Spatial Representation of the Desire for Political Domination and Power and the Construction of the Subject: Spatial Arrangement in the Film *Nasipse Adayız*

Ege Göksu, M.A.
Media and Cultural Studies, Istanbul Arel University, Istanbul, Türkiye
egegoksu@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0000-7814-6403

CONTENT TABLE

Spatial Representation of the Desire for Political Domination and Power and the Construction of the Subject: Spatial Arrangement in the Film *Nasipse Adayız*

Abstract

This study examines the spatial representations of political domination and the transformation of the individual within these spaces through Ercan Kesal's 2020 film Nasipse Adayız. The film reveals how space, within a political context where representation is increasingly replaced by networks of relationships and pragmatic interests, and where public space is instrumentalized, becomes both a symbol of power and an active instrument in its construction. This transformation becomes particularly visible through Dr. Kemal's failed attempts to establish meaningful relationships with various spaces; thus, politics is depicted as a structure that has evolved into a superficial performance dictated by personal interests. The relationship Dr. Kemal builds with space is analyzed through Henri Lefebvre's theory of the "production of space" and David Harvey's spatial categories. In line with this theoretical framework, Dr. Kemal's repeated failures to establish hierarchy cause his relationship with space to shift toward the dimensions of Spatial Practices and Relative Space. Consequently, space is reproduced through everyday practices while simultaneously acquiring different meanings and qualities depending on the observer and context. Since the film focuses primarily on power relations, it makes visible the hierarchies between characters through spaces that are constantly being transformed by interactions.

Keywords: Production of Space, Power, Social Institutions, Turkish Cinema, Representation of Space in Cinema, Politics of Space

Introduction

In Turkey, since the beginning of the modernization project, space has been a fundamental domain where political powers have embodied their ideologies, shaped society, and consolidated their legitimacy. Therefore, understanding the relationship between space and politics as depicted in the film Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020) necessitates a consideration of Turkey's historical and social context. With the proclamation of the Republic, the construction of the capital city, Ankara, was a symbolic spatial project that reflected the Western, modern, and secular identity of the nation-state. Wide avenues, geometrically planned neighborhoods, and monumental public buildings were an inscription of an ideological vision onto space a vision that rejected the old (the Ottoman Empire) and targeted a new social order. During this period, space was the clearest arena in which the desire of the ruling power to design society in a top-down manner was manifested.

The intense wave of rural-to-urban migration, which began in the 1950s, led to the emergence of new and "informal" spaces on the peripheries of this planned modernization project: gecekondu (squatter settlements). Initially seen as a housing problem, the gecekondu districts gradually transformed into one of the most dynamic arenas of politics. These areas, holding significant voting potential for political parties, became the site of a pragmatic bargaining relationship between the ruling power and the citizens, conducted through promises such as title deed allocations, zoning amnesties, and infrastructure services. As Tanıl Bora has also pointed out, this situation created a ground where politics became intertwined with

daily life and the most basic needs, and where populist discourses found their expression through space. The land negotiations and zoning issues in Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020) can be read as a contemporary reflection of this historical process. Indeed, studies indicating that politics in Turkey is shaped by the center-periphery tension and that populist discourse gains strength through its pragmatic relationship with voters in these peripheries point to the historical origins of the bargaining environment depicted in the film (Bora, 2017).

In the post-1980 period, with Turkey's integration into neoliberal policies, urban space became the center of capital accumulation and rent. As explained by David Harvey's concept of the "spatial fix," cities were transformed into investment vehicles, reshaped by shopping malls, luxury housing projects, and urban renewal applications. In this process, as public spaces diminished, urban space became increasingly fragmented, and the segregation between social classes deepened. The ruling power, through tools like large-scale infrastructure projects and TOKİ (Housing Development Administration), not only created economic value by transforming space but also showcased its own political power and vision to society through these massive structures. This situation aligns with analyses suggesting that the state in Turkey is shaped by the relationships between bureaucratic elites and the developing bourgeoisie, and that urban rent is one of the fundamental dynamics of this inter-class struggle (Keyder, 2022).

