

ULKOMAALAINEN/UTLÄNNINGEN/ YABANCI (1979-1981-1983) – A MOST TYPICAL MIGRANT ARCHIVAL OBJECT*

JOHN SUNDHOLM

This essay is written in the spirit of the vast number of recent studies that have questioned and deconstructed established notions and practices for (film) archives, while also transforming that criticism into practice by constructing counter-archives and mapping existing alternatives.¹ However, despite such important initiatives, which have been significant for the studies of migrant and transnational cinemas and have made it increasingly difficult to reproduce a conventional national—and often nationalistic—history, there are still some key problems affecting the theory and practice of alternative or diasporic archives. Every archive, marginal or hegemonic, is not only a place of power but also executes power, decides what to exclude or include, not to mention the fundamental question of what that constitutes the archival object. While these are challenges that affect every archive, I would argue that they are particularly pertinent for independent, or minor, migrant cinemas.²

I will explore these questions by presenting the case of the Finnish-Swedish-Turkish *Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabancı* [Foreigner] (Muammer Özer, 1981). This film constitutes an unruly object of cinema that has migrated in different ways, together with its filmmaker, across national borders, languages and media formats until finally being digitised in 2020 by the Swedish Film Institute into its Finnish version, *Ulkomaalainen*. The one and only out of the four versions to receive its premiere as a digital copy in the autumn of 2021 at the annual Restored Festival, organised by Deutsche Kinemathek in Berlin.

The trajectories of the film since its first version(s) as *Utlänningen/Yabancı* and its subsequent appearance in prints, negatives, tapes and digital files, as well as its current digital form as *Ulkomaalainen*, make the film a most typical object of migrant cinema, not in the sense of “being typical of” but rather in the sense proposed by David E. James in his now classic book *The Most Typi-*

cal Avant-Garde: History and Geography of Minor Cinemas in Los Angeles (2005). James' assertion that minor cinema practices, "a rainbow coalition of demotic cinemas: experimental, poetic, underground, ethnic, amateur, counter, non-commercial, working-class, critical, artists, orphan, and so on" (2005: 13), constitute the most typical avant-garde, is essentially a paraphrase of Viktor Shklovsky's suggestion that *Tristram Shandy* is the most typical novel (Shklovsky 1991). This should not be interpreted to mean that Sterne's novel is typical in the sense of constituting an archetypal exponent of the genre (which it is not), but that *Tristram Shandy* encompasses everything that characterises the novel as a genre. James' intention is thus to show that the heterogeneous range of minor cinema practices in Los Angeles, which operate outside Hollywood even though they are not necessarily standing in opposition to that commercial centre of film production, are in fact the true avant-garde. Similarly, my aim here is to show how *Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabancı*—which reached its hitherto final archival form in Finnish as *Ulkomaalainen* in 2020—questions the idea of what constitutes an archival object and encompasses everything that characterises the history of the archiving and circulation of an independently produced immigrant film, i.e. the most typical migrant archival film object.

HISTORY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

Independently produced films by migrant filmmakers—whether professional, semi-professional or amateur—challenge most common-sense practices when it comes to scholarly and archival procedures. This is because such films have often been produced under difficult conditions with limited resources, a fact that needs to be considered when studying the work. They thus reflect their conditions of production and are not a result of a privileged free will to choose "a poor image", "a raw look", or alternative forms of distribution.

Moreover, such films rarely have the opportunity of being shown to the general public, or of catching the interest of gatekeepers such as film critics. This in turn is because independently produced films by migrants seldom achieve any kind of regular or established distribution. And the few that do often play a minor role, as a marginal part of a larger program or context. This also makes it notoriously difficult to trace the history of their circulation.

This invisibility of these filmic objects, due to the conditions of production and distribution, is reinforced by their multilingual character, meaning that they have been filmed in a language other than the local hegemonic one(s). Thus, they have been viewed as linguistically foreign and "othered". This linguistic estrangement (which is always the product of the current hegemony of language use) is one of the main reasons why national archives have traditionally shown little interest in such films and have been reluctant to give them the status of historical objects by including them in their collections.

