

THE EFFECTS OF FUTURISM ON SCIENCE FICTION CINEMA

Erdal Devrim Aydın*, Togan Tong*, S. Emre Pusat*

**Faculty of Architecture, Yıldız Technical University, Turkey
eaydin@yildiz.edu.tr, ttong@yildiz.edu.tr, sepusat@yildiz.edu.tr*

ABSTRACT

In this study, the history and the definition of futurism is mentioned and as the concepts that the futurism is mostly concerned with, outer-history, machine, speed and dynamism is defined to explain the effects of Futurism on science-fiction cinema. Futurist cinema and the futurist architecture constitute the last topics of the second section.

In the 3rd section, the sources and the short history of science fiction is explained. Then, the approach of the science fiction cinema to the concepts that Futurism focuses on is defined and the 3rd section ends with the examination of the cities in science-fiction cinema.

As a result, it is concluded that without an examination both in intellectual and formal context, it is wrong to use the term *Futurist* for all cities in science fiction cinema.

INTRODUCTION

Today, while defining the places and the cities in science-fiction cinema, the most commonly used word is *Futurism*. It is possible to come across with this word mostly, in the placards of *Blade Runner* which is among the most important science fiction films, (the original cut of the Futuristic adventure) in the definition of the duty of Syd Mead who is the product designer in the same film's credits, (*Visual Futurist*) in the article of Derek Agnew which is published in 2003. (*Representations of Technology in Futuristic cinema* - in this article, science fiction films like *Blade Runner*, *Metropolis*, *Matrix* are given as the examples of Futurist cinema). Also on Internet, the list of the science fiction films takes their places on www.futuristmovies.com (Agnew, 2003).

It is clear that the reason of the term *Futurism* is often used is because the science fiction cinema speaks of future. But, when the intellectual and the formal struc-

ture in the science fiction films are handled, the usage of the terms is suspected. While the term Futurism was used to define in the residences in science-fiction films, in the beginning of the 20th century, it expressed the movement that is outlined by Sant' Elia in architecture and Marinetti in all fields of art especially in literature. This debate forms the problematic of this work.

On this point, it is necessary to make the definition of *Futurism* completely and correctly to mention the intellectual and formal background of the movement and to define the relationship between *Futurism* and science fiction cinema by examining its intellectual and formal structure.

This work, which focuses on the examples that can be regarded as the most dominant ones that science fiction cinema deals with, handles the films *Star Wars*, which may also be defined as *The Space Opera*, *Blade Runner* and *Metropolis* where foresights presented on city scale, (although these two films present foresights on city scale, they are different-also alternative –from each other both intellectually and formally) and *Waterworld* which has a view of *post-apocalyptic* (On the appendix, the subjects and the curriculum vitas of these films are shortly told).

The aim of this choice is, by examining these films that presents different appearances in subject and in appearance, to make diversity in examples and to make a study on which points that we should be careful before regarding an example of science fiction cinema as *Futurist*.

FUTURISM

The History and The Definition of Futurism

The term futurism is firstly used in the work of F.T.Marinetti's *Manifeste du Futurisme* that is published in the magazine *Le Figaro* in 1909. With this term, Marinetti could give the name of the movement that started with literature and then contained all fields of art. In 1910, along with *Manifesto dei pittori futuristi* that was published by Balla, Boccioni, Carra, Russolo and Severini, futurism started to show itself in other fields of art. In 1912, Boccioni's *Pittori Scultura Futurista* and in 1914, Sant'Elia's *Manifesto dell'architettura futurista* followed this.

In *Larousse*, Futurism is defined as “a literature movement based on the rejection of pastism and the adjustment of key concepts of modern world, (dynamism, speed, mechanization etc.) mostly, in Italy and in Russia in the beginning of 20th century” (Larousse, 1986). Futurists, who mentioned that the artists did not take into consideration of the innovations of technological field on artistic field, mentioned the belief that machines will give happiness to human beings. The propos-

al “machines should give back the happiness to people whom they took from” could be accepted as the new formula of happiness for the sovereignty of bourgeois that is afraid of the revolution of the working class. The bourgeois, who has materialized its own revolution before, was afraid of another, which was the lower class’ revolution, then. In accordance with that, the most important subject that futurists should focus on is *outer-history* (Marinetti, 2002; Roloff, 1995).

