

The Shift in Governance Through the Fall of Sound in the Face of Image: From Homo Sapiens to Homo Vidiens... A Panoptic Perspective in Alfred Hitchcock's Cinema within the Context of Media Political Economy: The Case of Rear Window

Gökmen KANTAR¹
Sibel AKOVA HAVALI²

Received:17.11.2024, Accepted:16.02.2025
DOI Number: 10.5281/zenodo.16447474

Abstract

When examined within the framework of social sciences, the phenomenon of surveillance, most precisely defined as systematic observation, refers to the monitoring of all actions and behaviors undertaken by individuals, groups, and societies within the context of their vital processes, particularly communication practices. According to numerous theorists across various disciplines within the social sciences, surveillance functions as a critical tool for collecting, recording, and controlling data essential to the establishment and maintenance of governance systems and authority. Surveillance, enabling states to consolidate their power and frequently regarded as an instrument reinforcing this power, encompasses not only the oversight of behaviors exhibited by individuals and societies within national borders but also the recording, organization, protection, and regulation of the gathered data. This administrative element constitutes a significant area of investigation within the field of media political economy. The increasing complexity and evolution of administrative practices in contemporary societies—driven by factors such as communication, transportation, infrastructure, technology, globalization, and digitization—are rendered feasible through mechanisms of surveillance. The phenomenon of surveillance forming the central focus of this study, is a pivotal subject of our time and represents the foundational basis of media political economy. Analyzing the historical development of media as a communication tool reveals that the governance changes resulting from the ascendancy of image over sound have profoundly and pervasively shaped the lives of contemporary societies. Within the trajectory of human history, spanning from Homo Sapiens to Homo Vidiens, the transformation and evolution of media political economy can be most distinctly observed in the cinema of Alfred

¹ Assoc. Prof. PhD, Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University, Türkiye, gkantar@nku.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-5120-110X.

² Assoc. Prof. PhD, Yalova University, Türkiye, sibelakova@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-7680-7394.

Hitchcock. This study endeavors to analyze Hitchcock's cinema through a panoptic perspective. Specifically, it investigates the panoptic viewpoint in Hitchcock's Rear Window within the framework of media political economy, aiming to elucidate the governance shifts induced by these transformations.

Key words: Media Political Economy, Governance Shifts, Alfred Hitchcock, Rear Window.

JEL Code: C22, G02

1. Introduction

In order to draw the conceptual framework of today's fundamental social changes, the life processes of contemporary societies conceptualized with the adjectives post-modern, globalization, information society, digital transformation and its derivatives are shaped by the phenomenon of surveillance. The phenomenon of surveillance is the basis for the transformation of these adjectives into reality. Communication, transportation, infrastructure and technological changes, which play an important role in the economic, political, social, cultural and technological development of societies, have led to a radical transformation in the life processes and forms of societies by affecting each other in a spiral in gradient relations with each other. Surveillance, which is a phenomenon that is at the basis of the relevant transformation and change processes but is ignored, is defined as a structure that is actually identical to human history but has reached the ability to create an agenda with its inclusion in literature today.

The phenomenon of surveillance, which constitutes a source of changes and contributes to transformations, contains a structure that points to social processes in the first place. Based on objective data, the concept of phenomenon, which includes concrete forms and entities, merges with the act of surveillance and transforms from objective to concrete concepts and acts. Again, the phenomenon of surveillance refers to social processes and consists of the processes of understanding and explaining the world and the elements of life, from the existence of individuals, groups, societies and states to the present day. All conclusions arising from human observations of the world are phenomena. Of course, the phenomenon of surveillance is also an important element of inquiry that started with the development of coexistence practices and was conceptualized and included in the literature as a result of social changes. As people start to live together, the ideas and information they acquire by observing each other bring about a process of learning and understanding. The processes of information gathering, learning and understanding constitute an act of surveillance.

