"Migration and Cinematic Process: The Post-communist Post-colonial,"
Berghahn, D. and Sternberg, Cl. (eds)
European Cinema in Motion: Migrant and Diasporic Film in Contemporary Europe,
London: Palgrave, 2010, 50-76.

Migration and Cinematic Process in Post-Cold War Europe

Dina Iordanova

Introduction

The year 1989 remains of definitive importance for the recent migratory and diasporic dynamics of Europe at large, and for European migrant and diasporic cinema in particular. Many of the developments that define today's Europe were, directly or indirectly, triggered by the events of that year, including German reunification, the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the wars of Yugoslavia's succession in the 1990s, and the 2004 enlargement of the European Union which saw the admission of a range of former communist countries.

After the end of the Cold War, global migration and diasporic cultural expression intensified, imposing a new understanding of transnational human interactions. Countries that had been traditional sources of emigration were turning into countries of immigration; worlds that had been unlikely to touch or collide now intersected and overlapped. The new movements consolidated the status of older European diasporas, of migrants who had arrived in the West at an earlier point: all of a sudden the Turks of Germany, the Algerians of France and the Jamaicans, Indians and Pakistanis of the UK came across as well-established mature settlers whose presence and creative voices were clearly an inherent part of the artistic and discursive fabric of the respective countries. This 'maturing' of diasporas took place against the background of new arrivals, mostly from the former Soviet bloc: migrants driven away by the wars in former Yugoslavia throughout the 1990s, Polish construction workers or other migrants from the Ukraine, Romania and Bosnia, whose influx posed new challenges to

understanding and managing immigration. Eastern European countries, while being a source of significant outmigration, were simultaneously turning into immigrant-receiving countries. Sometimes in transit to the West and sometimes as permanent settlers, Chinese migrants opened take-aways, Vietnamese migrants ran cheap good shops, and North African migrants engaged in complex transnational trade networks. There was yet another significant population shift, reflecting the multi-layered nature of the former Eastern bloc, in which people from less prosperous former communist countries flocked to more affluent ones. The migratory litanies of Europe's largest transnational minority, the Roma, were indicative of these economic hierarchies and inequalities.[i]

This chapter investigates aspects of our understanding of Europe's migrant and diasporic cinema that were defined by these population shifts and the specific migratory patterns triggered by the end of communism:

First of all, I endeavour to show that the prevailing economic and political discourse of progressive transition from centrally-controlled state socialism to free market capitalism as put forward in the social sciences, which builds on visions of straightforward and linear postcommunist evolution, is not supported by the narratives that emerged in the context of European cinema of the period. Intentionally or otherwise, a range of cinematic texts reveal that the European status quo of the post-Cold War era is more appropriately addressed if one recognises that the state of affairs is marked by a specific postcolonial condition. Films and other narrative arts tell the 'real' story of movements, inequalities, cultural hierarchies and exclusion in contemporary Europe, and disciplines like history, anthropology, cultural, literary and film studies have, to some extent, acknowledged that the postcolonial framework is particularly suitable to study these processes and texts in the postcommunist context.

Secondly, I am concerned with some of the themes that characterise the representation of post-Cold War migrations in cinema. A wide range of films featuring new migrants

interacting within multiethnic urban neighbourhoods have recently been made across various European countries; I believe these make up a critical body of works that enable us to discover and define a new film genre, one which is specifically European and which I tentatively call ‘cinema of the metropolitan multicultural margin’.

Next, I argue for a transnational treatment, i.e. for a methodology that transcends the discrete and ultimately limited national frameworks in favour of ‘watching across borders’ and takes the cinematic discourse to a level that rises above the national. The diverse films of migrant and diasporic cinema reveal an expanding universe of multicultural conviviality; they can no longer be studied as a mosaic of isolated cultural phenomena idiosyncratic to specific national contexts. One increasingly recognises that the localities of migrant productions are spatially disjointed and that audiences too live in diasporic conditions scattered around the globe.

Finally, I look at some specific career pathways of transnational film professionals in the new Europe. The post-Cold War migrations of East Europeans differ substantially from earlier resettlements that took place in the aftermath of WWII and into the early 1960s, which produced compact migrant communities and thriving milieus for what came to be known as European migrant cinema in countries like Germany or France from the 1990s onwards. Nowadays filmmakers operate more in a mode of perpetual dynamics rather than in an exilic or diasporic one; their trans-border moves are less permanent and more project-based. I illustrate the specifics of these new migratory patterns by looking at recent creative trajectories of film directors, actors and other professionals. This reveals that, ironically, the most important Eastern European films on post-Cold War migrations have often been made by filmmakers who are not migrants themselves.

Postcommunism: Transitology and Postcoloniality

In the context of historical time at large, the Soviet Empire may have been a short-lived phenomenon, yet the tremors of its demise are clearly felt across the continent. The reality of contemporary Europe is one where the established links within the former Soviet bloc's 'sphere of influence' were severed overnight and replaced by new, often rushed, affiliations that essentially formed another sphere where disparities persist; a contested pecking order has been taken down to be replaced by another, equally challenging one. In the new configuration, economic inequalities and cultural incompatibilities not only persisted but predefined the outcomes of many undertakings; peripherally located countries were often reassigned from previous dependencies to the position of satellites to emerging sovereigns. The ongoing redistribution of wealth and power was often disguised through a Europe-wide rhetoric of deficiency of supposedly culturally inferior areas that are traditionally located in the South East or East of Europe.