It is precisely against this complex historical backdrop that Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020) is situated. The film reveals a political atmosphere where, on the one hand, the Republic's modernist spatial ideals have been surpassed, and on the other, the politics of bargaining born from the gecekondu has become intertwined with a rent economy, all managed by a neoliberal 'market' logic. The spaces experienced by Dr. Kemal during his candidacy process bear the traces of these three historical layers (modernist, populist, and neoliberal) and demonstrate how his quest for power becomes meaningless within these complex spatial networks. This section, before proceeding to the film's analysis, aims to establish that the spaces in the film are not merely backdrops but are, in fact, vibrant arenas that produce and reflect the very politics of Turkey.

As a constructed domain, space is not merely a physical entity; it is also a form of social and political construction. The way a space is designed, its intended use, and its aesthetic configurations often serve an ideological framework. Spaces function as instruments that direct individual behavior, regulate social relations, and reinforce power structures. For instance, a space created by parents for a child raised in a sterile environment is designed to block external threats, while a space not shaped by a protective mindset leaves the child open to various social influences. Such a space accommodates potential threats in an "unforeseen yet controlled" manner. Both types of space are artificial and inorganic configurations, shaped through a political lens. Although these spaces may appear to be neutral, they typically reproduce and legitimize a particular form of power. While concealing the mechanisms of authority in the background, they present values such as safety, comfort, or public benefit in the foreground to guide individuals. In doing so, they

provide a fundamental ground for analyzing the relationship between the individual and power.

Similarly, power relations become overtly visible in public spaces designed for communal use. While public spaces may seem to be organized on the basis of collective benefit, they often contain mechanisms of guidance—or even coercion—within them. This allows public space to function as an ideological instrument. For instance, the 2021 reconstruction of the Atatürk Cultural Center in Istanbul's Taksim Square, along with the creation of a "cultural route" that directs pedestrian traffic from Nişantaşı through the interior of the complex, illustrates how a seemingly public space is in fact ideologically designed. In this context, pre-existing social habits were restructured, and citizens' movement flows were redirected in ways that appeared unplanned, yet served specific ideological objectives. These spatial interventions not only reshape urban experiences but also reform individuals' social practices and habits.

This reveals the transformative impact of modernization on the relationship between individuals and space. As Marshall Berman suggests, modernization promises constant change, development, and renewal while simultaneously uprooting individuals and detaching them from their existential foundations (Berman, 1982). Estrangement from tradition, loss of belonging, and the erosion of continuity are especially prominent in modern cities. This transformation reshapes the individual's relationship with space not only on a physical level but also on psychological and social dimensions. The alienating effect of modern cities illustrates that space is not merely a domain of habitation, but also a stage for social relations, power dynamics, and struggles over identity. As Walter Benjamin also emphasized, individuals express themselves not only through verbal narratives but also through the spatial arrangements they inhabit, experience, and engage with (Benjamin, 2024).

In this context, modern space offers a setting in which individual identities are constructed and social conflicts are shaped. In modern cities, the flow of daily life is surrounded by spatial arrangements that directly impact individuals' social positions and relationships. These spaces function on the one hand as tools of power that pressure individuals to conform to certain norms, and on the other hand, as environments through which individuals can develop identities based on their interaction with such arrangements. Therefore, modern art forms such as cinema serve as powerful means to make these relationships visible and to examine them through a critical lens. Visual narratives reconstruct the political and cultural meanings of space, offering audiences the opportunity to question social dynamics. Particularly in cinema, due to its capacity to visualize the effects of space on individuals, power relations, and social transformations, space emerges as one of the most effective domains in representing its political nature. Just as the transformation of urban space reflects the domination mechanisms of political power today, cinema can reveal forms of social domination through spatial representations.

Spatial Representation of the Desire for Political Domination and Power and the Construction of the Subject: Spatial Arrangement in the Film *Nasipse Adayız*

Films that explore how power is structured within social institutions, the family, the state, or public life, do not treat space merely as a background setting. They also open up a crucial terrain for understanding how individuals are included within these structures, how spatial arrangements shape them, and under what conditions they develop obedience or resistance. Such films provide a critical foundation for comprehending how space encompasses, directs, and transforms characters.

In this regard, the film Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020), which will be analyzed in this study, offers a suitable framework to examine how space is used as an instrument in the representation of power and how the individual is reconstructed within these spaces. The film opens a discussion about the positioning of the individual within the modern political system, the power-imbued structure of politics, and the role of space as a carrier of this structure. The film's central premise revolves around the contemporary reality in which politics has lost its function of generating public value and benefit, becoming increasingly dominated by pragmatic personal interests. The main objective of this study is to examine how politics shapes individuals through spatial constructs and how political power is consolidated through space. The spatial arrangements in the film will be analyzed through the theoretical lenses of Henri Lefebvre's "production of space" and David Harvey's "reproduction of capitalist space," with an emphasis on the social and political functions of space in the construction of identity.