In addition to being as invisible as their creators, migratory filmic objects are also vulnerable and unstable objects of study. This makes them particularly challenging for film studies. However, as Paolo Cherchi Usai has argued in *The Death of Cinema*, the idea of the filmic object as "the model image", a stable, pristine entity, is nothing more than an ahistorical abstraction:

If all moving images could be experienced as a model image (that is, in their intended state, in an intention visible in every part of them even before their actual consumption), no such thing as film history would be needed or possible (Cherchi Usai 2001: 21).

Another implication of Usai's dictum, which has been taken up most notably by the proponents of so-called New Cinema History, is that we should shift our focus from film as text and object of interpretation to film as object(s) in circulation.³ This is particularly apt for migrant filmic objects

as these have usually circulated as a single print, constituting precarious objects that thereby emphasise the networks and social relations of which the films become a part, and which are their vital condition. Hence, it is a question not only of how a film circulates and is being received, but also of how the filmic object itself changes. The historiography for these films is thus rather a historiography of cultural and social relations, of uses and practices, while the filmic object itself is often in constant flux, always migrating. This poses some crucial challenges for archival practices and calls some fundamental procedures of archiving into questions, as the film is a fugitive object that will now be preserved and fixed as an original filmic object in order to serve as an expression of history. The paradox is that this often goes against what the history of the film and its various prints and tapes actually constitute.

PRODUCTION

The history of production, re-production, distribution and circulation of *Ulkomaalainen* is convoluted. It covers a lengthy period, involving different geographies and heterogeneous material because the film has appeared in different versions over the years. The film was originally shot in Finland and Turkey during the years 1973-1978.⁴

Ulkomaalainen is a semi-documentary film that was edited and directed by Özer, who also plays the leading role. Most of the footage was shot by Özer and his childhood friend Kemal Çinar; Özer filmed most the documentary footage, whereas Çinar was responsible for the fiction scenes (in which Özer is usually the protagonist). Others who contributed to the camera work were Muammer's Finnish wife, Synnöve Özer, (who had no previous training in filmmaking), and Oguz Makal (who would become one of the most prominent scholars of film studies in Turkey). It was Makal who shot the brief sequences in super-8 showing a Turkish Labour Day demonstra-

tion. In addition, there is a substantial amount of found footage and other pre-existing visual material. There is extensive material from an unknown Turkish propaganda film, although Özer also uses images from Turkish newspapers and magazines. Overall, this polyvocal, multi-material and semi-professional way of filmmaking reflects the conditions of production: *Ulkomaalainen* was completely self-financed and therefore dependent on a network of friends and the extensive use of pre-existing material.

Özer began working on his film while he was a student at what at the time was Finland's only film school, the University of Art and Design in Helsinki. He had ended up in Helsinki as a refugee after taking the opportunity to escape when he was temporarily released from prison awaiting trial in Turkey. While imprisoned, he had been tortured. Before leaving Turkey, he had made a few shorts and commercials, and he would continue shooting short political documentaries arriving in Finland. Compared to the rest of his filmography at the time, *Ulkomaalainen* was by far his most ambitious project. He would, however, be unable to finish the film in Finland, and in 1978, after finishing film school, the Özers decided to move to Sweden where there were better opportunities for filmmaking. In addition to the far superior material resources for filmmaking at the Swedish Film Institute and the public television broadcaster, Sweden had also established co-ops and organisations like *Filmcentrum* and the Stockholm Film Workshop (*Filmverkstan*), which distributed or produced documentaries and short films. Due to increasing immigration (in contrast to Finland, which at the time was more a country of emigration, predominantly to Sweden) there was also a plethora of cultural organisations for immigrants.⁵ Muammer Özer's first years in Sweden would turn out to be very productive, and eventually he would manage to shoot several feature films in Turkey towards the late 1980s and

AFTER ARRIVING IN SWEDEN, ÖZER CAME INTO CONTACT WITH THE STOCKHOLM WORKSHOP FILMVERKSTAN AND HE STARTED IMMEDIATELY TO WORK ON SHORT FILMS THAT DEPICTED THE EXPERIENCE OF IMMIGRANTS IN SWEDEN

early 1990s that were Turkish-Swedish co-productions.⁶

After arriving in Sweden, Özer came into contact with the Stockholm workshop *Filmverkstan* and he started immediately to work on short films that depicted the experience of immigrants in Sweden. He would also complete *Ulkomaalainen* in two versions, with different voice-overs, one in Turkish and the other in Swedish, which were produced without any aid from the film workshop. The finished films were of substantial length, 88 minutes, which is quite uncommon for a documentary intended to be distributed on 16mm film.