History textbooks of the future may describe the post-Cold War period as a time during which the Eastern European countries underwent a clear-cut passage from authoritarian political regimes and centrally controlled state socialist economies to democratic forms of government and free markets. At least this is the way in which the postcommunist period has come to be interpreted and represented within an interdisciplinary spread known as *transitology,* which includes a mix of political science, law, economics, and various aspects of finance and governance-related know-how. It is an axiom of transitology that the times after the end of the Cold War are seen as a period marked by linear progressive advancement from state socialism, a form of centralised social organisation that has been exposed as inferior, to a free market economy model that has been verified as superior. Initially influenced by Francis Fukuyama's pronouncements of the triumphant superiority of Western capitalism and democracy over all centrally run societies (in his essay 'The End of History' of 1989 which

appeared as a longer book in 1993) and by the economic theories of Jeffrey Sachs, who acted as advisor to various Eastern European countries in their transition from planned to market economies, the ideology of transitology evolved and took various shapes and manifestations across the region. Its main premise, however, assumed an inherent sameness and equality between all nations across the New Europe. It operated with an optimistic view of the future, where at the end of the 'transit' period, Eastern European nations triumphantly 'arrive' at free market democracy and 'return' to a united enlarged Europe where they naturally belong. The emerging civil society was constituted as 'a core concept of emancipation culture' (Kennedy 2002: 49) and as 'the subject of history and spokesman for transitions necessity' (ibid.: 46). The formal acceptance of a number of former Eastern bloc countries into the European Union in its enlargements in 2004 and 2007 represented important milestones in the context of the transition; disciplines like economics or political science that were preoccupied with these developments dominated the studies of the area.

On the other hand, scholars who were not directly concerned with the practicalities of the transition but were focused on the rapidly transforming social milieu, often saw similarities between the processes of postcommunism and those of postcolonialism. Some, like Milica Bakic-Hayden and Robert Hayden (1992), compared the on-going dissolution of large former multinational federations like the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia to the partition of India and spoke of concepts like Orientalism and postcoloniality, where earlier colonisation from powerful state socialist entities was gradually being replaced by new subtle forms of colonisation by the West. These critical views, however, were not only not taken up but frequently refuted by a choir of political scientists and economists who did not see much value in such an approach as what mattered at this point was not to question the emancipation from the communist state, but to facilitate the transition of these countries to Western-style democracies, no matter at what cost. Thus, disciplines that were linked with the practical and

concrete political dimension of postcommunism moved within the transitologist paradigm and enjoyed a high public profile. Scholars who found the less linear and more complex postcolonial framework better suited to understanding the reality of post-Cold War Europe, remained confined to their own disciplines like history, anthropology, comparative literature and cultural studies.

As David Chioni Moore observed, despite the fact that the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the system of its state socialist satellites evoked numerous parallels with those areas of the world extensively interpreted through the postcolonial framework, the matter remained shrouded in 'two striking silences' (2001: 117). On the one hand, Moore noted, there was the silence 'of Western postcolonial studies […] on the subject of the former Soviet sphere': most influential theorists do not seem to have made any explicit statements that would relate to the area, thus leaving the impression that the former 'Second World' is of no relevance to the core of postcolonial studies. Then, there was the second silence, mirroring the first one and most strikingly visible in 'the failure of many scholars specializing in the formerly Soviet-controlled lands to think of their regions in the useful postcolonial terms developed by scholars of, say, Indonesia and Gabon. South does not speak East and East does not speak South' (ibid.). Moore believed that postcolonial theory would be particularly suitable for reassessing history and culture, because one can observe conflicting processes of colonisation (from Russia) and reversed colonisation (Russia itself suffering from an inferiority complex and being indirectly colonised by the West).

Moore's critical assessment of these theoretical developments is largely correct. However, I would not speak of 'silences', but rather of 'muted voices.' There are scholars who made very good use of the postcolonial framework by applying it to material from the Eastern peripheries of Europe. Among historians, there were pioneering studies by Larry Wolff on Russia's 'Orientalisation' (1994) and by Maria Todorova on Central Europe's

Balkanist discourse (1997). Scholars working in cultural studies, anthropology, comparative literature and film extensively explored and exposed the subtle nuances of what came to be known as 'nesting Orientalism' and related it to different nuances of whiteness (Bakic-Hayden 1995); they used material from across the former Soviet Empire, such as Central East Europe (Tötösy de Zepetnek 1995; Imre 2005), the Baltics (Kelertas 2006), former Yugoslavia (Goldsworthy 1998, Iordanova 2001a, Kovacevic 2005), the former Soviet Union (Forrester et al. 2004), or theorised the postcommunist migrations of East Europeans in terms of 'alienhood' and 'palatable foreignness' (Marciniak 2006, 2008).[ii] When it comes to film studies, a discipline preoccupied with analysing cinematic texts that reflect on social processes rather than trying to be instrumental, the postcolonial framework is more than useful, however; it is embraced and applied widely (Imre 1999, Iordanova 2001a). Thus, one can say that the issues of postcommunist postcoloniality have, in fact, been taken up in a productive manner even if this body of scholarship still remains in the shadow of buoyant transitology and operates in a somewhat subdued manner. It is also peripheral in the context of postcolonial studies proper, consigned to what has been referred to as studies into 'postcolonial whiteness' (Lopez 2005), and thus not as influential as it could be, for reasons that are beyond the scope of my investigation here.