In addition to the space-oriented theories of Lefebvre and Harvey, Dr. Kemal's struggle in the political arena can also be read through Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of "field" and "capital." From this perspective, politics is a field of power that different actors enter with the social and symbolic capital they possess. Dr. Kemal's efforts to exist in this field and his failed attempts to increase his capital through spaces add another dimension to understanding the hierarchical structures and power relations in the film.

The main purpose of this study is to analyze the spatial arrangement in the film Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020) based on the theoretical approaches of Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey, and thereby to thoroughly examine the spatial representations of the desire for political domination in Turkey and the transformation of the subject in this process. In line with this general aim, the article primarily sets as its main question how the film represents the desire for political power and the construction of the subject in Turkey through its spatial arrangement. To illuminate this fundamental question, answers are sought for sub-questions such as: how spaces like the party headquarters and luxury restaurants reflect political and social hierarchies; what role Dr. Kemal's failed relationships with these spaces play in revealing the pragmatic nature of politics; and finally, how the film's spatial arrangement makes visible the efforts of political actors to establish their fields of power.

Spatial Representation of the Desire for Political Domination and Power and the Construction of the Subject: Spatial Arrangement in the Film *Nasipse Adayız*

In Turkish cinema, space has frequently been used as an important tool for social and political critique. Studies focusing particularly on the transformation of urban spaces and its effects on individuals provide a significant ground for understanding the relationship between cinema and social reality (For an example, see Köse, 2021). In addition to this general framework, specific academic studies on the film Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020) are also available. For instance, Selami İnce (2025), by examining the film through a sociological and cultural analysis of the "Mitläufer" character Dr. Kemal, focuses on the character's political and ethical dilemmas. Distinct from İnce's character-focused analysis, our study aims to offer an original contribution to the literature by revealing the spatial dynamics of these dilemmas and how this process unfolds in light of the theories of Lefebvre and Harvey (Alinia and Gürkan, 2025)

In the literature on Turkish cinema, Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020) has been the subject of various studies, particularly those addressing the ethical and pragmatic dimensions of politics. These studies generally center on the ethics of a politician through the character of Dr. Kemal (İnce, 2025) or the critical dialogue the film establishes with the current political atmosphere in Turkey. While the existing literature successfully analyzes the film's political discourse at the level of character and plot, the primary purpose and original contribution of this study is to demonstrate how this political critique is constructed through a spatial language. In other words, this article aims to add a new analytical dimension to the field by examining, through the theoretical lens of Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey, how the desire for political power and the transformation of the subject are represented not only through dialogues or character actions but through the very arrangement of space itself.

In this study, the theoretical case study method, one of the qualitative research designs, has been adopted. The film Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020), designated as the unit of analysis, was examined using the descriptive analysis technique. During the analysis process, the use of space in critical scenes was systematically coded through Henri Lefebvre's spatial triad and David Harvey's categories of space. This theoretical "mapping" process aims to uncover the ideological layers of meaning beneath the spatial arrangement and the film's critical discourse. It should be noted that this analysis focuses not on the literary work from which the film was adapted, but on the unique visual language of cinema itself.

The Politics of Space as an Instrument of Domination

Space is not merely a physical entity, but rather a dynamic field of production in which social, political, and economic processes intersect. Thinkers such as Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey have demonstrated that space is a construct shaped by social relations and continuously reproduced. They reveal how spatial relationships are inherently intertwined with mechanisms of power. Lefebvre argues that space functions as "a kind of map" that bears the traces of power relations and social processes (Lefebvre, 1991). Every space contains embedded social relations and operates as a cartography of those interactions.

> Representations of space are always infused with relative and transforming knowledge—a hybrid of learned perceptions and ideology. Therefore, although these representations may be reconsidered, they maintain a form of objectivity. Are they correct or incorrect? The question does not always yield a defined answer. Is a perspective true or false? Representations of space, being inherently abstract, infiltrate social and political practices. However, the relationships formed between people and objects within the represented space inevitably fracture these representations due to their lack of cohesion. Rather than being meticulously designed, representational spaces are lived experiences that require neither consistency nor continuity. These spaces, shaped by imagination and symbolism, are rooted in history—the history of a people and each individual who belongs to that community. Ethnologists, anthropologists, and psychoanalysts, whether consciously or not, study such representational spaces, yet they often fail to confront them with other coexisting, interrelated, or overlapping spatial representations—and, notably, tend to neglect spatial practice itself (Lefebvre, 2014, p. 70).