The phenomenon of surveillance, in terms of its functionality and objectives, brings social control to the forefront in the theoretical context. However, defining the phenomenon of surveillance solely as a mechanism of social control

would mean squeezing the phenomenon of surveillance into narrow molds or not questioning its meanings sufficiently. For this reason, it is of great importance to address the phenomenon of surveillance with its function as a mechanism of control, as well as the relations of sovereignty and power. This is because the phenomenon of surveillance has a complex and integrated structure based on the relations of sovereignty and the objectives of the powers of power, along with its function as a mechanism of control. The integrated structure of the phenomenon of surveillance prevents an ordinary definition that can be explained by compressing it into narrow molds.

From this point of view, it would be appropriate to state that the phenomenon of surveillance, which is considered as one of the main tools of social control activities, is almost identified with the history of humanity in terms of its historical structure. While the history of surveillance is rooted in human history, surveillance society is evaluated in the context of its relations with the industrial revolution, capitalism, modernity and information technologies. The conceptual framework of the surveillance society, which is defined as relatively new, is drawn with the act of institutionalized surveillance of social life. This act of surveillance emerged with the process of modernism and took on an institutionalized structure. However, the phenomenon of surveillance society that emerged with modernism has gained the ability to set an agenda with the rapid rise of values and beliefs in democracy.

For this reason, it would be appropriate to state that surveillance has paradoxically developed in parallel with the democracy and enlightenment movements. With this in mind, it is necessary to state that the development of surveillance in the historical context has a complex structure. "The question of who is observing whom and what the effects are cannot be answered without reference to specific social situations in a given period" (Lyon, 1997:42). It is known that the concept of Surveillance, which originates from the French language, was first used in the 18th century to closely monitor the attitudes and behaviors of individuals. Surveillance, which emerged in the process of developing life practices starting with the coexistence of people and becoming a life practice, is conceptualized with many phrases such as surveillance, surveillance, protection and surveillance. The phenomenon of surveillance, which forms the basis of different research, analyses and problematics by many disciplines from communication sciences to psychology, from sociology to history, from management to economics, is conceptualized with the panopticon metaphor among communication sciences and studies.

2. Literature Review

Although surveillance society is nowadays explained with different theories, approaches and metaphors, it is identified with the panopticon metaphor in communication sciences studies. The Panopticon, or house of surveillance, a large circular structure consisting of many cells around a central watchtower, where a guard can supervise many prisoners at the same time, is in a sense the product of Jeremy Bentham's creative, albeit contradictory, imagination. The Panopticon is commonly known and referred to under Jeremy Bentham's name, although it was actually the brainchild of his brother Samuel. Samuel Bentham was responsible for the construction of the Panopticon in Russia in 1806, and before leaving the country he saw that “only a small part of the foundations of the building had been built”. The principle of surveillance, which works in two directions at once - the guard keeps the prisoners under constant surveillance and the people are free to inspect the guard at any time - emphasizes the Benthamite principles of openness and responsibility (Çoban, Özarslan, 2008:77).

Bentham's Panopticon prison plan has been carried out to the present day, especially through Foucault's work. The compatibility of this plan with the electronic Panopticon has taken its place in academic literature as a separate field of study. Here, there is a form of personal and continuous surveillance. There is a form of power exercised over individuals in the form of control, punishment, reward and correction, i.e. the transformation and shaping of individuals according to certain rules. The principle of surveillance, which works in two directions at once - the guard keeps the prisoners under constant surveillance and the people are free to inspect the guard at any time - emphasizes the Benthamite principles of openness and responsibility (Çoban, Özarslan, 2008:77). Bentham's Panopticon prison plan has been carried out to the present day, especially through Foucault's work. The compatibility of this plan with the electronic Panopticon has taken its place in academic literature as a separate field of study.

An individual who thinks that even if he or she is not being watched, he or she is being watched, or that he or she can be watched at any moment, develops a self-control mechanism and begins to monitor himself or herself. In other words, a gaze that observes and everyone who feels the weight of the gaze on them internalizes the gaze and eventually reaches the point of self-observation. Power is perfected by creating a continuous and permanent sphere of influence. This power is exercised through its invisibility, and on the other hand, it imposes a compulsory principle of visibility on those to whom it is exercised. Thus, after a while, everyone will keep themselves under observation. Perpetual power has found its perfect solution, but according to Foucault, “Perfect surveillance is a totality of malevolence.” (Barış, 2016:17).