The Swedish version has an interestingly accented polyvocality due to that neither of the three voice-overs speak standard Swedish. Muammer's wife, who belongs to the Swedish-speaking minority in Finland, has a distinct accent, and the other two voices, both male, are even more othered: Muammer hardly knew Swedish at the time and speaks the language with great effort, while the Özers' Finnish friend, Erkki Rynänen, has a noticeable Finnish accent.

The use of voice-over and the lack of any dialogue gives the film a clear documentary and didactic character. However, the main storyline is fictitious and the film moves freely between fiction and documentary, containing both direct documentary imagery and symbolic, subjectively expressionist sequences. After a visionary prologue in which we are shown a man who is going to hang himself on a bare tree in the midst of a frozen waste, we are introduced to a young

Turkish man who arrives in Helsinki looking for work. His dream is to earn money and to become wealthy and free. The narrative unfolds along the two main strands of documentary and fiction. The first uses a voice-over and images that recount the immigrant's efforts to find employment, obtaining the necessary work and residence permits. The subjective and expressionist imagery is accompanied by music or sound effects that represent the migrant's experience in the new country. The feelings of alienation increase until the migrant is reminded of the political situation at home in Turkey. This shift of perspective takes place when a childhood friend gets in touch, sending him letters and packages with magazines and newspapers about the ongoing political struggle back home. His situation in Finland does not improve, and finally, when he receives a telegram that informs him of his friend's death, he realises that he also has to take up the political struggle in his new country: not as an immigrant, but as a worker, and without being tempted by the promises of consumer capitalism that will only result in the reification of his life-world and his socio-emotional condition.

CIRCULATION AND CULTURAL REASSESSMENT

According to Muammer Özer, the first two versions of *Ulkomaalainen* were shown at a few minor festivals in both Sweden and Turkey.⁷ I have not been able to find any documentation of these except for one screening in Sweden during an extended program that ran for ten days in December 1979, titled *Människa på väg* [Human on the Move]. This program of films by and about immigrants was co-organised by the Immigrant's Cultural Association and the Swedish Red Cross at the Swedish Film Institute. It is characteristic of the Swedish context that the focus was exclusively on immigration, even though the 1979 version of the film had overtly political content. The focus

is on the political economics of migration and in the Swedish version a female voice-over presents a Marxist analysis of the dynamics of capitalism and the exploitation of a cheap migrant workforce. However, the film not only addresses the question of migration and the circulation of cheap labour from a Marxist political position, but also takes a stand on the turbulent political situation in 1970s Turkey. *Ulkomaalainen* also differs from the usual migrant stories in the way it establishes its geographical counterpart, i.e. the immigrant's place of origin. Özer does not depict a private home that is left behind, and which he longs for nostalgically, but a political struggle that his protagonist has abandoned. Some of the footage from Turkey is very graphic, showing mutilated bodies, but Özer also gives space to two of the most legendary militant left-wing figures of the early 1970s, Mahir Çayan and Deniz Gezmiş, who were executed in 1972 by the military regime (Çayan and Özer were in fact imprisoned at the same military prison in Turkey).⁸ That it is this political emotional homeland that the migrant has left behind is stressed by the use in the film of the poetry of Nazim Hikmet and the music of Ruhi Su, both celebrated radicals who spent considerable time in prison due to their political opinions and activities.

In terms of overall content, *Ulkomaalainen* is thus not a very typical migrant film, as the retelling of the political situation in Turkey, the lead-up to the coup in 1971 and its aftermath take up a substantial part of the story. However, thematically and stylistically in particular, it is a representative exponent of independent, exile and migrant filmmaking, with an aesthetic that corresponds directly to Hamid Naficy's concept of "accented cinema" (Naficy, 2001). The style of the film is characterised by an aesthetic that reflects the existential conditions of its production. It has an open structure, and is fragmented, autobiographical and multilingual, characteristics that Naficy argues are a reflection of the migrant's position and response to her/his diasporic and dis-

placed situation. However, the entanglement of the two different discourses of documentary and fiction, in which the political didactic is particularly strong, calls for another perspective on migrant and exile cinema, an approach that is less anchored in a textualist-aesthetic position. Here, I would like to draw attention to Zuzana M. Pick's work on the exile and migrant cinema of Chile of the 1970s and 1980s, research that preceded Naficy's as it was published in the 1980s (Pick, 1987, 1989).⁹