Ultimately, when it comes to understanding Eastern Europe and Russia today, the prevailing paradigm is the preference to transitological type of thinking: the priority is to see through the direct political and economic reforms and to ensure the success of the transition. As it is driven by completely different preoccupations, transitology cannot possibly see the postcolonial paradigm as 'useful'; it may be good for explaining implications and subtleties, but does not have an effect on transforming the status quo.

Narrative cinema, however, relies on the postcolonial framework much more than is usually acknowledged. It tells the story of dependencies and inequalities in today's Europe in

a way that differs substantially from the view provided by transitology. It subtly presents old and new colonial-type hierarchies and political compromises that affect the lives of the ordinary people who are its protagonists. The underlying postcolonial dynamism may not be overtly manifest in cinematic texts, yet it can easily be revealed in the process of closer analysis, especially of films featuring migrants that have been set on the move as a consequence of the radical social shifts of 1989. I will look at two examples.

Gianni Amelio's acclaimed *Lamerica* (Italy 1994) provides a snapshot of postcolonial anxieties affecting Europe in the aftermath of 1989. The protagonist, Gino, an aspiring young businessman from the South of Italy, is sent to insolvent Albania to sort out a shady business deal. A series of unfortunate events, however, lead to a reversal in Gino's fortunes and his visit unravels in a way that puts him on the breadline and in a position in which he cannot be distinguished from any other destitute Albanian trying to get a slice of Italy's prosperity. A secondary but important character in the film is an elderly Italian, another Southerner, who has come to Albania during WWII as a soldier with Mussolini's army and who has been confined to Albanian labour camps for decades. Now released, but having effectively spent the prime of his life among Albanians, he is closer to them than to his long forgotten Italian compatriots. *Lamerica* reveals a situation where Italians live through circumstances that make them experience the challenges that ordinary Albanians face. While accidental, this narrative set up is not inconsequential; it is used by the director whose intention is to show that the invisible divisions between East and West are not as durable as they seem to be. The bonding between dispossessed Albanians and cast-out Italian Southerners charts new fault lines, suggesting that the East and West of Europe's South are becoming compatible in a new configuration of power affiliations.[iii]

Even films that do not seem to deal directly with migration reveal circuitously this hierarchy of belonging in post-Cold War Europe. Anthony Minghella's *Breaking and*

Entering (UK/USA 2006) is a case in point, as it offers a revealing symbolic hierarchy of different social groups in London. Its prosperous protagonist, the architect Will, has a beautiful home with a SW postcode; his partner is an attractive Swedish blonde whose daughter, Bea, suffers from autism. A gang of migrants from former Yugoslavia repeatedly breaks into Will's studio at Kings Cross. Determined to prevent further break-ins, Will takes on night shifts to watch the studio; here he meets and befriends Oana, a streetwise prostitute from Romania. Will also meets the mother of one of the teenage robbers, the Bosnian migrant Amira, who ekes out a living by repairing clothes in her flat in the nearby housing estates. Will falls in love with Amira; their few sexual encounters leave him truly infatuated with her. Soon, however, he begins to doubt Amira's motives and to suspect that she maintains the relationship in order to protect her felonious offspring; she may be prepared to blackmail him if he talked to the police about it. Even though he is ready to forget the burglaries, Will rapidly sobers up and takes some radical steps to put an end to the relationship with Amira. While making the generous gesture to forgive the aberrant son at the cost of his own public embarrassment, Will regains the respect of his beautiful Swedish partner. The passion for the Bosnian woman fades away, only occasionally haunting him as a bad dream.

On the surface, *Breaking and Entering* focuses on the midlife crisis of a white upper middle-class Briton, while below the surface it reveals a hierarchical reality of a Western metropolis where 'clean', 'elevated' ('white') Europeans (an Englishman, a Swedish woman) are pushed into temporary interactions with 'untidy' ('dark') migrants (a Romanian prostitute, a Bosnian delinquent and his jobbing mother), but soon regain control and distance themselves from these low-grade contacts. A variety of details in the film efficiently restate Europe's hierarchies: The British protagonist is an educated professional, an architect, who is responsible for a regeneration project in central London's Kings Cross where the film's migrant characters live. The Eastern European characters, by contrast, may have had

professional lives at some point, but now inhabit the murky spaces of the metropolis and earn a living in menial jobs or moonlight as petty criminals. The daughter of the blond Swede is autistic, but has exceptional talents; she is treated by considerate psychologists. By comparison, the son of the Bosnian brunette is on skid row and in the 'care' of tough-talking policemen and frazzled social workers. The Swedish woman has difficulties coping with her child's disability; hence she needs all of Will's love (and financial support), which she demands and accepts with an air of noble superiority. The Bosnian woman has difficulties coping with her son's law-breaking, and the revelation of her relationship with Will is tainted with references to a lowly blackmail-driven affair that should preferably not be mentioned in public.