Outer-history forms the origins of the term *modernity* which the idea of enlightenment and its continuation-the Revolution of Industry created. In his work *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air* Marshall Bermann summarizes the term *modern*, which takes its intellectual origins from the Renaissance artist-intellectuals and from the movement of *positivism* that Auguste Comte made the leadership in 18th and 19th century, which is built with the revolution of industry and which is used to define the environment of *Mass production and consumption*, like that:

Being modern means finding ourselves in an environment that promises us adventure, power, delight and besides the transformation of both ourselves and the world but at the same time that carries the thread of eradication of everything we have, we know and we are. Modern environments and experiences intersect all kinds of geographic and ethnical borders, class and national borders, religion and ideological borders. On this point, it could be said that modernity unites all humanity. But this unity is a paradoxical one, a unity of disharmonious; lets all of us flow into a vortex of unfastening and innovation, struggle and paradox, hesitancy and pain that never finishes. In Marx’s statement being modern is being the part of the universe that ‘all that is solid melts into air. (Bermann, 2004)

The *destruction* concept that Bermann speaks of, progresses from accepting the past beliefs, acquiescence, legends and myths as *the chains on their foot* that prevents the aim of modern being who *at last* perceives the order of nature and uses this knowledge to *beat nature* (using nature for the sake of their aim and promise the escape from natural disasters).

But starting from 2nd half of 19th century, this belief, which focuses on human reason, the idea of enlightenment, the industrial revolution and beating of nature, was slowly leaving its place to pessimism. The belief to the *Revolution of Bourgeois* and its bringing was lost. The *happiness* that is promised for everyone in past time and that created the idea of Enlightenment, became only the priority of bourgeois, and drags the small bourgeois, proletariat and the peasant class to poverty.

This pessimistic atmosphere was not good for the bourgeois. The fear that bourgeois people have from unfastenening and being dispersed is not only related to the shaking of the belief that bases on rational world view which defends that the rational form of enlightenment can control the natural powers (at the same time this means getting suspicious of one’s own self to control his/her impul-

sive/natural side) but also related to the new social conflicts that come out with the industrialization process (an irreconcilable paradoxical class power against the bourgeois with the working class). On this point, as a movement of bourgeois, futurism got into the subject and defined the new *happiness* formulation and the elements it includes. The classes who are in pessimism should be reminded of the promises before Marx. It was necessary to remind that the machine was not a means of happiness and it was essential to sanctify the progress, speed and motion in the beginning of 20th century. But in the past, the *bourgeois* who made its own revolution real, now not to make this revolution as an *example* for the working class and "... to legitimize its own sovereignty it had to throw aside the historical dimension from the social understanding; otherwise in this social understanding, it was probable that their own priorities would be related to a certain period of time and historically would end some time" (Roloff, 1995).

The concept of outer-history is handled almost in all futurist manifests. While it is mentioned that all art institutions, which belongs to the past should be destroyed and all fields of art should be properly build according to the new era, history is defined as the source of being rotten, narrow-minded and dull. On this point as in his work *Futurist musicians manifest* musician Pratella declined that all schools, libraries and museums are the institutions that should be attacked (Pratella, 2002).

Futurist hates history, in accordance with that attacks all schools, institutions and traditions that belong to the past. According to futurists, academies, museums, libraries should be destroyed. So, they designate aggressiveness and war as the principle for themselves in all their manifests that they publish. Marinetti offers that the explosions in wars, the flame machines, the machine guns the tanks create new aesthetical forms. War, according to Marinetti, is full of "... the beauty of orchids from fire ..." (Batur, 1998).

"The positive utopia of Bourgeois is war. Because war is the only place that we can carry on the technological developments unavoidably without constituting new social conflicts" (Roloff, 1995). So, if it is a must to break out from the history to build up a new and happy society, this break out can only be real with a big world war.

Marinetti, in his *Futurist Manifest*, discusses the necessity of multiplying by the help of the machines and joining the tamed natural powers with human beings' instincts. According to futurists, "the musical spirit of crowds, the construction yards of the big industries, trains, transatlantic, armoureds, cars and planes ..." should be caught, all the technical possibilities in theatres should be benefited, and new symphonies with devices that can produce 30.000 different noises should be composed. However the machine is the new device that arranges the

new world, *futurist* feels uncomfortable that it has not been taken into consideration by art makers, until now (Marinetti, 2002; Pratella, 2002).

Along with revolution of industry, the concepts like motion and speed settled into the lives of human beings. So according to Marinetti, we should feel “an utter distaste from the slowness, niggling, long drawn analysis and explanations.” As the speed brings the desire of motion and action along with itself, *Futurists* choose to have a manner full of desire of action instead of an attitude, which is noble and complex on a work of art. On this point, situations like selling two tickets for the same place and trying to be booed is created to direct the audience into action in the futurist theatre (Marinetti, 2002; Roloff, 1995).

The four concepts summarized above, which the futurists focused on, are the ones that are come across in the science fiction cinema frequently.

