabe has dealt with bureaucracy for 30 years but he has been unaware of his own situation. He doesn't interrogate whether an alternative world exists or not. He repeats the same things. This is ethical death.

Question: My name is Ramazan (his surname is unheard). I am a student in the philosophy department. I joined this meeting because of the topic's relation with philosophy. The foundation of philosophy is to interrogate, to doubt, and after all, to be happy. And philosophy has a connection with all other sciences, all disciplines. Thus, the effect of

interrogation and doubt has a reflection on society. You have said that cinema also has a connection with all society, with all branches. How does cinema affect society? What is the degree of this effect? How does it lead society? I mean, how much can it make society happy? What are its reflections on society? I am curious about your comments.

Answer: Cinema does not need to satisfy the desires of society. In fact, it had better not do it. If you are not happy, you may have a chance to ask questions. Abbas Kiorustaim argues that the best movie is a boring movie since it causes to ask questions. Then, you dream about this film at nights. This is a permanent movie, a permanent effect on you. Well, what is a temporary effect? If movie solves every problem, in that case, it has a catharsis and after the movie you ask "so what?" I have shown you a popular movie scene. It is somewhat hybrid as well. *Hello, My Name's Doris*. The ending scene. What happened? Did it bring you to the edge of the cliff? There are no answers things. This is the aporia situation mentioned in the famous dialogues [by Plato]. To take you to the edge of the cliff and leave you there. In that case, you are asking questions. "What will happen now?" I think we have somewhat a chance to cross the line if we are taken to the edge of the cliff and left there. If you ask me what a good film is, for me, a good film is full of unpredictable and unexpected images and which takes us to edge of the cliff and let alone. The movie which takes us to edge of the cliff, leaves us there and leads us to think in a meditative way. We need to think a lot there.

Question: I think cinema is partly identified with real life... Partly, I mean. And I believe philosophy has a direct influence on cinema as you stated in your speech and arguments...

Answer: Sorry, but I haven't stated it. Please don't misunderstand me! If so, I want to correct myself. Philosophy doesn't influence cinema directly. If you say so, meaning philosophy determines cinema or affects cinema altogether, that means cinema derives from philosophy. However, my conception is the cine-philosophic approach, which means cinema and philosophy are equal to each other. They can affect one another. They don't need to get along with each other completely. They have interrelation. They have to be different, to be in conflict with each other, to be paradoxical but thanks to this vibration, like Apollo and Dionysos, we can produce new ideas. Apollo represented logic, whereas the other, Dionysos was the God of Nature, wine. Vibration between them.

Question: If we take cinema as a real life and as in Marx's famous equation, the relationship between real life and philosophy is similar to the relationship masturbation and sex. If cinema and philosophy make an effect on real life, what kind of relationship is this? In this respect do you agree with Marx's this expression? Is philosophy isolated from real life?

Answer: In fact, Marx is wrong in this respect, I think. I am not saying it to devalue Marx. He is quite an important philosopher as well, I think. He's a philosopher as well as a social theorist. He claimed that until now [his era] philosophers interpreted the world, now it is time to change it. Is it so? But the idea itself somehow changes the world. I have just expressed some ideas here. Are you the same person as the one who entered the conference hall? As Gramsci argued, ideas at a certain point have a material effect in some ways. I mean

after ideas reach a point they start to change the world. Changing the world is an issue related to ideas. They reach a certain level and affect people. When Plato interpreted the world, or when Socrates interpreted the world, didn't they change the world? They changed so many people. What does changing the world mean? It means to change human beings. When you change a person you change the world. [It means] [T]hat a person transforms himself, and by using ideas that he transforms the world means anyway changing world. Because the subject of transforming is the human agent. He did it so much that, eventually, we have come to global environment crisis. Thus, what should we do? We should make this person aware of his actions. Therefore, we should create a lot of art so that he will be able to see himself there. Here is what I want to emphasize... One of the essential issue here is that symbols themselves, similar to genes explained in Richard Dawkins *Selfish Gene*. Cultural transformation constructs the human being. As you know, after a certain period, cultural evolution left biological evolution behind. What do I want to say by cultural evolution? That symbols transform humans. A movie, a book, a painting and a dialogue produced in this hall. All of them are ideas. As long as they are implanted, people start to change.