In The Production of Space, Lefebvre classifies space into three conceptual levels: Representations of Space, Spaces of Representation, and Spatial Practices. This triadic framework demonstrates that space is not only a physical object, but also a product shaped by ideologies, political systems, and social structures. Representations of Space refers to spaces structured directly by power and hierarchy—spaces planned and regulated by the state and capital. Examples include governmental institutions, military zones, and urban spaces shaped through city planning. These spaces reinforce social order and manifest a specific ideological worldview. In contrast, Spaces of Representation are the lived, experienced spaces imbued with symbolic meaning by individuals. These spaces emerge independently of official ideology and are shaped by everyday life, contributing to personal identity formation. Examples include informal neighborhoods, streets, protest grounds, or sites marked by personal memory. Spatial Practices refer to the processes through which individuals reproduce space via their daily interactions. These practices reveal how society conceptualizes space and how power relations influence such perceptions (Lefebvre, 2014).

David Harvey, in Spaces of Global Capitalism, expands this triad by proposing a spatial framework composed of Absolute Space, Relative Space, and Relational Space. According to Harvey, space is not merely a physical realm but is also shaped by social and economic forces. Absolute Space refers to space that is fixed and physically defined—such as buildings, national borders, or zones of property. These types of space form the foundation for property rights, legal boundaries, and institutional control. Relative Space, on the other hand, is a construct that changes according to the observer's position and socio-political context. For example, how a city center is perceived by different communities or how a district transforms based on economic activity exemplifies the relative nature of space. Relational Space

emphasizes that space is embedded within and transformed by social, economic, and political processes. It is not merely defined by physicality or relationships between objects but evolves through those very interactions. Relational space investigates how individuals experience space within a given social context. Thus, space is continuously reproduced through social interaction and shaped by lived spatial experience. Examples such as urban redevelopment projects or refugee movements illustrate the relational nature of space (Harvey, 2006).

Harvey's spatial analyses help illuminate how capitalist modes of production materialize spatially. In capitalist systems, space is not only an instrument for organizing economic activity but also a mechanism for reinforcing social hierarchies and regulating individuals through spatial arrangements. In this way, social behavior and lifestyles are indirectly controlled through spatial planning. Urban redevelopment projects are among the most tangible examples that reveal how class distinctions are spatially reproduced. In cities, the spatial separation between high-income residential zones and low-income neighborhoods directly reflects the capitalist system's influence over space. More broadly, the "relative" dimension of all definitions of space becomes reinterpreted within power structures shifting, over the course of a narrative, from one point of meaning to another.

↓Harvey | Lefebvre →	Spatial Practices	Representations of Space	Spaces of Representation
Absolute Space			
Relative Space			
Relational Space			

Table-1 Spatial Categories as Conceptualized by Harvey and Lefebvre

The Cinematographic Space as a Stage for the Power Struggle

The relationship between space and power in cinema is often a prominent theme. The cinematic representation of a city, structure, or natural area reveals the power dynamics associated with that space. As Michel Foucault points out in his works Heterotopia and Discipline and Punish, power does not merely shape space but also observes and controls individuals through these spaces (Foucault, 2019). In this context, space is not just a physical environment but a social construct that shapes individuals' behaviors, positions, and perceptions. When approached from this perspective, space in cinema is not merely a narrative tool; it also emerges as a visual and semantic element that materializes power relations.

When examining the space-power relationship in cinema through Foucault's concept of disciplinary society, it becomes clear that power does not operate solely through legal and political apparatuses. In disciplinary systems, power exerts direct control over individuals' bodies and actions, primarily through spaces. These spaces manifest in cinema as environments that limit the freedom of characters, observe

1
 This table, which visualizes the concepts developed by Lefebvre and Harvey, will be used in the spatial analysis of films.

them, and force them to conform to societal norms. This visual strategy aligns precisely with Foucault's notions of surveillance and discipline.