Futurist Cinema

In Futurist cinema, that is firstly exemplified by A.Ginna and B.Carra and which is seen since 1910, Futurists tried to create *synthesis of arts* by leaning against the formulation “Painting + sculpture + plastic activity + free words + combined noises + architecture + synthetic theatre = futurist cinema” in Marinetti’s manifest. They commented on cinema as a futurist art and although they had short performances like in theatre, they made their defense for the necessity of dividing cinema and the theatre scene. They appropriated to the symbolic narrative in cinema and tried to set objects and people out of well-known forms and cover them up into supernatural forms. Since only a few films, which are produced by futurists, could reach today, it prevented making a complete comment on *futurist cinema*. But it could be said that Futurists, as it is understood from their manifests, did not make any innovations on the field of cinema. This kind of a cinema is seemed to have no effect on our time (Marinetti, 1916) (1).

Futurist Space

A. Sant’ Elia’s and M.Chiattonone’s exhibited project *Citta Nuova* in 1914 – Milano, which consists of preliminary sketches that belongs to the city of future, draws the outlines of *Futurist Architecture*. The project of *Citta Nuova* which rejects decoration and defends the necessity of using the old type of architecture on the newly founded cities, the necessity of constituting the city more than one grade (Figure 1), the necessity of not compressing the machines like elevators on the stairwells, the necessity of constituting the modern constructions, on high floors, with modern materials and leaving the appearance of the city to the simple beauty of these materials, is handled by Sant’ Elia and Chiattonone and by appending some attachments to its preface, Marinetti published *Manifesto dell’architettura futurista* (Sant’ Elia & Marinetti, 1991; Conrads, 1991).

Sant' Elia's ideas about the mechanized city, which could be accepted as the utopia, then, would be the initiator of the slogan of *the house is the machine that we are living in* of modernism and become the source of inspiration of Le Corbusier's project *Villa Contemporaine*. So, it can be said that *Modernist architecture owes too much to Futurism*. (2)

As it will be examined in the coming sections, Futurism was mostly effective in the innovations on the field of architecture in science fiction cinema and also science fiction cinema benefited frequently, from the utopia of *Citta Nuova* in its places.

SCIENCE FICTION CINEMA

Science Fiction can be defined as “a type of literature and cinema that takes place in the fictional extend-times (especially in future times), create societies and living animates and in that sense, it mentions sciences, techniques and conditions, totally different from the ones in our time” (Larousse, 1986).

Starting from that definition, it will be right to look for the sources of science fiction in the term of utopia, if we consider that science fiction literature and cinema foresees the future. In his work in 1516, which has the same name, Thomas More formed the word *utopia*. It has been used in the meaning of *nonexistent place* from that time on. The origin of this word that More had formed, is constituted of the words ‘eu’ (good), ‘ou’ (nonexistent), ‘topos’ (place) in Latin: *Nonexistent good place* (Thema Larousse, 1994).

Platon's work of art *The Republic*, which was accepted as the first example of utopia, can be defined as “... a socio-political written proposal, a project that is tried to be put into practice in the real world not only with scientific tools but also with the ones before science and that has no aim except being practically used than just to be a scientific theory” (Roloff, 1995).

In 16th century More's *Utopia*, in 17th century Cyrano De Bergerac's *The Ridiculous History of Moon Republics and Empires*, in 18th century Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* formed a *travel literature*. *Travel Literature* was the product of the maturity period of Enlightenment. Because “it could be more easily solved in the travel incident in which the individual experiences and the general can easily put into an harmony with the problem that occurs as a type of making connections between individual experiences and existing commonly used knowledge, and between individual practical and social theory and principles.” Getting over this problem means that, human beings should dominate, also, the nature in themselves like how they dedicate themselves to understanding and taming of nature (Roloff, 1995).

But it will be incomplete to evaluate the *travel literature* only with these elements. Because, with this travel, the nature and the races outside of Europe was reached, and the arranging hegemony of the reason was brought up to there. On this point, it is necessary to point out that travel literature is a reflection of colonialism. As it is impossible for the movement of Enlightenment improve without colonialism.

While in these travels, the adventurer's efforts of saving the outer world, his own inner world or reason from the unknown and uncontrollable side of nature and his efforts of purifying these from his supernatural side was considered preliminary, pessimism which is mentioned above in the part 2.1 *The History and the Definition of Futurism*, caused the awareness of the absurd side of that effort, with the second period of 19th century. So, "... if the reason is a part of nature, the principles and laws that are produced from it was also a part of nature, too; in other words, reason's comprehensive feature on nature, the initiative arrangement according to its own principles and laws and its interference was unnecessary, even unreal." In this century, the certain and resulted utopia of communism changed the utopic literature which is connected to the travel literature and this change constituted dystopia. The disbelief to the project of *renewal of nature*, which the Enlightenment promised, also became the preparing element of this new constitution. Enlightenment's defender's hope of comprehending the *foreigner* and the primitive and wild human being with reason, faded out. The curse and the anger of the fantastic and undefined objects that are brought to Europe from the colonies by being broken off from their peaceful world and meaningful context became frightening. This literature, which has also the support of positivism, started to direct itself to the adventure literature which carries the belief that there remain no way except destroying *the thing that can not be comprehended with reason* and *the thing that can not be explained with nature-scientific laws*. But this meant that the supernatural, mystical and the magical will also, be destroyed so the anxiety of the guilties of being accused of these murders emerged as a Romantic reaction against the reason of Enlightenment (Roloff, 1995).