As Foucault points out, Panoptic techniques played a crucial role in the transition from locally based self-supervisory and self-regulatory mechanisms of integration, which fit perfectly within the natural capacities of the human eye and ear, to supra-local integration, which far exceeds the natural capacities of human beings, and which takes place under state administration (Bauman, 2010:59). Even

if the focal point of panopticism is blinded, it is always a very cunning form of surveillance based on appearances and playing on the opposition between the beholder and the beheld (Baudrillard, 2010,53). We are all thus defenseless; we are all virtually immune retarded (Baudrillard, 2010,61). When no one is preoccupied with judgments and prejudices, there is greater tolerance, but also greater indifference. People who no longer try to make eye contact with others end up not seeing themselves. For example, they don't look at each other when they meet in the street, which can be seen as a sign of politeness, of kindness, but it is also a sign of indifference (Baudrillard, 2006,111).

The Panopticon is an artificial space; it was constructed for a specific purpose, considering the impassivity of the faculty of vision in the mind. The aim was to consciously manipulate and voluntarily reorganize the transparency of space as a social relation, in the final analysis, as a relation of power. The artificiality of bespoke space was a luxury denied by the powers that were determined to manipulate space on a state-wide scale. Instead of creating a new, functionally perfect space from scratch, modern state forces had to settle for a second-best solution, while retaining their "Panoptic" ambitions. Making an easy-to-read map of space for state administration, but going against indigenous practices, depriving the natives of the navigational tools they knew so well and thus leaving them bewildered, was thus the first strategic move of the modern spatial war (Bauman, 2010:43). The internalization of surveillance, which is one of the most important principles of the Panopticon, and its transformation into self-surveillance, is one of the most important features of the surveillance society. Beyond the internalization of surveillance only through an authority, a more mystical element, namely the transformation into docile bodies under the influence of the inner voice, may be in question.

The Panopticon is a ring-shaped building with a courtyard in the center and a tower in the center of the courtyard. The ring is divided into cells that look both inward and outward. In each of these small cells, in accordance with the goal of the institution, there is a child learning to write, a laborer, a prisoner being reformed, a madman experiencing his madness. In the central tower there is an overseer. Since each cell looks both inwards and outwards, the overseer's gaze can traverse the entire cell; there is no dark spot, and consequently everything the individual does is open to the gaze of an overseer, who observes through shutters, half-open partition windows, so that he can see everything, but no one can see him (Foucault,2005:42).

According to Foucault, punishment, which in the past was directed directly at the body, is now directed at the soul and becomes public. Instead of direct infliction of pain, there is an appeal to the soul and the transfer of power into the hands of 'the word'. Thus, while in the ancient period insanity was something that eliminated crime, in the modern world "sick souls" are tried to be tamed by gaining an institutional identity through prisons and asylums (Foucault,2000:174). According to Foucault, "panoptism" is one of the hallmarks of the society we live

in. Gathering events and people in a limited space allows the conflict to continue and develop, facilitates the use of characters, prepares the possibility of collective behavior, intensifies the tension, and allows for the reflection of society (Serttaş, 2009:60).

In today's conditions, even though individuals are oppressed under certain hegemonies, the individual is made to feel free. Compared to a totalitarian socialist society, we have more options to choose from. However, an understanding that reduces freedom to “being able to choose among options” is nothing more than emptying the concept of freedom. Because freedom in this sense would be limited to options, the limits of our freedom would be set by those who offer the options.

Human freedom cannot be measured by the right of choice available to the individual; the only decisive factor in determining freedom is what the individual can choose, what he chooses. The fact of being able to freely choose masters abolishes neither the slave nor the master. Free choice among many goods and services is not the same as being free. If alienation is necessary for these goods and services, if the individual spontaneously replaces the imposed needs, this does not show that the individual is autonomous, it only proves that controls are effective. Within this sphere, it seems possible for the individual to enrich and prosper. In this way, opposition to the hegemony itself loses its basis, and opposition can only take place within the framework of the rules of the given field. As freedoms lose their fundamental meaning, freedom of thought, autonomy and the right to political dissent are deprived of their functions in a society that is on the way to fulfilling its individual needs a little better everyday thanks to the “modern” order established by the states.