All that *Breaking and Entering* purports to do is to show the private predicament of a middle-aged man in need of love. In charting his dilemmas, however, the film reveals a background panorama of postcolonial disparities and dependencies, which provide insights into understanding the dynamism of postcolonial Europe and ultimately bring up issues of identity and ideology in the aftermath of communism. A wide range of European films that look at aspects of the post-1989 migrations – from Lukas Moodyson's *Lilja 4-Ever* (Sweden/Denmark 2002) to Ken Loach's *It's A Free World* (UK/Italy/Germany/Spain/Poland 2007) – make powerful statements on the postcolonial human condition. The subtle matters that such films raise cannot be explored in the context of the self-contained paradigm of transitology, which is not capable of integrating human drama alongside statistics and its preoccupation with civil society and market reform. The postcolonial paradigm, however, offers fine tools that allow us to understand and appreciate precisely those half-spoken instances of duplicity, segregation, control, and even enslavement that make up the contemporary human condition for those who were put on the migratory path after the collisions of 1989.

Metropolitan Multicultural Margins

The dynamic forces of global economy brought new diversity to Europe's urban margins – a process that has been analysed by anthropologists (Hannerz 1996) and sociologists (Sassen 1998) and represented in films since the mid-1990s. The classical cinematic text of the multicultural urban periphery is probably Mathieu Kassovitz's *La Haine/Hate* (France 1995), a European hip-hop cult drama (Vincendeau 2005) that – with its Black, Jewish and Moroccan protagonists – foregrounds the dynamics of migratory and diasporic togetherness against the background of an immobile, segregated and violent location, thus underscoring what David Morley has aptly called 'incarceration in the banlieues' (2000: 159).

A range of other films that tackle very similar concerns, however, were made and released independently in the context of other European cinemas, most notably in places where the influx of migrants and the formation of multicultural peripheries in previously ethnically homogeneous urban areas was a relatively new phenomenon. I believe, therefore, that we have sufficient critical mass of films to allow us to identify a new genre within European cinema. I call it the genre of the 'metropolitan multicultural margin', and will outline its main characteristics below.

In offering a definition of genre that spans beyond the mere textual characteristics and endeavours to include the contexts of film creation and reception, Andrew Tudor stresses that genre is

> best employed in the analysis of the relation between groups of films, the cultures in which they are made, and the cultures in which they are exhibited […] It is a term that can be usefully employed in relation to a body of knowledge and theory about the social and psychological context of film. (1986: 10)

Tudor's framework is particularly useful in the context of the 'metropolitan multicultural margin' as genre in that our attention here combines specific textual elements with specific conditions of production and reception.

Let us look at the textual elements first: Many of the films that belong to the genre take place in European cities that are still struggling to acknowledge their multicultural side. One example is Vienna in Barbara Albert's *Nordrand/Northern Skirts* (Austria 1999), which features a motley group of displaced East Europeans inhabiting the periphery beyond the 'belt' ('Gürtel') that separates the desirable downtown locations from the ethnically diverse *Vorstadt* and plays a very similar function to the equally segregating *périphérique*, the ring road that encircles the central *arrondissements* of Paris and cuts them off from the *banlieues*, mostly populated by immigrants (as featured, for example, in Abdellatif Kechiche's *L'esquive/Games of Love and Chance*, France 2003).

Fatih Akin's debut feature *Kurz und schmerzlos*/*Short Sharp Shock* (Germany 1997) is another example of the genre; it centres on a group of friends – a Turk, a Greek and a Serb – of whom two get involved in the shady activities of an Albanian mafia boss in Hamburg-Altona in Germany. Nicolas Winding Refn's *Pusher* series (Denmark 1996-2007) and *Bleeder* (Denmark 1999) show the business of drug dealers in Copenhagen and their regular interactions with newly arrived Serbs, Ukrainians and Russians. Similar films have been made in other European countries including Sweden, Hungary, Greece and Spain, often featuring a peripheral city setting, an inner-city ghetto or a deprived landscape of cookie-cutter housing projects.

These films of 'European metissage', as termed by Italian critic Giovanni Spagnioletti (2000), can be placed in the category of the 'metropolitan multicultural margin', and evolve around interactions of peripheral characters. A recent light comedy by director Vijay Singh (*One Dollar Curry*, France/India/UK, 2004) for example, shows the Sikh protagonist, a new

immigrant, intermingling with street-wise souvlaki vendors and Russian women in the neighbourhood around *Château d'eau* metro station, one of the seediest areas of the French capital. 'I wanted to show a part of the city that has never been shown before,' the director said in an interview (Gentleman 2003: 12). The touristy glamour of Paris is far away from the daily life of the protagonists whose migrant lives evolve around routines of nail parlours and shops that sell hair extensions and ethnic fashions. Another good example of the genre is Goran Paskaljevic's *Tudja Amerika/Someone Else's America* (France/UK/Germany/Greece 1995). Set in the multiethnic enclaves of New York, the film is a European production telling a story of a Montenegrin migrant marrying a Chinese-American in a wedding celebration during which they all dance flamenco to the accompaniment of a Basque neighbour.