As it is moved from the classical understanding of utopia of Enlightenment to the dystopia of Romanticism, future directed social images get themselves out of their completed project identities and started to draw attention as the *utopia warning* which includes only, incomplete elements about future. These warnings have the same meaning with the concepts of dystopia in literature. Shelly's well-known work of art *Frankenstein* (1818) is among the first examples of that type of dystopias. In this novel, Dr. Frankenstein symbolizes the representative of the era of Enlightenment and the dead whom he revived by taking him out of his

grave, symbolizes the wrath of nature (or the wrath of the supernatural, the undefined by reason) (Thema Larousse, 1994; Roloff, 1995).

Romantic Movement (dystopia), which came out as the stories of fear and eerie, welded to the science-fiction cinema, also. Like outer Europe *foreigners* in travel stories, the *space aliens* of science fiction cinema reflect the worries of Romantic point of view. It is possible to read the stories of military occupation in science fiction as the worry of controlling the *alien*.

Science fiction literature, from its beginning, is like if it is created for cinema. Getting out of the laws of nature and showing the impossible seems like the job of the art of cinema because of its natural form, even in the years that it is technically insufficient. The first science fiction film in history is George Melies' *'La Voyage dans la lune'* (1902). When the history of science fiction cinema is observed, it will be understood that the type is the continuation of popular science fiction literature from both its attitudes and its transposition of the products of that literature into the cinema.

In Ünsal Öskay's work *Modern Fantasia* and in Darko Suvin's writings on science fiction poetics, how the mass communication tools used not only in science fiction but also in whole popular literature, is observed and its being an industrial fantasia which is produced by mass communication tools or with a more efficacious term *Industry of Conscious* of the science fiction cinema is mentioned. Really, in the stories of dictatorship under the rule of tecnocrats, because of their *dystopical* behaviours against technology, in the stories of travel called *space opera* or in the stories where post-apocalyptic views are shown, when the popular science fiction literature and its reflections in cinema is observed, a sovereignty of *health* proposing on the leadership of the *theological* power focuses and of heroes who are equipped with mythological powers are traced. As a result of the attitude in science fiction cinema, the distopical stories, which are against technology, ends with the victory of a hero equipped with *supernatural* powers so an absurd idea of "waiting for a mythological hero who can give an end to the pain and difficulties of the real life" is defended. These films, according to Ünsal Öskay, "... links the faith of humanity to the success of the third and the youngest son of the ruler who becomes the prince at the end in spite of all the injustices and unfaithfulness like in the fairy tales. Like the element of flying carpet that can help to pretend not to see the rule of gravity, the photon rockets, the techniques of sending humans from one place to another by addition, in these stories they become an unreasonable 'wishful thinking' tool against the real world, also being counterpart to the known or estimated idea of science. In other words, although it seems like passing from the fairy tales of old times to the science fiction in modern times, the thing they do is 'to present the old wine with a new goblet'" (Oskay, 1982).

When viewed from that point, even though the science fiction cinema seems like it wants to change the existing world, as a result of its closeness to mythology, it serves to the unchangeable and repeated acceptance of the existing world. Even, according to Suvin; this cinema provides replaced and made-up victories by the help of *mythological heroes* for the human being who is in the dream of escape and tired of technology and science. The popular science fiction cinema, with those of its ways, hinders and tames the *imagination* that humans envisage for a better world.

Before examining how the concepts, which *Futurists* focused on, are handled by science fiction cinema over the exemplified films, it is necessary to evaluate the subjects (narratives) of these films with that point of view.

Among these films, only *Blade Runner* does not include the theme of heroism (or mythological powers) when compared to other films. *Metropolis*, *Star Wars*, *The Running Man*, *Waterworld*, *Independence Day*, *5th Element*, *The Matrix* all have the *happy ending* of this good, supernatural, potential, mythological powers (heroes).