All our technologies are nothing but the instruments of a world that rules over us through an order that we think is sovereign, but of which we are nothing but the operators. This means that there is an objective illusion similar to the illusion of mass communication (Baudrillard, 2006,93). What we are talking about is a “medium” that is relentless, that tries to change reality by settling into it like a chronic disease. We are talking about a reality that has turned into a ghost, like the news that the “medium” presents through a filter, or a three-dimensional advertising image created by a laser light in a vacuum. Like television dissolving into life, or life dissolving into television. Life and television are like an inseparable solution. This reversal simulacrum, or polarity reversal, is the secret of all kinds of manipulative rhetoric, this ingenious smuggling. It is called the secret of power. (Baudrillard, 2010,55).

The fact that today's surveillance technologies arouse discomfort or uneasiness in individuals and come to the stage of being questioned makes the issue of privacy even more important. New living habits/styles that develop day by day, together with information technologies, cause the opening of the private sphere to the public sphere and the evisceration of the private sphere and freedoms. While

the concept of privacy is transferred to different meanings for individuals, it also makes the ethical dimension of surveillance debatable.

3. Methodology: Semiotic Method

The Power of Seeing: Homo Videns, the Seeing Man

Sight comes before speech. The child learns to recognize by looking before he or she begins to speak. In another sense, however, sight came before words. We find our place in the world that surrounds us by seeing. We describe this world with words, but words can never change the fact that we are surrounded by the world. Every evening, we see the sun setting. We know that the earth is turning its back to the sun. But this knowledge, this explanation, never matches what we see (Berger, 2010:8). The image is a reality that leaves no room for words, a reality that is perceived as it appears.

Recognizing events only through images is tantamount to not understanding anything. An image can mean more than a thousand words, but millions of images cannot produce a single concept (Sartori, 2006:154). Semiotics is a science that studies strings of signs such as languages, patterns, signs, etc. With this definition, language is a part of semiotic subjects. In fact, almost everyone agrees that language has a privileged and autonomous place in this field. This makes it possible to define semiotics as “the study of non-linguistic signs” (Guiraud, 1994:17). Semiotics does not investigate meanings, but the way meaning is articulated and tries to reveal the processes of meaning production. Therefore, it is a theory of signification oriented towards the form of content (Rıfat, 2007:8).

Semiotics (semiology), derived from the Greek “semion/sign”, is a branch of science that studies signs. Natural languages, behaviors, images, music work, a painting, a theatrical performance, a film, advertising posters, fashion, deaf-mute alphabet, literary works, the structure of transportation routes in a country, in short, every meaningful whole, whether it is intended for communication or not, is a string consisting of various units. The units of these strings are generally called signs.

The natural languages people use to communicate with each other (e.g. Turkish), behaviors, various gestures (hand-arm-head movements), the deaf-mute alphabet, images, traffic signs, the spatial arrangement of a city, a work of music, a painting, a theater performance, a film, advertising posters, fashion, literary works, various scientific languages, the order of passions, the structure of transportation routes in a country, an architectural arrangement, in short; In short, every meaningful whole, whether it is intended to communicate or not, is a string of various units. The units of these strings with different planes of realization are generally called signs.

The two founders of contemporary semiotics are the American pragmatist philosopher Charles S. Pierce and the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. These two thinkers, who are considered to be the founders of semiotics, developed their views and concepts on semiotics at about the same time, but were unbeknownst to each other. C.S. Pierce used the word Semiotics as the equivalent of semiotics, while Saussure used the word Semiology. In a sense, these different usages are useful in terms of indicating the differences as well as the similarities between Pierce and Saussure (Mutlu, 2008:117).