One of the peculiarities of the Chilean cinema of the 1970s and 1980s is that it was predominantly made elsewhere. It was a cinema of migration that has forced the National Cineteca in Chile to collect films made by Chilean exiles during the years of the Pinochet regime. Pick does not approach exile and migration cinema as necessarily being embodied in, and expressed through, certain stylistic or narrative formulas, but instead considers exile from a consistent perspective of culture and production. Her point is that a filmmaker in exile has "to reassess cultural practice", which implies that you not only have to change your language and aesthetics but also have to undergo a more fundamental process: to reassess not only your methods and skills but also who and where you are, and consequently to ponder how to articulate and communicate that new experience (a reassessment that does not necessarily lead to accented filmmaking) (Pick, 1987: 54). Your situation is fundamentally new; existentially, materially and politically. Muammer Özer has described it as a new becoming, but as one in which you are subordinated: when you are forced to learn a new language as an adult, you are "like a child in a new country" (Özer, 2001: 8, my translation). Another Turkish immigrant, the German-Turkish author Emine Özdamar has expressed it more poetically: in the foreign language, she argues, "words do not have a childhood", an idea that also stresses the themes of loss and alienation (Özdamar, 1998: 44, my translation).

An essential part of the reassessment of cultural practice that is brought to the fore is the re-negotiation of what we consider to constitute the so-called subject-object divide that is so important in filmmaking and cinematic aesthetics: the question of what is outside or inside, objective or subjective, imagined or real. Do we look at the screen as a window out to a surrounding world? Do we see a narrative ordering of the images or sequences, or rather a series of images that direct our gaze back on ourselves? One of the striking characteristics of *Ulkomaalainen* is the persistent blending of documentary and fiction, of found footage and staged scenes—thereby suggesting the constant presence of a surrounding world with which we have to renegotiate our relationship. And for the migrant filmmaker this is not only a question of aesthetics, but also of the actual filmic object that is in circulation, because your lack of access to the established channels of circulation also forces you to reconsider where to show your films and in which form and format. The reassessment that Pick considers to be the main condition of exile and migrant cinema is thus a practice in a very direct and material sense, in addition to the aesthetic and stylistic features (defined by Naficy as “accented”), which of course are also part of your re-evaluation of your practice. The migrant filmmaker must seize any opportunity to make a film and get it distributed, to be prepared to revise prints and copies in order to reach a bigger audience. As a migrant, no subject-object relationship can be taken for granted and you will have to be prepared always to renegotiate your relationship to the surrounding society.

This is why Özer cut the film by more than half its original length in 1981 in order to increase the opportunities for exhibition. The first version had a Turkish voice-over that apparently also reached minor festivals, although again documentation on this is lacking. In 1983, an opportunity arose for Özer to have the film broadcast on Swedish television as part of a program slot for Finnish immi-

ÖZER CUT THE FILM BY MORE THAN HALF ITS ORIGINAL LENGTH IN 1981 IN ORDER TO INCREASE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXHIBITION

grants. The Finns were at the time Sweden’s largest immigrant group, providing the country with a cheap labour force who took care of the same tasks that the character played by Özer does in *Ulkomaalainen*. Another short, *Jordmannen* [The Earthman] (Muammer Özer, 1980), which also depicts an immigrant story and which Özer shot and completed after his arrival in Sweden, had already been broadcast on Swedish public television in 1980, and would be shown again in 1984 in the Finnish programming time slots scheduled for Saturday mornings. While *Jordmannen* was subtitled (it has both dialogue and a voice-over), *Ulkomaalainen* was provided with a Finnish voice-over because it has no dialogue. It was broadcast on Swedish television on the 26th of November 1983, as a 37-minute short on a Saturday morning, as part of the 90-minute program titled *Finska program* [Finnish programs], sandwiched in between a short documentary on boxing in Finland and the weekly news in Finnish. It is the material for that print (sound and image negatives) that has been deposited in the archive of the Swedish Film Institute and that thus constitutes today’s archival object out of which the current digital copy has been made. In other words, the preserved material of the film consists of one picture negative and two different soundtracks, one in Turkish and another in Finnish. Although I have not been able to track the history of the circulation of the Turkish version, the Finnish one was made exclusively for the broadcast in Sweden. There is thus no short version of *Ulkomaalainen* with Swedish voice-over and the film has subsequently been a linguistically “foreign” object whenever shown in Sweden.