In none of these examples, even in real world, mythological potential power is not that materialized and well-known like in *Star Wars* that has formed disciples. In this film, which is considered to be among the most common *space operas*, in an unmentioned time, two former generals' (Darth Vader and Obi-Wan Kenobi) war beyond galaxies is used as the subject and our hero is a young man called Luke Skywalker, who dreams of being *an engineer* in Tatooine planet and who does not even aware of his being the hero. After some *coincidental* events, he finds himself battling against an empire, which rules the whole galaxy with dictatorship. But in this war, he would left aside all the machines of technological products that the film is full of and he would use the *Force* that Obi-Wan has taught him. Even, in this film it is said that *Force* brings together the whole galaxy. By the help of *Force*, Luke who has improved on the way to be one of the *Jedi* knights uses the *Lightsaber*, which is a *ray sword*, like all other *Jedi's*. The mythological reference of the film can be observed here. In spite of all developed laser arms, the hero or the *Jedi* knight (or in Ünsal Öskay's terms, *superior human*, *ubermensch*) battles with a *sword* like the mythological heroes. But on the condition that this sword should be laser. When, in the scenes where it is full of laser coming out from the laser arms, he uses his laser sword, which has the thickness of *two fingers* as his shield and defends himself by using that sword. (if only there has been a laser shield). But as our hero is a mythological one, developed his ability by the help of *supernatural power*, the audience should accept that situation. (even, in a scene that Luke has a training, he battles against a small ball which spreads laser, with his eyes tied, with the help of *Force*). In this way, Luke's being *beyond-human* becomes legitimized not only for his tutor but also

for the audience). Thus, in the last scene Luke will not want the technological possibilities in the space ship, he will listen to his dead tutor Obi-Wan's voice coming from the other world (although, according to *Force* he was not dead because the *Force* in Jedi does not die but transforms into another person), by the help of the *Force* he will shoot at the heart of *Death Star* which is the goal post of technology and insensitivity and destroy that goal post; also at the end of the film he will be the leader to assemble the *constitutional monarchy* that is governed by his sister. This part of the film is interesting. The empire, which enslaves Princess Leia, is governed by *constitutional monarchy*. We witness that the massacre that is claimed to be done by the empire, is done by the *good* side during the film. In conclusion, if the same type of a government would be used, it is not clearly known who is *good* and who is *bad*. When this evaluation is handled, it can be observed that the narratives of the other films approximately have the same elements. Only in *Blade Runner* the theme of *well-known* hero is not repeated completely, even our hero Deckard, if there has not been the *bad* character, would be the one who would be destroyed by falling from the roof in the last scene of the film. But in the last scene, the image of the salvation of *the good partner* Deckard and the *replicant* Batty and *replicant* Pris, draws *Blade Runner* closer to the same point of view with other films.

THE EFFECTS OF FUTURISM ON SCIENCE FICTION CINEMA

“Like it is the type of science fiction, protecting the present... The obsession of using the technology both in destroying and protecting the existing is also traced in Futurists. Making the unknown known and devising the future in a chaotic way by making people accept “*the present*”, without being historical, it mostly gets the types closer to the fascist ideology like in futurism and science fiction.” Futurists' demand of *destroying the history* finds its equivalent broken off from history in science fiction cinema. The film *Waterworld* which mentions the social explosion and the constitution of the new society as a result of the doomsday resembles to Futurism in that sense (Batur, 1998).

But a social explosion or a big war is not always the shortest way of salvation. When he faces with Enlightenment and technology, the hero, who is the symbol of romantic attitude, should struggle more to save the world. This struggle is the *war* against the bad. The character of Mariner in the film *Waterworld*, again, has supernatural powers. (Different from the standard human being, Mariner could breath both in air and in water). In a world which is under water because of global warming, Mariner saves the little girl Enola who has the tattoo of the map of *Dryland* on her back, from a group called *Smokers* who live in an old and half full tanker and carries the elected people to the *Dryland*. Leaving the question of how he determines *the elected people* unanswered like in *Star Wars*, does not only

mean being *outer-history* but also draws *post-apocalyptic* films like *Waterworld* near *Futurism*.

Science fiction cinema almost has the same views about the subjects of *outer-history* and *war* with *Futurism*. But science fiction cinema shows a counter-manner of conduct (in appearance) because of the dystopic attitude that it has its sources from the concepts that futurists focus on. The concept of *machine* is one of them. While the *machine* in *Futurism* turns up to a myth, in science fiction cinema it becomes *an object, which is struggled for happiness*. In science fiction cinema, it is often encountered with the machines, which revolt against their designers who are humans. Marinetti's words "...the human kind that increases with machines" which is mentioned in his manifest, is observed when the "crazy" scientist Rotwang who is the founder of the city in *Metropolis* wants to make the robot of his dead lover (they never get together because she was married with John Frederson who is the governor of the city).