It is based on the famous linguist Ferdinand de Saussure's Lectures on General Linguistics. After his death in 1913, his students at the University of Geneva had Saussure's lecture notes published as a book in Geneva in 1915. This book heralded a new science called Semiotics. The main source of semiotics is linguistics. Language is the most complex and characteristic of all systems of expression and is the basic model for all branches of semiotics (Belkaya, 2001:68). Plato (428-348 BC), who produced thoughts on language, and Aristotle, who dealt with names in his poems and “Tafsir”, are considered to be the pioneers of semiotics. The theory of signs, on which various ideas were put forward in ancient times, was brought back to the agenda in the 17th and 18th centuries during the periods of rationalist and empiricist philosophy.

To describe meaningful wholes, in other words; To describe meaningful wholes, or in other words, to describe sign systems, to determine the relations that signs establish with each other, to find the ways in which meanings are articulated, to classify signs and sign systems, or to explain the interaction between human beings and human beings, human beings and the world, and to this end, to formulate an all-encompassing, coherent and simple theory in terms of epistemological, methodological and descriptive perspectives, are all within the field of a branch of science called semiotics in Turkish (Firat, 2008:113).

Semiotics has developed its own method of analysis and interpretation over time by adopting the new approach models put forward or developed by different disciplines, especially human sciences (linguistics, ethnology, human science, social science), psychoanalysis, philosophy and literary theory as a point of departure. Semiotics, which investigates human beings' mechanisms of creating signs, constructing strings with signs and communicating through them, in reality focuses on the signs we encounter everywhere and is interdisciplinary. It draws support from fields such as anthropology, sociology, social psychology, perception, philosophy, linguistics and communication science and offers an analysis method for analyzing the texts we encounter in these fields. Semiotics is a science of forms. Semiotics believes that there is a relation, a rule-based solidarity between the units that form a meaningful and structured whole.

The subject of semiotics is all kinds of signs: Cultural codes, traditions or anything that is investigated as a system of signs organized according to the

processes of understanding the text are the subject of semiotic studies. Many different disciplines such as architecture, fashion, literary texts, myths, paintings and films are analyzed with the methods developed by semiotics. The semiotic approach has brought with it a critical shift from the simple interpretation of objects and modes of communication to the study of the structure and organization of cultural artworks, especially how they produce meaning (Dyer, 2010:166).

The placement of signifier and signified in a structure based on reciprocity can lead to complex relations of synonym and polysemy without violating the logic of the sign. For example, a signifier can have many signifiers or vice versa, in other words, there is no change in the principle of equivalence, i.e. exclusion and reduction, on which causality is based (Baudrillard, 2008:183). According to Saussure, the sign consists of signifier and signified. Peirce, on the other hand, talks about the iconic/indexical/symbolic dimensions of the sign. In short, an iconic sign is a sign that replaces its object due to a relationship of similarity: it can be seen as a painting, a sculpture. The indexical sign has causal connections with its object.

These are almost like existential/natural connections, such as smoke foreshadowing fire, symptoms foreshadowing diseases. Symbols, on the other hand, are signs learned as a result of social consensus; their relationship to their objects is entirely arbitrary: words, numbers... etc. (Türkoğlu, 2000:19). The sign-object is not something that is given or taken, but something that individual subjects own, hold and utilize like a signifier, that is, a coded difference. While consumption means consuming the sign-object, the sign-object also resembles a form of social relation that is specific to the past, that has been thingified, that has been given the appearance of a code (Adanır, 2010:83).

4. Findings

The Panoptic Angle in Alfred Hitchcock's Cinema: The Example of the Film Rear Window.

Rear Window (1954) is Alfred Hitchcock's most original expression of cinematic thought, in which he applies the idea of adopting the world outside through the eyes of a person by identifying it with the audience; as usual, he reveals his trump cards openly, reflects his puritan structure and gives the audience the opportunity and means to step back and observe what happens to the characters and the signs that cause the events.

The movie Rear Window depicts Jeffries, a man who has an accident while taking photographs at auto races, breaks his leg and is confined to his home in a wheelchair until he recovers, and the events he witnesses. It is an original film that begins with the gift of a pair of binoculars to Jeffries by his lover and deals with the

urge to spy and the expression and reactions of the passive act of peeping, which is also described as “voyeurism” among the people.