The symbolic meanings of space in cinema also hold significant importance in deepening our understanding of these space-power relations. These spatial constructs not only demonstrate the physical but also the ideological nature of space. In this regard, Foucault's concept of heterotopia provides a functional framework to understand the spatial counterparts of non-normative experiences (Foucault, 2019).

David Harvey's theories on urbanism and capitalism also offer crucial insights into how spatial representations in cinema are shaped by power relations (Harvey, 2006). The capitalist system utilizes space not only as a medium for regulating economic activities but also as a tool for reinforcing social hierarchies and forcing individuals into specific spatial arrangements. Cinema makes this reality visible by demonstrating how cities are reproduced and how, within this process, class differences become spatially divided. This cinematic choice directly correlates with Harvey's theoretical framework emphasizing spatial injustice in capitalist cities.

In this context, Henri Lefebvre's concept of relational space offers a complementary perspective for understanding the social meanings of space, power relations, and the multilayered connections space has with individuals (Lefebvre, 1991). Relational space encompasses not only the physical location we inhabit but also the social meanings assigned to it and the emotional relationships individuals develop with these meanings. Cinematic uses of space in this way show how characters are situated in space based on their identities, roles, and social positions, and how this positioning creates meaning.

Theoretical tools provided by thinkers like Foucault, Lefebvre, and Harvey offer essential resources for understanding how space in cinema undertakes ideological and narrative functions. In this way, cinema transforms space from a physical setting into a multilayered narrative domain where phenomena like power, class, surveillance, and social structures gain visibility.

Alongside sociological theories of space, film studies also emphasize that space is not merely a backdrop but a constitutive element of the narrative itself. In cinema, space is an active element that reflects the psychology of characters, visualizes social hierarchies, and produces ideological meanings. Analyses of mise-en-scène (staging), in particular, examine how a space acquires meaning through cinematographic tools such as lighting, color, set design, and composition (Bordwell & Thompson, 2011). This study aims to analyze the spaces in Nasipse Adayız by building a bridge between Lefebvre's abstract theory of space and the concrete visual language of cinema, focusing on 'how' space produces meaning.

Spatial Representation of the Desire for Political Domination and Power and the Construction of the Subject: Spatial Arrangement in the Film *Nasipse Adayız*

The Transformation of the Subject through Spatial Arrangement

In cinematic narrative, space is not merely a place where characters are physically located, but a powerful narrative tool reflecting their psychological and social transformations. The use of space plays a central role in revealing characters' social positions, identity conflicts, and inner worlds. Through visual elements such as mise-en-scène, set design, lighting, color, and costumes, space not only provides an aesthetic ground but also conveys ideological and class-based messages. The way social structures are built and the positions of characters within these structures are concretized through these visual components. Camera movements, angles, and shots are fundamental visual tools in shaping the impact of space on characters in cinema. Spatial narration allows for the visualization of not only physical environments but also the psychological states and social positions of characters. In this context, characters' reactions to space and the transformations they undergo in response constitute one of the strongest representations of subjective change in cinema.

On the other hand, David Harvey's concept of "time-space compression" emphasizes the experiential dimension of space in these narratives; space is not only a physical context but also a level where psychological pressures intensify and rapidly changing social dynamics are reflected. In modern urban narratives, as individuals are forced to adapt to rapidly changing spaces, this rhythm becomes a pressure point that triggers the transformation of characters. In this context, space in cinema becomes both the cause and the reflection of the character's psychological dissolution, identity search, and resistance to social pressures.

Cinema, through the spatial experiences of characters, not only makes visible the individual's inner world but also the social structure and ideological relations. The language of the camera, space design, and cinematographic details transform into the visual expression of the psychological, social, and emotional transformation the character undergoes. Lefebvre's concept of relational space and Harvey's time-space analyses provide essential theoretical tools for decoding the social dynamics underlying this visual narration. In this context, space is not merely a backdrop; through cinema, it becomes both the carrier and the determinant of the subject's transformation journey.

Spatial Composition and Subject Construction in the Context of Domination Relations in *Nasipse Adayız*;

The 2020 film Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020) focuses on Dr. Kemal Güner's candidacy for the position of mayor in a district of Istanbul. Leading a calm life, Kemal unexpectedly finds himself in the midst of a complex and challenging political race. The bureaucratic obstacles and personal conflicts he faces during his candidacy are presented through a series of tragicomic events. The film sheds light on Turkey's local political dynamics, how individuals position themselves in public spaces, and how power relations are shaped through spatial arrangements. The spaces Dr. Kemal occupies throughout his political journey function as symbols reflecting his political identity and social status. These spaces make visible the

conflicts between Kemal's personal goals and the societal pressures he faces.