It is observed that science fiction cinema accepted the machines and *the robots* (defined also with the words android, replicant, cyberg), which are a kind of machine, as the element of fright and as being *the other, alien, unknown* like its ancestors - travel literature, not only because of the *dystopic* attitude against technology. So the robot in *Metropolis* is shown as the source of the chaos and is burned in the Middle Ages' fire like it is done to the *witches*. *Blade Runner* shows a *post-modern* attitude in contrast to *Metropolis* which can be shown as the product of *modernism* and mentions the sympathy that it has for the machine (to *the other*) by drawing attention to the poetical death of mortal, *replicant* Batty or to the love of the hero (as it mentioned before, the character Deckard can not wholly be regarded as a hero) for Rachel which is a machine and their escape at the end of the film. *Star Wars* gets separated from these films. The robots R2D2 and C3PO became sympathetic characters with their humanlike attitudes. These two robots are *more human than a human*, R2D2 is coward and talkative like a human and C3PO is so virtuous that he can sacrifice himself in war.

The concepts of *speed*, which Futurists especially focused on in their drawings, statues, were seen since the film *A Trip to the Moon* (1902) as the first example of science fiction cinema. "... (The first examples) were, of course, the reflection of the car technology which is developed almost in geometrical jumps" (Roloff, 1995). Although the term *speed* caused bewilderment and fright in that period, *speed* was accepted as a tool that facilitates in present science fiction films with the development of technology, with the real travel to the moon and with the theories that Einstein had developed on light-speed. In *Star Trek* and *Star Wars* (1977) the words moving to *light-speed* and *adiation* is often used and shown as the facilities that is done away with distances. Of course, the positive utopian attitude of *Star Wars* is also a factor of presenting the concept of *speed* as a facility.

It is impossible to think of the bigness that ‘speed has reached for futurism, which is outlined in the beginning of the 20th century.

However the *spaceships* are often seen in science fiction cinema, the cities are the preliminary as places that the life passes in, the technology is born and develops (Özakın, 1997).

In the history of science fiction cinema, the examples of streets and life styles that belong to the city of future are too few. *Metropolis* (1927), (which is named after the city), *Things to Come* (1936), *Star Wars* (1977), *Blade Runner* (1982), *Total Recall* (1990), *Demolition Man* (1993), *Judge Dredd* (1995), *5th Element* (1996) can be listed among the most important films of that type.

For these films, the definition of *the films that architects present their foresights on the city of future* can be made (Özakın, 1997).

No doubt, the most important one of these films is *Metropolis* because it is the first important production. As the director Fritz Lang is effected by New York, when he went to U.S.A in 1924, he created the film *Metropolis* in which set designers of science fiction cinema were interested in the architecture of a big city more than the inside architectural (Özakın, 1997). While Fritz Lang created *Metropolis*, it is realized that he was affected by Sant’ Elia’s *Citta Nuova*, expressionist city designs of Germans and Corbusier’s *Modern City* (Neumann, 1999).

Science fiction cinema was so affected by *Metropolis* that *Metropolis* was the first source to apply in the films that decors with city like scales should be settled, afterwards. In that sense, it can be said that *the movements that science fiction city is effected, are the ones that helped to create Metropolis* (Neumann, 1999).

In his manifest, Sant’ Elia said: “Roofs should be benefited, the cellar should be used... bury the squares under ground, rise the level of the city” and supported his speech with his preliminary sketches in *Citta Nuova* (Figure 1). In *Metropolis*, the height of the city and its multi-floor form was borrowed from futurism and even moved to a front part. The drawings in *Citta Nuova* are so small when compared to the set designs of *Metropolis* (Figure 2). The *multi-layer* form in Sant’ Elia’s manifest became so much preliminary that it constituted the main conflicting element of the film (Sant’ Elia, 1991).

It is encountered with the multi-floor form in the film *Blade Runner*. Only, *Blade Runner* set up the multi-floor form on the old building of the city. As it is mentioned above, the post-modern attitude of *Blade Runner* constitutes the collaboration of old and new in the city. But like in *Metropolis*, the life on the lower layers of the city is so hard in *Blade Runner*, too. On the lowest layer of the city, acid rains; the stratum of mist and darkness is dominant. Nevertheless, life was going

on that layer, in some way. By this feature *Blade Runner* change the place of futurists' city utopias with dystopic city.

“The elevators should not be hidden in the step's buckets like worms feeling alone, then the unused steps should be removed and elevators should climb up the faces of the buildings like snakes made of iron and glass. The house made of concrete, glass and iron which has not been died and which does not have a statue should only be rich with the beauty of its own wavy form, and should be, ultimately ugly with its mechanical simpleness ...” Sant' Elia, with his words pointed out the outline of material usage of Futurism. By using the word ugly here, Sant' Elia shows an ironic attitude by considering it *ugly* according to the architecture that gives importance to the decoration at the end of the 19th century. But in science fiction cinema, there have been images of city that are in conflict with this narrative. In *Metropolis*, the elevator plays an important role. In contrast to the image of old and new mixture in the ghettos of the city in *Blade Runner*, the building of Tyrell firm that is the replicant producer has the construction that machines and elevators determine. In *Star Wars* especially *the death star* shows an aspect of that type. The biggest architectural detail on the giant war star that has reached to the size of a *planet* is the giant crater that is necessary for the biggest arm to work (Sant' Elia, 1991; Neumann, 1999).