In “Rear Window”, Jeffries, who spies on his neighbors throughout the film, is in a sense forced into voyeurism by circumstances; he tries to peep at his neighbors through the rear window as if watching a silent film. Since there is no way for him to hear his neighbors, Jeffries constructs the story himself. As the character's curiosity about the neighbors and the windows increases, the character, who already has nothing to do, spends his free time watching from the back window of his house. In the early stages of surveillance, Stella, the caregiver, is uncomfortable with surveillance. However, the pleasure of the feeling of surveillance spreads to Stella over time.

This pleasure even infects Liza. This situation can also be described as Liza wanting to be close to Jeffers or wanting to be involved in the surveillance herself. Jeffries spies on the apartment across the street to get away from his own problems and to get rid of the boredom of his own situation. In fact, just as viewers need different fictions to escape from their own daily problems and troubles, Jeffries feels the need to spy on the apartment across the street. From the beginning of the movie, the events can be seen from the point of view of our protagonist, Jeffries, meaning that the viewer sees what Jeffries is watching and peeping at.

The voyeur - or in other words, the exhibitionist - can choose and identify with any of the protagonists with the ease that comes from the exhibitionist's lack of awareness. He participates in the film on an emotional level and is therefore in a passive position. With this movie, he changes the stereotype of the one who is afraid of being watched and creates the figure of the one who is frightened by what he watches. The actor, unable to move in an atmosphere of paranoia, is integrated with the audience in the same situation in the theater seats, increasing the dose of tension.

According to Robin Wood, there are two ways of thinking about film. The film both advocates the condemnation of curiosity spying and peeping and encourages the feelings of curiosity spying and peeping. According to Wood, film is more complex and detailed than either view suggests (Barış, 2006:75). The film examines voyeurism from a psychological perspective, Hitchcock describes this situation as, "Aren't we all a little voyeuristic?" The external world observed through the hero's eyes is a kind of manifestation of the secret sense of surveillance that exists in the inner world of man. The act of surveillance provides the person with a compensatory power and a sense of superiority over the person being watched.

A journalist confined to a wheelchair due to a broken leg suspects that his neighbor killed his wife while watching his neighbors with binoculars, but he cannot convince his lover or his detective friend about this. Starring James Stewart, Grace Kelly and Wendell Corey, the film is considered one of the Hitchcock classics. The film also draws attention because the script belongs to Hitchcock. It is one of

Hitchcock's freest films in terms of camera technique. Independent of the structure of the building, multiple and frequent angle and width adjustments, sliding cameras have given the film a different perspective than others.

The film viewer generally feels himself in a relationship similar to the relationship between the scene being filmed and the camera. With the identification of the eye with the camera lens, the viewer finds himself in continuous movement where the distance and direction are constantly changing. When we examine what is happening from his subjective perspective, we also identify with Jeffries. In *Rear Window*, the gaze is the center of the storyline.

Hitchcock's skillful use of the identification process and the free use of the subjective camera from the male protagonist's point of view powerfully puts the audience in the male's position, allowing them to share the anxious gaze. The audience is drawn into a voyeuristic situation on the stage, a parody of their own situation in the cinema. Jeffries is the spectator, the events in the building opposite are similar to the screen. As he observes, an erotic dimension is added to his gaze, and a central image is added to the drama. His girlfriend Lisa, who does not interest him sexually, is more or less boring as long as she remains on the spectator's side. In fact, the fact that Jeffries' leg is broken also means that he is castrated in a sense. Jeffries' pursuit of power through the gaze only strengthens his impotence.

However, despite all this "genderless" position, when Lisa overcomes the barrier between his room and the building across the street, their relationship is reborn erotically. Jeffries not only spies Lisa through his binoculars as a distant, meaningful image, but also sees her as a guilty intruder, exposed by a dangerous man and threatened with punishment, and so he eventually saves her. Lisa's exhibitionism is already evidenced by her obsession with clothing and fashion, a passive image of visual perfection; Jeffries' actions are constructed through his work as a journalist-photographer, creating stories and capturing images. Yet his forced inertia, which binds him to his chair as a spectator, places Jeffries directly in the fantasy position of the moviegoer. In traditional film narrative, the spectator is in a passive position, because in traditional narrative, the story is so well-prepared and so dramatically organized that the spectator is captivated by it.