The patronage system and hierarchical order in Turkish politics are deeply explored in the film. Kemal's efforts to gain the support of powerful figures to rise in the political arena demonstrate how politics is shaped through personal interests. In this process, Kemal learns how ruthless and coercive power can be. The film's spatial design, which questions how this system transforms and manipulates individuals' ideals, symbolizes Kemal's political rise and fall. In the film, spaces function as symbols of power, while the relationships between characters reveal the effects of these structures on individuals. Kemal's efforts to access political power, his personal journey, and the obstacles he faces form the core dynamics of the narrative. Politicians' homes and offices, Kemal's house, meeting rooms, and public spaces serve as important reference points for analyzing the political context of the spaces in the film.

The homes and offices of politicians in the film function as symbolic centers of power and authority. These spaces are essential for understanding the world of those who hold power and how they operate. Specifically, the luxurious and ostentatious décor symbolizes the desire for power and prestige. Kemal's presence in these spaces can be viewed as part of his effort to attain power. Dr. Kemal's home reflects his inner world and his presence in the political arena. The simple, ordinary decoration of the house reflects the conflict between Kemal's ability to exist in the political world and his true identity. This space mirrors the vulnerable and fragile aspects of Kemal's personality, as he faces internal conflicts in his pursuit of power. While the home represents a space where he feels safe from the outside world, it is not a sufficient refuge to deal with the harsh realities of political struggle. Meeting rooms, municipal buildings, and other official spaces are places where political power and authority are concretized. Scenes in these spaces express Kemal's efforts to establish himself in the political arena, his relationships with powerful figures, and the disappointments he experiences. The cold, distant, and hierarchical nature of official spaces represents the inaccessibility of power. Cities and public spaces, on the other hand, represent the obligation to be among the people and communicate with them. Kemal's visits to the streets, coffeehouses, and marketplaces demonstrate his efforts to connect with the public and establish himself as a politician. However, these spaces also reflect his fragility, alienation from society, and the difficulties in his political career.

The hierarchical spaces in the film can be analyzed in three main categories through the concepts of Lefebvre and Harvey: places such as coffeehouses, health centers, furniture stores (Sleep Center), prayer ceremonies, hotels, and wedding halls function as "Spatial Practices" and "Relational Spaces." These spaces are areas where social relations unfold, constantly transforming within the dynamics of daily life, and gaining meaning through social interaction. These places, where political relations are repeated and serve a particular purpose, turn into sites for vote-catching. Hospitals and streets can be defined as "Representations of Space" and "Relational Spaces." These spaces, which are shaped within the flow of daily life, do not directly dictate hierarchy but acquire meaning through social interactions.

Furthermore, Simge Wedding Hall, where Dr. Kemal Güner experiences some of his most significant moments, falls under both the "Representation of Space" and "Relational Space" categories. Constructed and controlled by power centers, this space gains different meanings depending on the observer's position and context. Similarly, the political party headquarters seen in the opening sequence of the film can also be considered as both a "Representation of Space" and a "Relative Space"; it is an area shaped by the ideological control mechanisms defined by dominant powers.

↓Harvey | Lefebvre →	Spatial Practices	Representations of Space	Spaces of Representation
Absolute Space			
Relative Space		Political Party Headquarters in the Prologue	
Relational Space	Coffeehouse, Health Center, Sleep Center, Furniture Store, Prayer Ceremony, Hotel, Wedding Hall	Simge Wedding Hall	Hospital, Streets

Table-2. Dr. Kemal's Relationship with Space at the Beginning of the Candidacy Process