When *Ulkomaalainen* was cut down to its current length—it could not really be described as a re-edit as the shorter version has the same order of the sequences—it not only achieved another linguistic belonging but also created new possibilities for circulation. Being shot on 16mm film was always an advantage if the duration was not more than 60 minutes because the print could fit on one reel, making it possible to take full advantage of the mobile technology that the 16mm projector still constituted in the 1980s. Özer had tried to expand the distribution opportunities by having the film transferred on to a U-matic tape, which was also taken for distribution by the Swedish co-op, *FilmCentrum*. However, at the time the possibilities offered by U-matic were actually more limited than those of 16mm film, as it never enjoyed the same level of use by schools and associations as the more affordable, portable 16mm projector. On the other hand, one of the crucial consequences of the shorter version of *Ulkomaalainen* was not only that it was better suited to the widely used 16mm technology and to television program duration policies, but also that it consolidated immigration as the focus of the film. This was because the new edit of the film stressed its accented character (in Naficy's sense) and it was more fragmented due to having been shortened considerably. And because of the conditions of distribution and circulation, the film became better suited to migrant (or accented) cinema, as it were.

ARCHIVAL AFTERLIFE

As independently produced immigrant films are exceptional in terms of production, distribution and actual circulation, they are also exceptional as objects of study. The trajectory and history of *Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabancı* is a paradigmatic example of this. Established theories of archival practice, such as Giovanna Fossati's ground-breaking book *From Grain to Pixel: The*

Archival Life of Film in Transition (2009), reflect the shortcomings of common archival practices. However, the categorisations used in Fossati's book are nevertheless useful for exploring the problematics of a migrant archival object such as Özer's film.

Fossati distinguishes between four approaches to the archival life of film: "film as original", "film as art", "film as *dispositif*" and "film as state of the art" (Fossati, 2009: 117-131). Of these four categories, the first three are of direct relevance to a film like *Ulkomaalainen*. The "film as original" approach can be considered the very foundational idea of the archive. When you claim that there is an original object you establish an artefact and argue for its preservation. As Fossati argues, although the idea of the original can certainly be questioned and problematised, to claim originality for an artefact is a necessary aim of archival practices (Fossati, 2009: 117-123). When working with independently produced migrant cinemas, the act of establishing the original is an ultimate archival goal, as this is a way of acknowledging the film and its filmmaker. However, as in the case with *Ulkomaalainen*, the question of the original is not really relevant when there are different originals, with substantially different later versions that could equally be claimed to be originals too. Nevertheless, the "film as original" framework is such a strong part of the institutional idea of cultural heritage and of any national archive that it is difficult to ignore. It is a claim that will have to be made for a film in order for it to be acknowledged.

For the "film as art" approach, Fossati identifies two different meanings (Fossati, 2009: 123-126). Archival faithfulness to film as medium, the imperative that a film has to be archived in its original format, or the approach that a film constitutes a unique product of an *auteur* and therefore has to be archived in a way that is true to the director's original intentions. Because a film such as *Ulkomaalainen* is a precarious object in migration, it has been forced to appear in different forms

WHEN WORKING WITH INDEPENDENTLY PRODUCED MIGRANT CINEMAS, THE ACT OF ESTABLISHING THE ORIGINAL IS AN ULTIMATE ARCHIVAL GOAL, AS THIS IS A WAY OF ACKNOWLEDGING THE FILM AND ITS FILMMAKER

and formats, which are all of equal importance to the director or to those who were involved in the making of the film. Thus, a common-sense archival theory that presupposes a stable object is not able to deal with such a volatile film as *Ulkomaalainen*.