The fact that Jeff and the audience are watching what is happening in the other apartment causes the things on this side of the window to lose their importance for Jeff and the audience. Thus, what is happening around Jeff becomes less important. In this respect, *Rear Window* can be considered an ironic reversal of Bentham's Panopticon, as used by Foucault. Because, according to Bentham, the effect of the Panopticon is that the one being watched does not know when he is being watched, in other words, in his uncertainty. This creates the feeling that it is impossible to escape the gaze. In this film, those being watched in the apartment across the street continue their daily work. Here, the one who is terrified and who actually has the psychology of someone being watched is the reverse watcher. He

watches the other with the fear of missing anything. The center and area of influence of the panopticon is Jeff himself. (Barış, 2006:77).

The power that Foucault mentions, just like Hitchcock's cinema, does not prohibit but shapes and takes it upon itself to operate society – or the audience. In the atmosphere created by Hitchcock, identification is established in all its depth, and a path of control is opened for the audience. The audience also identifies with Jeffries and begins to watch the screen. The classic Rear Window created by Alfred Hitchcock carries deep meanings in itself regarding surveillance. In this film by Hitchcock, as in all his films, he delves into the depths of psychology and reveals the individual feelings of a man by adding many psychological fictions and subtexts.

5. Conclusions

Derived from the Greek "semion/sign", semiology is a branch of science that studies signs. Natural languages, behaviors, images, a piece of music, a picture, a theater play, a film, advertising posters, fashion, the alphabet for the deaf and dumb, literary works, the structure of transportation routes in a country, in short, every meaningful whole, whether it has a communication purpose or not, is a system consisting of various units. The units of these systems are generally called signs.

Natural languages (for example Turkish) that people use to communicate with each other, behaviors, various gestures (hand-arm-head movements), deaf-mute alphabet, images, traffic signs, spatial organization of a city, a musical piece, a painting, a theater performance, a film, advertising posters, fashion, literary works, various scientific languages, the order of passions, the structure of transportation routes in a country, an architectural arrangement, in short; every meaningful whole, whether it has a communication purpose or not, is a system consisting of various units. The units of these systems, which have different levels of realization, are generally called signs.

Hitchcock has made many innovations in the world of cinema, and his methods have been applied by many directors. The gender element in his films has been addressed from very different perspectives and narrated in an unusual style. While dealing with the subject, he bases the story on a classical narrative and develops the flow of the event by emphasizing the cause-effect relationship. He also constructs the time and space framework in a different way. The flow of events is narrated through the eyes of the main character, and the audience is included in the events experienced by the hero.

Fear and tension are the most basic characteristics of human nature and have contributed significantly to the development of universal culture. Although there are many types of fear in humans, one of the most dominant types of fear is the fear of death. The helplessness of humans in the face of death has led to different

searches for accepting the reality that death is a part of life. One of the mainstays of horror literature and films is this search. Especially deaths resulting from unnatural causes, such as murder, are more shocking for people, and horror and thriller films contribute to their internalization.

The film *Rear Window* is one of the director's important works that reflects his auteur directing characteristics. His appearance as a cameo in the 27th minute of the film as a man winding the clock in the composer's house, his successful reflection of the tension elements with the actors' facial expressions and gestures, the audience entering the events through Jeff's eyes with the lens, the evolution of the end of the film from chaos to order with negative and open photographs from the very beginning, and the strong performances of the actors despite the fact that it takes place in a single location, are all characteristics of Hitchcock, and the director's intelligence is revealed.