But when these appearances are observed, it is traced that the places with this kind of a *mechanical simpleness* are the ones that insensitivity, cruelty and *badness* are settled because of the dystopic attitude. The Tyrell firm in *Blade Runner* is the firm where replicants who are dangers for humanity, are made. Beside the fact that *the death star* in *Star Wars* symbolizes *the bad* and the constructions with mechanical simpleness in *Metropolis* are the places where working class is crashed, the amorphous, organic shape of the entertainment place known as *pleasure garden* is the extension of the attitudes of the same type.



Figure 2. Metropolis (Neumann, 1999a)



Figure 3. Blade Runner (old buildings are seen on the left side) (Neumann, 1999a)

Sant' Elia said: "Futurist house should resemble to machine" and then modernism made this idea continue. Science-fiction cinema carries the *machine-house* concept to a front part. In science fiction cinema, houses help their owners, tell them what to do according to the time (even provide them to do). In *Blade Runner*, in a scene that Deckard examines a photograph in his house, a machine that is seemed to be the part of the house, gives Deckard a chance to examine the photograph to its last detail only with commands in voice and gives a copy of it. But in *5th Element*, which is not among the chosen examples, the machine-residence became clearer. The house that wakes the character – Corbin Dallas up, offers cigarette, tidies up the bed, and switches on the television. It also gives orders like *keep clean* and does not let him smoke too much. All his needs are on a distance of an arm. With only a button, his wardrobe comes down; his letter is brought near him.

In both aspects, it is not possible to talk about the dystopic attitude of science fiction. When the examples are examined, the machine-house is not that impossible to live like the machine-city. It is also effective that these machine-houses are the belongings of our mythological heroes in both films. If our hero is a modal for *good* person, his machine-house should also be domestic.

CONCLUSION

When science fiction cinema is discussed, the reason why the term *Futurism* is used that science fiction cinema mentions about the future or chooses the subject of *technology* in a dystopic or utopic way, which can be regarded as a careless wrong. When the examples in the introduction part are examined, as one of them is a work on the level of master's degree, one is the name of an internet page (it is not worth discussing that internet is a *garbage dump of image and writing* more than a main source knowledge) and the other is the one that is taken from the poster of a popular film, it is clear that it has nothing to do with the works that deeply examines the science fiction cinema.

Science fiction cinema, intellectually, rejects the philosophy of Enlightenment and points out the supernatural heroes and mythological stories with its form handling the Middle Ages. The reason of the Enlightenment Revolution's promise of salvation from nature's coincidental form constituted another disappointment that is ignored before. When we handle present time, it is observed that this *salvation* is materialized; but human, who is the part of nature also killed the nature inside him. Even though, he is not satisfied with that, it is too late. So, the reaction of science fiction against enlightenment and technological development, which is the continuation, starts from that point.

But the reaction that forms the dystopic attitude of science fiction is a diluted one and also a showpiece. If we don't be careful about it, because it proposes that technology prepares the end of humanity, and presents *crazy scientists* as figures who aim at smashing, destroying and making the humanity suffer by using technology, and also as it presents the uncontrollable machine although everything is considered, the invaders coming from the space and lastly, as it settles mythological heroes who are anti-social, *working alone* saviors against these figures, the science fiction cinema becomes unrecognizable and it caused that it is not able to comprehend the real problems of the masses. As it is pointed out in its definition, Futurism shows a similar effect on masses like science fiction cinema because it has its origins from bourgeois and it has its starting point from the paranoia of bourgeois, and it chooses the subjects that it focuses on with an aim to continue its domination. In that sense, it can be said that science fiction cinema has taken its place on the same side with futurism.

Futurists were the group who sanctifies the technological development mostly in the fields of art and in all fields of art. By the help of their manifests, they turned their faces over technology. As Sant' Elia and Chiattonne, in his preliminary sketches that forms *Citta Nuova*, announced how this movement regards the city of future, in 1914, the movement completed its utopic previsions. Futurism was announcing a city, which was full of pieces of art whose subject matter was technology.

If *Citta Nuova*, along with Corbusier's *Modern City* is a utopia that approaches most to the image of the city of future, science fiction cinema would work on these utopias because of its dystopic attitude when it needs to show its aspects. While it is doing that, he will, at first, set up these cities and then, (thinking how the life will be in these cities) place continuous rain, stratum of mist, darkness and class differences shaped by these layers. So it will handle the world that the defenders of *Futurism* and its follower-modernism dreamed of and show its dystopic attitude by pointing out the badness in that world. In that sense, the places of science fiction cinema is post-industrialist, post-modern and post-futurist in appearance.