In the later parts of the film, Dr. Kemal's relationship with spaces gradually emphasizes his powerlessness. Witnessing people gambling in the back of the coffeehouse, being asked for dentures in response to a request for votes at the furniture store, exceeding the elevator's capacity when trying to visit the party chairman at the hotel, his speech being ignored at the Simge Wedding Hall, being attacked by a former patient's relative on the stairs after kissing the religious leader's hand at the prayer meeting, and finally being punched by his driver on a street—all these events cause him to lose his power wherever he attempts to establish hierarchy. From this point on, all the spaces in the film become "Spatial Practices" and "Relative Spaces." These spaces, which are constantly reproduced and acquire different meanings depending on the context, demonstrate that the character's efforts to exist on the political stage result in failure. The film narrates power relations not through the hierarchy between individuals, but through the transformation of space. The film's spatial argument is reinforced not only by the choice of locations but also by a conscious cinematography, that is, through mise-en-scène (staging). For example, the hierarchy in the party headquarters is visualized with wide camera angles that show Dr. Kemal as small and ineffective within the space. The negotiations in luxury restaurants are supported by dim, high-contrast lighting that emphasizes the moral ambiguity. Similarly, the precarious and dynamic atmosphere of the gecekondu neighborhood is directly conveyed to the audience through the use of a handheld camera. Therefore, the

film's visual language adds an aesthetic layer that reinforces the theoretical meaning of the spaces.

↓Harvey | Lefebvre →	Spatial Practices	Representations of Space	Spaces of Representation
Absolute Space			
Relative Space		Coffeehouse, Health Center, Sleep Center, Furniture Store, Prayer Ceremony, Hotel, Wedding Hall, Simge Wedding Hall, Hospital, Streets	
Relational Space	Tailoring Workshop		

Table-3. Dr. Kemal's Relationship with Space After the Rejection of His Candidacy

Dr. Kemal's inability to control any space forms the core conflict of the narrative. In the final scene of the film, the character visits a pork restaurant located in the basement of a flag tailoring workshop. An old minister dining there tells him he can help. This space, which appears as a place where Dr. Kemal does not attempt to exert control, can be analyzed within the frameworks of "Spatial Practices" and "Relational Space." This space, which is constantly reproduced and shaped by the changing nature of social relationships, represents the space the character has been trying to reach since the very first moments of the pre-candidacy process. However, ironically, unlike the spaces he has been trying to control and impose a hierarchical order on throughout the film, he forms a connection in this space, where he has no expectations, which ultimately helps him advance in politics. This scene, while exposing the contradictions of individual ambition and the pursuit of power, also reveals how unclear and unexpectedly the rules of political power operate.

Conclusion

In cinema, space is not merely a physical backdrop; as an integral component of storytelling, it plays a strategic role in conveying social and political messages. Spaces not only reflect the inner worlds of characters but also make visible their interactions with social structures and power relations. In this context, Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020), a film reflecting a period where individual idealism succumbs to political pragmatism, effectively demonstrates how the relationship between the individual and society is transformed through spaces. The film takes place in an environment where politics has become a tool for individuals to exploit, and social identities are reshaped around self-interests. Dr. Kemal Güner's tragicomic candidacy process symbolizes a period in Turkish politics where the political landscape has become increasingly superficial and open to manipulation. In this political structure, spaces become witnesses and metaphors for this transformation.

Spatial Representation of the Desire for Political Domination and Power and the Construction of the Subject: Spatial Arrangement in the Film *Nasipse Adayız*

The film offers a striking critique of the nature of local politics in Turkey, creating a suffocating feeling in the viewer. It not only makes visible the familiar small political calculations and the hypocrisy of politicians but also exposes the human weaknesses, desires, and mechanisms of pleasure that make this scene possible. The dream sequence in the opening of the film shows how deeply the representation of the political is intertwined with unconscious processes. From this point forward, the entire narrative becomes a text that progresses through symbols and repressed desires, much like the workings of dreams. Dr. Kemal's efforts to reach power are constantly interrupted by difficult and often humiliating spatial encounters with his own body and social environment. Spaces such as the wedding hall, prayer house, hotel elevator, or coffeehouse transcend mere representation, becoming symbolic planes that reveal the character's internal disintegration. Particularly moments like his inability to enter the elevator, his avoidance of his ex-wife's gaze while announcing his candidacy, or the physical conflict with his driver on the street in the scenes after he realizes he will not be selected as the candidate represent the failure of his desire for power and the unconscious tension created by this failure (Özmen, 2021).

The spaces in the film become tools that continuously redefine and transform Dr. Kemal's social status. His transition from personal space to public space reflects the individual's shaping by social norms and power relations. While Kemal's home represents his inner world and personal idealism, political meeting rooms and official buildings symbolize how political idealism is transformed within the politics-interest nexus. The spaces that appear in the film, such as meeting rooms and campaign offices, are presented as areas where politics is transformed into a stage, and the content and meaning of these spaces are reshaped according to individuals' quests for power (Özmen, 2021).