All these films share similar production, distribution and reception conditions: usually made in the context of national cinemas, they 'travel' in a sense that they get appreciated across Europe. Films that map the contested territories of the cosmopolitan metropolis within the space of the screen, effectively juxtapose the diverse and hybridising periphery of the 'global city,' an inclusive concept that reflects dynamic confluence, with the concept of 'diaspora', a notion that is inherently set to extend a nation-centred discourse. This juxtaposition is extensively discussed by theorist Ien Ang in her essay on 'undoing diaspora' (2001).

To Ang, 'diaspora' is an extension of the idea of transnational nationalism and presupposes a certain 'sameness in dispersal', whereas the 'global city' is a formation of an inherently hybrid nature that embraces and thrives on ethnic diversity, the only true site of spatial convergence where the cosmopolitan imagination can discover togetherness-in-difference. Ang argues that the uncritical celebratory concept of 'diaspora,' which she sees as limiting, needs to be defied ('undone', in her words) in favour of the 'multicultural global city,' which is better suited to serve as a 'model for analyzing social relations in the age of

globalization' (2001: 76). She even contrasts the characteristics of the two transnational formations in a table (ibid.: 89):

Diaspora	**Global city**
Ethnic unity, spatial scattering	Ethnic diversity, spatial convergence
Transnational nationalism	Local hybridity
Virtual deterritorialized space	Actual social/territorialized space
Sameness-in-dispersal	Together-in-difference

As final destinations for migrants from various points of departure, global cities are the sites where hybridisation occurs and diaspora is 'undone', i.e. where migrants are no longer confined within their own ethnic communities, but break free and enter multiple crosscultural interactions that have come within reach. In the context of the 'global city' and its multicultural urban margin, the discourse on diaspora, Ang insists, had failed to recognize its own 'limiting conceptual and political implications' (ibid: 81). It has been important, therefore, to develop the counter-metaphor and counter-discourse of the global city as a site for the truly transnational and cosmopolitan imagination. The syncretism and the multidimensionality granted by the global city effectively subverted the 'sameness in dispersal' stance of the diaspora.

Global cities are deeply internationally oriented, by virtue of the transnational essence of the very activities that sustain their existence (media, tourism, trade, trafficking). These cosmopolitan cities are, in Arjun Appadurai's term, 'translocalities' (1996: 192): spaces where various itinerant populations have come together to create neighborhoods defined by and dependent on transnational connections. Here, 'externally imposed modes of regulation, credentialization, and image production' (ibid.: 192) have superseded most of the traditional ways. Echoing Appadurai, Morley speaks of the global city as a site of encounters between

'moving images and deterritorialised viewers' (2000: 153) where the traditional ideas of homeland and nation have been 'destablilised, both by new patterns of physical mobility and migration and by new communication technologies which routinely transgress the symbolic boundaries around both the private households and the nation state' (ibid.: 3).

In cinema, the potential of multicultural global city narratives is best seen in the periphery-to-periphery exchanges in which the inhabitants of the metropolis engage on a daily basis. These migrating protagonists have taken off from one peripheral place to end up in yet another, in one of 'side streets' and ethnic enclaves. Their trajectory is not a liberating escape from a restrictive marginal environment that leads to a triumphant settling into whatever is perceived to be the socially or geographically desirable centre. Yet it is still an acceptable progression that appears to move in the right direction, and even if it does not get them to the hub of their aspirations, at least brings them closer to it. The African migrants in *La Promesse/The Promise* (Belgium 1996, dir. Jean-Pierre and Luc Dardenne) make Belgium the centre of their small universe, but once there, they are confined to an isolated ethnic slum. To the Russian migrants in *Last Resort* (UK 2000, dir. Pawel Pawlikowski), England, a country linked in the popular imagination with an image of prosperity and stability, seems to be acceptably central, but they have to join a depressed community of asylum seekers, confined to transit accommodation in the fictional seaside town Stonehaven, for which Margate served as location. Having arrived, the migrant characters continue moving within a universe that consists of city margins, between *banlieues*.[iv]

These films rarely feature interactions with members of the characters' 'own' ethnic group, and when they do, episodes are likely to show how a new migrant is rejected by a well-established diasporic patriarch. New arrivals more frequently intermingle with members of other cultural groups or marginalised sexual minorities (as seen in Sébastien Lifshitz's *Wild*

Side, Belgium/France/UK 2004) than being welcomed and guided through the immigration maze by older settlers of their own ethnic background.

Most of the protagonists in the films of 'the multicultural urban margin' are new migrants from various parts of the former Soviet Empire; they are seen crossing paths and forging alliances with other migrants whose itineraries to Europe have originated somewhere in the Third World. Having come together in the global city, these newcomers encounter older migrants who have been there for decades and who know their ways, yet are still equally marginal and dispossessed. Most of their exchanges do not lead toward a cathartic breakthrough, but evolve as a monotonous sideline, with no gradation. The very act of finding each other, however, helps the protagonists of either group to come to terms with their own social exclusion. Rather than ending up in bitter disillusionment, these newly forged alliances allow them to interrelate and bond in ways that may lead to limited advancement but are nonetheless psychologically comforting and mutually empowering at that.