But when *Blade Runner* is exemplified and as both its production date and its narrative (its aspect of the concept of *the other* so to robots) are observed, it is seen that the film is established on a post-modern world. So the city in *Blade Runner*, in contrast to *Citta Nuova* dream of architect Sant' Elia, can not be qualified as Futurist city because it presents the old and new collaboration and because it places the decorated and heavy constructions (Figure 3) along with hi-tech products machines and simple and ugly construction elements (installation tubes, elevators) and also because of its rotten, dark and scary form. Although the city in *Metropolis* seems to deserve the label of futurist city with its formal aspects, it

can not be regarded that it completely has the profile of futurist city because it handles the same city both as utopian (for the administrators) and as dystopic (for working class) and because it presents the place which is shown as *pleasure gardens*, in contrast to what futurists say, with bent lines, amorphous shapes distant from *mechanical simplicity* even because it is presented as the place of happiness with its form.

In conclusion, in the context of this form over the exemplified films, if it is not handled on the surface but examined with regarding it twice, three times (or more), the label of *futurist* can not be used for science fiction just because they are mentioning about future and technology. When a science fiction cinema is examined, it is necessary to handle it both in intellectual and formal context, it is essential to examine the relationship between its visual and intellectual language and also its relation to futurism's intellectual and formal language, then after these analysis, it needs to be paid attention to define the film (or the places of the film) as 'futurist'. Nevertheless, it is unreasonable to define the science fiction cinema as *futurist cinema*, while, it took its place in history, in the beginning of 20th century not only with its products of *futurist cinema* but also with its manifest.

REFERENCES

- AGNEW, D. (2003), *Representations of Technology in Futuristic Cinema*, Emerson College. Available: pages.emerson.edu/courses/Spring03/MA663/papers/dystopia.pdf.
- BERMANN, M. (1994), *Katı Olan Herşey Buharlaşıyor*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul. BATUR, Y. (1998), *Bilimkurgu Sinemasında Şiddet ve İdeoloji*, Kitle Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- BÜYÜK LAROUSSE, (1986), Interpress Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- CANDAN, A. (1997), *Yirminci Yüzyılda Öncü Tiyatro*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- CONRADS, U. (1991), 20. Yüzyıl Mimarisinde Program ve Manifestolar, *20. Yüzyıl Uluslararası Mimarisi Dizisi*, Şevki Vanlı Mimarlık Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- MARINETTI, F.T. (2002), *Kuraldan Styrılmış İmgelem ve Özgürlüğe Kavuşmuş Sözcükler: Fütürist Manifesto*, YKY Sanat Dizisi, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- NEUMANN, D. (1999a), Before and After Metropolis: Film and Architecture in Search of the Modern City, chapter in *Film Architecture: Set Designs from Metropolis to Blade Runner*, Neumann, D. (eds.), Prestel Verlag, Munich.
- NEUMANN, D. (1999b), Film Synopses: Batman [1989], chapter in *Film Architecture: Set Designs from Metropolis to Blade Runner*, Neumann, D. (eds.), Prestel Verlag, Munich.
- NEUMANN, D. (1999c), Film Synopses: Things to Come [1936], chapter in *Film Architecture: Set Designs from Metropolis to Blade Runner*, Neumann, D. (eds.), Prestel Verlag, Munich.

OSKAY, Ü. (1982), *Çağdaş Fantazy: Popüler Kültür Açısından Bilimkurgu ve Korku Sineması*, Der Yayınları, İstanbul.

ÖZAKIN, Ö. (1997), Analysis of Urban and Architectural Visions in Recent Science-Fiction Films, School of Natural and Applied Sciences, (unpublished thesis), METU, Ankara.

PRATELLA, B. (2002), *Fütürist Müzikçilerin Manifestosu*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.

ROLOFF, B., SEESSLEN, G. (1995), *Ütopik Sinema: Bilimkurgu Sinemasının Tarihi ve Mitolojisi*, Alan Yayıncılık, İstanbul.

SANT'ELIA, A., MARINETTI, F.T. (1991), *Fütürist Mimarlık. 20. Yüzyıl Mimarisinde Program ve Manifestolar*, Şevki Vanlı Mimarlık Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul.

STAIGER, J. (1999), *Future Noir: Contemporary Representations of Visionary Cities. Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science Fiction Cinema*, Verso, London.

THEMA LAROUSSE, (1994), Milliyet, İstanbul.

www.colchsfc.ac.uk/art.htm

www.futurism.org.uk/cinema/cinema-frames.html

www.geocities.com/rr17bb/cityplanning.html