While both the “film as original” and “film as art” frameworks are based on the idea that there is a single artefact that is to be the object of preservation, of storage and confirmation, Fossati’s third category, “film as *dispositif*”, deals with exhibition and programming (Fossati, 2009: 126-130). *Dispositif* is the situation “where the film meets its user”, which, according to Fossati, “allows for a different way to look at films, namely, as dynamic objects where the material and conceptual artifacts are bound together” (Fossati, 2009: 127). “Film as *dispositif*” implies that every time a film is being shown it acquires a new meaning, an idea that highlights the challenge for any archival practice when faced with an object such as *Ulkomaalainen*. While Fossati tends to focus on the idea of the same object being shown in different venues and through different technologies and media formats, it could well be argued that the different formats of *Ulkomaalainen* constitute different *dispositifs*, different ways of mediating and communicating a particular narrative for different audiences and different language communities, in the forms of tape, print or digital file.

Of course, the three approaches, “film as original”, “film as art” and “film as *dispositif*” overlap. They also express three different ways of implementing archival policies. “Film as original” is at

the very core of an archive’s authority but the question is how much it actually contributes to our understanding of the meaning of a particular film, since a film should not be—and in fact is not—bound to a particular object or print. What *Ulkomaalainen* shows is that a single film always gives rise to different films—in terms of reception, different prints or tapes, and versions—and that these form part of the history of that particular film. As the German archivist Enno Patalas suggested, all those poor 16mm prints of German silent classics that had recorded music and were screened at the wrong speed in the 1950s should be archived because “these versions belong to the history of these films as much as their supposed ‘original’ versions” (Patalas, 1998: 29). Patalas thus concludes that “[e]ach print is a kind of ‘original’, and each performance unique” (Patalas, 1998: 38). This should not, however, be considered an argument in line with Borges’ well-known parable about the making of a full-scale map, “On Exactitude in Science”, the scientific fantasy of being able to map history in its totality. However, for marginal or minor and independent migrant cinema in particular, Patalas’ statement has a completely valid and direct meaning as both the prints and actual screenings are fewer in number, being a film culture that has a subordinate position, a culture of exception and vulnerability in which every occasion thus bears more significance. The question is how all of this may be accounted for in the archival afterlife of the current version of *Ulkomaalainen*, the modified version of a previous film that gives only one perspective on its history as a film—and that reproduces that new history when screened in its current digital format.

CONCLUSION: ARCHIVAL AFTERLIVES

Ulkomaalainen is a typical exile and migrant film, and archival artefact, given its history as a cinematic object and its trajectory relative to questions of film heritage and historical acknowledgement.

The fact that it is a film that exists in several languages but that belongs nowhere makes it characteristic of this type of film. *Ulkomaalainen* was not finished until Özer moved to Sweden and, as mentioned above, it was originally of a feature-film length and had a voice-over in Swedish that represented an accented polyvocality in its use of voice-over. The lack of dialogue emphasises the documentary and didactic aspirations of the film but also stresses the displacement of the migrant and allows the film to travel across cultures. It is always easier to subtitle a film that only has voice-over, or a voice-over in another language could even be created. When there is no dialogue, the language is never embodied in the people on the screen, and thus the film may migrate more easily.

Another peculiarity of *Ulkomaalainen* is that the film has never actually been screened in the country where most of it was made, and that in Sweden the main context of exhibition has been the Finnish immigrant community. In Turkey, *Yabancı* has been screened at minor film festivals. The film has therefore been largely misplaced and has never existed in relation to its surrounding society. In 2020, when the film was digitised by the Swedish Film Institute and was taken up for distribution by Filmform (Sweden's archive for artist's film and video), it became acknowledged as a part of the Swedish film heritage. The digital format increases its accessibility but is only able to offer one part of a quite complicated history of migration that extends across countries and different conditions of production. *Ulkomaalainen* thus raises interesting questions about archival policies, film heritage, film history and the history of circulation and distribution. These can never be answered as such but would have to be addressed through programming that raises the questions in new ways, i.e. by showing different versions in different contexts.

Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabancı is a film that has two primary production contexts: Finland and Turkey. Yet although it tells a story about