When one looks from the periphery, there is no need of a conditional centre to determine a hierarchy of ambitions and locations, no need to make oneself stretch out to reach a higher, superior level. The intensity of interactions at the margins turns the global city into a universe that consists of an endless periphery, a place where the centre of gravity and its symbolic condensation of power is bracketed out and where migrants' lives can be lived without constantly feeling inferior or excluded, in a content and joyful manner.

'Watching across Borders': Above National Frameworks

Migrant and diasporic cinema is usually discussed as it manifests itself in the context of cinematic traditions defined by the nation-state (e.g. Britain, France, Germany Italy, Spain), thus the national is still the defining paradigm in most studies of this cinema in Europe. This framework, however, is also the main obstacle to moving towards a more dynamic

understanding of the processes and properties of migrant and diasporic cinema. It cuts a thriving form of an essentially transnational cultural output into pieces, which are then neatly slotted into respective discrete national entities, thus inexorably taking the attention away from the global processes that bring the whole phenomenon of migratory and diasporic creativity into existence.

If we want to primarily study the development of a national cinema in its complexity, we can happily stay within the national framework. If, however, we want to focus on cinematic representations of migration and on the production of diasporic identities, we can do so better if we go beyond the confines of the national and begin 'watching across borders'. The migrations of the Bosnians who dispersed all over the world as a result of the 1990s upheavals are best studied if we look at films made in a variety of countries including Austria, France, Germany, Switzerland, the UK and Canada (Iordanova 2001b). If we wanted to study, in more general terms, the representation of migrant hardship on the route to Europe, we could more productively look at films from Italy (Nanni Moretti's *Aprile*, 1998), Slovenia (Zelimir Zilnik's *Tvrdjava Evropa/Fortress Europe*, 2001*;* Damjan Kozole's *Rezervni Deli/Spare Parts*, 2003) and the UK (Michael Winterbottom's *In This World*, 2002) rather than at the films made in one European country only.

Transnational film studies offer an alternative to the national framework by tracing the cycle of film production, dissemination and reception as one dynamic process that rises above national boundaries. Such treatment reflects more adequately the mode of human existence in the global age; it explores the narrative and stylistic features of films that come about as a result of a supranational cycle of filmmaking and reception. It keeps a clear distinction between migrant and diasporic filmmakers and films tackling issues of migration and diasporic existence, yet it insists that in each case the processes should be studied at a supranational level. While migrant and diasporic cinema may be conceived at sub-state and

sub-nation state level when we look at concrete films, the true extent and dynamics of the phenomenon come to light only if borders are transcended for the sake of the investigation (the diasporic cinema of the Bosnians, for example, is made across countries and continents and has no defined key location). On the other hand, when it comes to representing the migrations of a specific group of people, films made independently from each other in different countries often tackle the movements of the same group (e.g. migrating Russians, Iordanova 2000); thus if film scholars really want to explore this representation in its vibrant entirety, there is a clear need to go beyond the context of a singular nation.

Even if the attention is on one particular diaspora, the study of which represents a specific extension of the study of a national cinema, 'watching across borders' is still the more adequate approach. Turkish diasporic filmmakers, for example, have made films not only in Germany, but also in Austria, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK. In order to study effectively the dimensions of any diasporic movement of cineastes, one would need to look at films made in a variety of regions: Bulgarians, for example, have been active in Italy (screenwriter Doriana Leondeff, actor Christo Jivkov), Hungary (actor Djoko Rossic), the Czech Republic (actor Ivan Barnev), Germany (actor Sami Finzi), Sweden (actor Georgi Staykov), Canada (animator Evgeni Tomov, actress Nina Dobrev), the USA (actor Hristo Shopov), and so on. Lacking a critical mass in one single location, the Bulgarian diaspora is not likely to have much focused impact; yet in order to investigate it at all, 'watching across borders' is the only meaningful approach that would allow us to encompass the inherently transnational dimension of the diasporic existence.

In the New Europe, countries that had traditionally been a source of emigration, like Italy or Ireland, have turned into preferred destinations for new migrants, and new films reflect this migratory dynamics. In Sweden, directors and actors of various nationalities make films about Russian or Arab migrants, whereas previously Swedish cinema had explored the