Rear Window has a special importance as the first film that brought the master director to the top. The film stands out by successfully blending many different elements such as morality, sexuality, love, and tension, as the director emphasizes with different narratives in his different films, as well as by successfully exemplifying these elements in a semiotic way. The film *Rear Window* contains all codes, denotation, connotation, metaphor and metonymy, from a semiotic perspective. The director has used all these codes successfully throughout the film and has added a separate depth and richness to the film with these elements. In *Rear Window*, several different topics (murder, love and neighborhood) are handled together from a semiotic perspective and all these topics are presented to the audience with simple narrative language and images.

"*Rear Window*" is not only a thriller but also emphasizes that people should approach the events around them in a more participatory and sensitive manner. This kind of social message has been skillfully handled in a thriller by an auteur director like Hitchcock. As a result, in a thriller like '*Rear Window*', which contains very rich semiotic codes, master director Hitchcock has presented a different perspective on the art of cinema from a semiotic perspective by building layers of meaning and has opened a window by developing a different perspective.

REFERENCES

- Adanır, O. (2010). "Baudrillard", *Fikir Mimarları Dizisi:22, Say Yayınları*, İstanbul, p. 83.
- Barış, J. (2006). "Sinemasal Özne ve Gözetlemenin İktidarı", *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, İstanbul, 2006, p. 75.
- Baudrillard, (2010). "Simülarklar ve Simülasyon", Çeviren: Oğuz Adanır, *Doğu Batı Yayınları*, Ankara, p. 53.

- Baudrillard, J. (2006). “Amerika”, Çeviren: Yaşar Avunç, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul, p.111.
- Baudrillard, J. (2006). “Kusursuz Cinayet”, Çeviren: Necmettin Sevil, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 93.
- Baudrillard, J. (2008). “Gösterge Ekonomi Polisiği Hakkında Bir Eleştiri”, Çeviren: Oğuz Adanır-Ali Bilgin, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2008, p. 183.
- Baudrillard, J. (2010). “Kötülüğün Şeffaflığı”, Çeviren: Işık Ergüden, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 61.
- Bauman, Z. (2010). “Küreselleşme: Toplumsal Sonuçları”, Çeviren: Abdullah Yılmaz, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 59.
- Berger, J. (2010). “Görme Biçimleri”, Çeviren: Yurdanur Salman, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 8.
- Çoban, B., Özarslan, Z. (2008). “Panoptikon Gözün İktidarı”, Su Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2008, p. 77.
- Dyer, G. (2010). “İletişim Olarak Reklamcılık”, Çeviren: M. Nurdan Öncel Taşkiran, Beta Basım, İstanbul, p. 166.
- Erol Mutlu, E. (2008). “İletişim Sözlüğü”, Ayraç Kitapevi, Ankara, p. 117.
- Fırat, M. (2008). “XX. Yüzyılda Dilbilim ve Göstergebilim Kuramları: 1. Tarihçe ve Eleştirel Düşünceler”, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 113.
- Foucault, M. (2000). “Hapishanenin Doğuşu”, Çeviren: Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara, p. 174.
- Foucault, M. (2005). “Büyük Kapatılma”, Çeviren: Işık Ergüden-Ferda Keskin, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 224.
- Guiraud, P. (1994). “Göstergebilim”, Çeviren: Mehmet Yalçın, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara, p. 17.
- Lyon, D. (1997). “Elektronik Göz-Gözetim Toplumunun Yükselişi”, Çeviren: Dilek Hattatoğlu, Sarmal Yayınevi, 1997, p. 42.
- Rıfat, M. (2007). “Homo Semioticus ve Genel Göstergebilim Sorunları”, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 8.
- Sartori, G. (2006). “Görmenin İktidarı, Homo Videns: Gören İnsan”, Çeviren: Gül Batuş-Bahar Ulukan, Karakutu Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006, p.154.
- Savk Belkaya, G. (2001). “Film Çözümlemede Temel Yaklaşımlar”, 2. Basım, Der Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 68.
- Serttaş Ertike, A. (2009). “Televizyonda Görüntü Düzenlemesi”, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Türkoğlu, N. (2000). “Görü-Yorum; Gündelik Yaşamda İmgelerin Gücü”, Der Yayınları, İstanbul, p.19.