a Turkish migrant in Finland, the film only has a proper public screening history in Sweden, where it was broadcast on television in a context targeting another immigrant community. The film raises questions not only about where it belongs, but also about how we construct and reproduce a film heritage, what we acknowledge as historical objects and communities within the framework of a nation and a national archival apparatus such as the Swedish Film Institute. As the Institute is the most powerful organisation for film in Sweden, its historical acknowledgement of *Ulkomaalainen* is significant. This politics of recognition has begun receiving governmental and institutional support in recent years, and this change in cultural policy is partly responsible for the digitisation of the film. With the aim of embracing diversity and Sweden's multicultural history, the Swedish Film Institute has also begun to allocate resources for making artefacts such as *Ulkomaalainen* accessible and acknowledge it as part of Swedish film's cultural heritage. While digitising and archiving the film is certainly a positive step, it is not enough merely to establish *Ulkomaalainen* as a historical object to which we now have access. For such a typical migrant archival object, the different versions and forms should also be made available in order for its complicated history to be displayed, and its migratory and material history to be acknowledged. Archiving and programming are connected, and since a most typical migrant object such as *Ulkomaalainen* is a fugitive object, this connection should always be brought to light in order to expose the convoluted trajectory of *Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabancı*. Its history and programming should not be limited to one digital

copy, but expanded to multiple prints and copies, to archival afterlives. ■

NOTES

- * This article is the result of the research project titled “Cartografías del cine de movilidad en el Atlántico hispánico” [Cartographies of Cinema of Mobility in the Hispanic Atlantic] (CSO2017-85290-P), financed by the Ministry of Science and Innovation - State Research Agency, and the European Research Development Fund.
- 1 See for example Blouin and Rosenberg (2011) for a comprehensive overview from the archivist’s point of view. In her recent appeal for a global approach to audiovisual heritage, Giovanna Fossati mentions a number of alternative and diasporic archival projects (Fossati 2021). Fossati’s essay also contains a self-criticism of her seminal work published in 2009.
 - 2 See Andersson and Sundholm (2019), pp. 115-130 and Sundholm (2021).
 - 3 Two seminal anthologies on New Cinema History are Maltby, Biltereyst and Meers (2011) and Biltereyst, Maltby and Meers (2019).
 - 4 The film also includes a very short segment in Germany, shot by Özer, who resided in Munich for a while before returning to Turkey and being imprisoned.
 - 5 See Andersson and Sundholm (2019) for different associations and organisations that became important for immigrant filmmakers in Sweden.
 - 6 *En handfull paradis/Bir avuç cennet* [A Handful of Paradise] (1987); *Kara Sevdalı Bulut/Det förälskade molnet* [The Cloud in Love] (1990); *Hollywood-rymlingar/Hollywood Kaçakları* [Hollywood Fugitives] (1998).
 - 7 Interview with Muammer Özer, 15 October 2021.
 - 8 1960s Turkey was characterised by an increasing political radicalisation that led to violent clashes between left and right wing, and the emergence of militant extra-parliamentary groups. Mahir Çayan and Deniz Gezmiş were the leaders of two leftist factions, the Turkish People’s Liberation Party/Front and the Turkish People’s Liberation Army, which in 1970 began engaging in what has been described as urban

guerrilla warfare (Zürcher 2004). The unrest led to a military coup in March 1971 and the beginning of a turbulent and violent decade that plunged the country into almost continuous civil war throughout the 1970s. In 1980, a new military coup took place.

For a discussion and critique of Naficy’s concept “accented cinema”, see Andersson and Sundholm (2019).

REFERENCES

- Andersson, L. G., Sundholm, J. (2019). *The Cultural Practice of Immigrant Filmmaking. Minor Immigrant Cinemas in Sweden 1950-1990*. Intellect. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvj4svn5>
- Biltereyst, D., Maltby, R., Meers, P. (eds.) (2019). *The Routledge Companion to New Cinema History*. London: Routledge.
- Blouin, F., Rosenberg, W. (2011). *Processing the Past. Contesting Authority in History and the Archives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cherchi Usai, P. (2001). *The Death of Cinema. History, Cultural Memory and the Digital Dark Age*. London: BFI.
- Fossati, G. (2009). *From Grain to Pixel. The Archival Life of Film in Transition*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Fossati, G. (2021). For a Global Approach to Audiovisual Heritage. A Plea for North/South exchange in Research and Practice. *NECSUS. European Journal of Media Studies*, 10 (2), 127-133.
- James, D. (2005). *The Most Typical Avant-Garde: History and Geography of Minor Cinemas in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Maltby, R., Biltereyst, D., Meers, P. (eds.) (2011). *Explorations in New Cinema History*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Naficy, H. (2001). *An Accented Cinema. Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Özdamar, E. (1998). *Mutterzunge*. Köln: Kiepenhauer & Witsch.
- Özer, M. (2001). *Att vara eller icke vara filmare - det är frågan ... Den förlorade generationen*. Stockholm, unpublished report.