migratory experience and ordeal faced by Swedish migrants who had struggled finding a new place for themselves away from home, for example Jan Troell's *Utvandrarna/The Emigrants* (1971) and *Nybyggarna/The New Land* (1972) or Bille August's *Pelle erobreren/Pelle the Conqueror* (Denmark/Sweden 1987) and *Jerusalem* (1996). In more recent years, however, such narratives of diasporic dispersal have gradually been replaced by films that focus on the experience of transit migrants or newcomers into Sweden, such as Josef Fares's *Jalla! Jalla!* (2000) and *Zozo* (2005) or Geir Hansteen Jörgensen acclaimed TV mini-series *Det Nya Landet/The New Country* (2000) about Somali and Iranian itinerants who escape from a refugee camp. Other films have focused on Sweden's new multicultural reality (e.g. Rafael Edholm's *Babas Bilar/Baba's Cars* 2006). Along with the shift from emigration to immigration, films made in Sweden also reflect pan-European migratory patterns and propose a more inclusive concept of Europe's cultural territories that includes its formerly divided Western and Eastern parts. Lukas Moodysson's *Lilja 4-ever* addresses human trafficking across Europe, thus becoming a film of transcultural significance that supersedes Sweden's domestic concerns. The supranational take of this film has already invited and facilitated comparative scholarly investigations into the representation of migrant women, such as Lars Kristensen's study (2007) that juxtaposed *Lilja* and Pyotr Todorovsky's Soviet-Swedish production *Interdevochka/Intergirl* (1989) by looking both at production context and reception issues.

Recognising migrant and diasporic cinema as inherently transnational allows us to acknowledge the increasing migrancy among filmmakers, the diversification of distribution channels, and the dispersal of audiences (Iordanova 2007). Transforming the view on the dialectics of global cinema was accompanied by a concerted move of the attention from the national onto the postnational and the transnational, echoed, for instance, in such works as Laura U. Marks's *The Skin of the Film* (2000), Hamid Naficy's *Accented Cinema* (2001) and

Elizabeth Ezra and Terry Rowden's *Transnational Cinema* (2006). A reflection on alternative cinemas with a multi-national focus was initiated in the context of studies such as Scott MacKenzie and Mette Hjort's *Cinema and Nation* (2000), Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim's *Remapping World Cinema* (2006), Paul Willemen and Valentina Vitali's *Theorising National Cinemas* (2006), and Mette Hjort and Duncan Petrie's *Cinema of Small Nations* (2007). The 'floating lives' project (Cunningham and Sinclair 2001) offered a new dialectical understanding of cinema's transnational dynamics by developing a framework that takes into account the interactions between cinematic output, the ever-changing diasporas, and their dynamic consumption patterns. Taking its name from the eponymous migrant film of Hong Kong-Australian director Clara Law (1996), the 'floating lives' study was the first project that commissioned and presented case studies tracing the idiosyncratic patterns of production and circulation of visual material destined for both domestic and diasporic audiences from its point of origin to the point of consumption, thus facilitating the understanding of these seemingly disjointed processes. Influential edited collections applied this approach to a range of global media and film examples (Ginsburg, Abu-Lughod, and Larkin 2002; Shohat and Stam 2003). At the reception end, transnational cinephilia was described as an emergent trend by critics who closely observe the dynamics of the global cinematic process (Rosenbaum and Martin 2003; Egoyan and Balfour 2004). All these studies approached the exploration of individual cinematic texts in direct connection to the cycle of their production, distribution and consumption, thus putting forward a model of a novel approach to the global cinematic process, one that was transnational (in that it transcended national confines) and comprehensive (in that it combined the analysis of cinematic text with the analysis of cinematic traffic).

Even if recognised from early on in media scholarship focusing on Europe (Morley and Robins 1995), the work that documented the transnational dynamics of the cinematic

process grew out of studies more closely linked to Asian cinemas, in particular to the Indian and Chinese diasporic traditions. It is only recently that scholarship dealing with the cinemas of Europe began approaching its material through the lens of transnationalism (Mazierska and Rascaroli 2002, 2006; Bergfelder 2005). The big cinematic traditions of Europe (British, French, German, Italian, Spanish) are still explored from within national frameworks even in those instances where migrant and diasporic cinema is in focus (Göktürk 2002, Korte and Sternberg 2004, Santaolalla 2005, Tarr 2005, Ruhe 2006, Burns 2006, O'Healy 2008); for now the 'watching across borders' model has been applied predominantly in instances that focus on peripherally positioned European traditions like the East Central European or Scandinavian cinemas (Iordanova 2003, Hjort 2005, Nestingen and Elkington 2005). The present volume, and other forthcoming studies, will hopefully break the mould and turn the exploration of issues in a trans-European manner into a compelling and favoured approach.

Creative Trajectories

Phenomena like German Turkish or French *beur* filmmaking evolved out of more or less permanent migrations; here, filmmakers who are second- or third-generation descendants of migrants address identity concerns related to their particular group (Göktürk 2002, Tarr 2005). The protagonists that populate these films are usually born into a certain migrant group, which is settled more or less permanently into a clearly linguistically and nationally defined territory, and are often closely involved with their ethnic communities. If one accepts that a sizable, stable, and compact immigrant community (like Turks in Germany or North African Arab-speakers in France) is a precondition for the development of a migrant and diasporic cinema, it will not be difficult to conclude that the phenomenon is not likely to last unchanged in post-Cold War Europe. Because, with the exception of the more or less permanent repatriation of German Russians (who are already putting out literary works but

are still to break through in cinema), no other migratory group is likely to produce the steady resettlement or develop a milieu of enduring tightly knit communities.