The final scene of the film, where Dr. Kemal meets at the pork restaurant, is ironically the simplest yet most corrupt form of the "real" power space he has been trying to reach since the beginning—not politically, but through informal connections and mediation. His failure in all the spaces where he attempts to transform power relations, and his success in establishing a connection in this space where he makes no intervention, elevates the film beyond being merely a political parody. The transition between the artificiality of political representation and the decayed nature of real relationships is explored in a multilayered manner through space. Surrounded by sweat, humidity, dampness, and suffocating rooms, this scene not only portrays physical degradation but also the deviant pleasures embedded in desire and power relations (Özmen, 2021).

The multilayered meanings acquired by space in the film can be explained through the spatial theories of Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey. Kemal's transformation illustrates the impact of modern politics on individuals and how social relations are manipulated through spatial arrangements. As Kemal loses his power in all the spaces where he tries to establish hierarchy, all spatial relationships shift to "Spatial Practices" and "Relative Space." In this way, space is both continuously reproduced through everyday activities and gains different meanings and qualities depending

on the observer and circumstances. The film, focusing primarily on power relations, reveals the hierarchy between characters through the spaces that transform as a result of interactions.

In conclusion, Nasipse Adayız (Ercan Kesal, 2020) offers a structure that questions Turkey's social and political dynamics through the spatial representations of political practices. The film not only reveals how the bonds between the individual and society are transformed but also critically discusses the meaning loss of political discourse in the post-truth era, exposing the self-interest-driven nature of politics. The findings of this study also open several doors for future research. For instance, a similar spatial analysis could be applied to other political films or series in Turkish cinema to enable a comparison of the representation of space-politics across different periods. Furthermore, as this study focused on the theories of Lefebvre and Harvey, future studies could reveal new layers of interpretation by reading the same film through different theoretical tools, such as Foucault's heterotopia (Foucault, 2005), defined as "other spaces." Finally, research examining the relationship between the film's spatial arrangement and gender roles, or studies on audience reception of these spatial representations, would also offer significant contributions to the field.

References

Alinia, A., & Gürkan, H. (2025). Echoes of War: The Lingering Shadows of. Exploring the Cultural, Moral, and Technological Dimensions of Conflict, 171.

Benjamin, W. (2023). The Arcades Project (Ahmet Cemal, Trans.). Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Berman, M. (2024). All That Is Solid Melts into Air (Bülent Peker, Trans.). İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, T. (2017). Cereyanlar: Türkiye'de Siyasi İdeolojiler. İletişim Yayınları.

Bordwell, D. & Thompson, K. (2017). Film Art: An Introduction. McGraw-Hill Education.

Bourdieu, P. (2016). Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action (H. U. Tanrıöver, Trans.). Hil Yayın.

Foucault, M. (2005). Özne ve İktidar (Çev. I. Ergüden & O. Akınhay). Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Foucault, M. (2019). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay, Trans.). İmge Kitabevi.

Harvey, D. (2004). The New Imperialism (Hür Güldü, Trans.). Everest Yayınları.

Harvey, D. (2006). Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development. Verso.

Harvey, D. (2012). Paris, Capital of Modernity (Berna Kılınçer, Trans.). Sel Yayıncılık.

Harvey, D. (2013). Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution (Ayşe Deniz Temiz, Trans.). Metis Yayınları.

Harvey, D. (2019). The Condition of Postmodernity (Sungur Savran, Trans.). Metis Yayınları.

İnce, S. (2025). Nasipse Adayız Filminin "Mitläufer" Karakteri Dr. Kemal Üzerine Sosyolojik ve Kültürel Bir Analiz. Karadeniz Uluslararası Bilimsel Dergi, (65), 1-13. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/4325613

Keyder, Ç. (2022). Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar. İletişim Yayınları.

Lefebvre, H. (2014). The Production of Space (Işık Ergüden, Trans.). Sel Yayıncılık.

Özmen, E (2021). Nasipse Adayız: Ölüm dürtüsünün gelgitleri. Birikim Dergisi. https://birikimdergisi.com/haftalik/10602/nasipse-adayiz-olum-durtusunun-gelgitleri