- Patalas, E. (1998). On "Wild" Film Restoration, or Running a Minor Cinematheque. *Journal of Film Preservation*, 56, 28-38.
- Pick, Z. M. (1987). Chilean Cinema in exile 1973-1986. The Notion of Exile: A Field of Investigation and its Conceptual Framework. *Framework*, 34, 39-57.
- Pick, Z. M. (1989). The Dialectical Wanderings of Exile. *Screen*, 30 (4), 48-65.
- Shklovsky, V. (1991). The Novel as Parody. In Shklovsky, *Theory of Prose* (pp. 147-170). Champaign & London: Dalkey Archive Press
- Sundholm, J. (2021). History in the Making: Minor Immigrant Film Studies as Memory Activism. In Juvonen, A. and Lindemann Lino, V. (eds.), *Negotiations of Migration: Reexamining the past and present in Contemporary Europe* (pp. 167-184). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Zürcher, Erik J. (2004). *Turkey. A Modern History*. 3rd. edition. London: I.B. Tauris.

ULKOMAALAINEN/UTLÄNNINGEN/YABANCI (1979-1981-1983) – A MOST TYPICAL MIGRANT ARCHIVAL OBJECT

Abstract

This article explores the history and archival trajectory of the Finnish-Swedish-Turkish film *Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabancı* [Foreigner], made by the Turkish immigrant Muammer Özer. By examining the connection between the history of its production and of the distribution of its various versions, it is argued that this film constitutes “a most typical migrant archival object”. This kind of film is always a fugitive object, and thus both archiving and programming has to consider its heterogeneous history as well as its multiple forms and versions.

Key words

Muammer Özer; Archive; Historiography; Programming; Migration.

Author

John Sundholm is professor in Cinema Studies at Stockholm University and has published widely on minor cinemas and memory studies. His latest book is the co-authored *The Cultural Practice of Immigrant Filmmaking: Minor Immigrant Cinemas in Sweden 1950-1990* (2019). Sundholm also works as a programmer and since 2002 has been the director of Scandinavia’s only regular international experimental film event, AVANT. Contact: John.sundholm@ims.su.se.

Article reference

Sundholm, J. (2022). *Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabancı* (1979-1981-1983) – a most typical migrant archival object. *L’Atalante. Revista de estudios cinematográficos*, 34, 103-114.

ULKOMAALAINEN/UTLÄNNINGEN/YABANCI (1979-1981-1983) – UN OBJETO DE ARCHIVO MIGRANTE EXTREMADAMENTE TÍPICO

Resumen

El presente artículo explora la historia y la trayectoria archivística del filme finlandés-sueco-turco *Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabancı* [Extranjero], realizado por el inmigrante turco Muammer Özer. Mediante un estudio de la conexión entre la historia de su producción y la de la distribución de sus distintas versiones, se argumenta que la película constituye «un objeto de archivo migrante extremadamente representativo». Esta clase de película es siempre un objeto fugitivo, y por ello tanto el archivo como la programación debe tener en cuenta la heterogeneidad de su historia así como sus múltiples formas y versiones.

Palabras clave

Muammer Özer; Archivo; Historiografía; Programación; Migración.

Autor

John Sundholm es profesor de Estudios Cinematográficos en la Universidad de Estocolmo y ha publicado numerosos ensayos y artículos sobre cines minoritarios y estudios de la memoria. Su último libro es el estudio colaborativo *The Cultural Practice of Immigrant Filmmaking: Minor Immigrant Cinemas in Sweden 1950-1990* (2019). Sundholm también trabaja como programador y, desde 2002, dirige el único evento regular de cine experimental internacional en Escandinavia, AVANT. Contacto: John.sundholm@ims.su.se.

Referencia de este artículo

Sundholm, J. (2022). *Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabancı* (1979-1981-1983) – un objeto de archivo migrante extremadamente típico. *L’Atalante. Revista de estudios cinematográficos*, 34, 103-114.

recibido/received: 22.12.2021 | aceptado/accepted: 11.03.2022

Edita / Published by



Licencia / License



ISSN 1885-3730 (print) / 2340-6992 (digital) DL V-5340-2003 WEB www.revistaatalante.com MAIL info@revistaatalante.com