Such stable communities that persist in upholding their idiosyncrasies within a foreign context, however, are a necessary pre-condition for thriving migrant and diasporic cinema, as it is a cinema born out of a critical stance to the isolationism predicated by the self-contented diaspora. Whatever migrations there are to come, they are more likely to end up in dispersal within the multicultural urban margin that we already spoke of.

As we can see, the emergence of migrant and diasporic cinema presupposes a certain set of characteristics which are more or less absent from the pattern of post-Cold War Eastern European migrations that represent the bulk of movements within Europe in the 1990s and 2000s. Their migrations are very different from the migrations of South Europeans that characterised the post-WWII period, when Turks or Italians migrated to the North. Like those earlier migrations, the new ones are economically driven and are undertaken by people who can return at any time, but moving back and forth is easier nowadays. The new migrants can play with multiple career scenarios; they do not settle in compact groups, they assimilate effortlessly and are highly mobile. The recently acquired border fluidity of 'Schengen' Europe comes with a freedom of movement that precludes the formation of more or less permanent migrant and diasporic groups, a situation that, respectively, lessens the chances of migrant and diasporic cinema as we know it today.[v]

It is becoming increasingly difficult to brand any of the post-Cold War filmmakers who work in another country as 'migrant' or 'diasporic', as they are typically not part of a mature migrant milieu nor primarily anxious to voice the concerns of their particular group. They simply do not need to migrate on a permanent basis. It is a priority for these filmmakers to keep their options open: they move fluidly across Europe; they work abroad but they also go back, and are used to working across a range of countries. While migratory identities may

be of interest to them, so are a host of other, very different themes. Thus, in current European cinema we observe an interesting phenomenon: film professionals function in a supranational context where they migrate on what we call a 'per project' basis. They do not qualify as *bona fide* 'migrant' or 'diasporic', nor are they 'exilic' or 'intercultural' filmmakers in the sense that has been prominently focused on by researchers like Marks (2000) or Naficy (2001). As their migrations are project-based enterprises, they are more adequately described as 'transnationally mobile filmmakers'.

I will highlight this state of affairs by referring to several recent career trajectories of film personalities from the countries of the former Eastern bloc who have worked in this specific 'per project' migratory mode in the post-Cold War environment: high-profile filmmakers, art-house transnational filmmakers of the middle generation, as well as other established and well-respected film professionals.[vi] The post-Cold War trajectories of these filmmakers span over a range of countries and could easily qualify them as migrant and diasporic, not least because of the co-presence of their compatriots in the destination countries. However, none of them are considered to truly belong to the migrant cinema category, precisely because they are under no obligation to continuously display loyalty to their migrant compatriots but instead keep moving between situations and are free to associate with whoever they see fit; working in a transnational mode on a 'per project' basis has become their *modus vivendi*.

Paradoxically, as far as Eastern European cineastes are concerned, the same directors who were around during the Cold War and had reached prominence before 1989 still enjoy the highest international profile today. Most of them – István Szabó, Agnieszka Holland, Goran Paskaljević, Emir Kusturica, Sergei Bodrov, Andrzej Zulawski, and others – were already internationally recognised names by the time of the fall of the Wall, and most of them had undergone artistic migration by 1989. Ironically, they had benefited from the Cold War

division of Europe, as it was the presence of the Iron Curtain that granted their films a degree of attention that is not given to filmmakers from the region today. Some of them had clearly fallen out with the socialist regimes and settled permanently in the West, while others manoeuvred and maintained a strong position both at home and abroad, making a range of internationally financed films throughout the 1980s. Since 1989, many of these directors have worked predominantly outside of their home countries and could, therefore, easily qualify as 'migrant'. Yet, we do not think of them this way, perhaps because they switch countries all the time and have access to financial resources quite different from those available to more traditional migrant and diasporic filmmakers, or, most significantly, because their films are not primarily concerned with issues of identity and bridging cultures.

What is characteristic of the work of all these directors is that, with the exception of Polish-born director Andrzej Zulawski who has durable ties to France, they are not permanently based in one country, but rather make films transnationally, with *ad hoc* arrangements of financing and other elements on a 'per project' basis. While migration and diasporic existence figure as topics in their films, they can barely be described as their only or primary concern.

Serbian Goran Pasklajević, for example, appeared to have migrated to France from where he received partial funding for all the films he has made since the 1990s. Yet each one of his subsequent projects would take him to a different geographical and thematic territory, with films taking place among illegal migrants in New York (*Tudja Amerika/Someone Else's America*), in depressed war-time Belgrade (*Bure baruta*/*Powder Keg*, France/Greece/Turkey/Macedonia/Yugoslavia 1998), and in Ireland (*How Harry Became a Tree*, Italy/France/UK/Ireland 2001). All these productions were supported through pan-European arrangements, with the participation of countries like Greece, Turkey, Ireland, France, the UK and Italy, and took advantage of programmes like MEDIA and Eurimages.

Since leaving Poland in the mid-1980s, Agnieszka Holland has made films in France, Germany, USA, Canada, and Poland, and was recently shooting in Slovakia. Russian Sergei Bodrov, officially based in Los Angeles, has worked on films that were financed by a range of mostly European partners (France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, the UK and more) and Central Asian investors, and take place in a range of American, European, and Asian locations, from Sweden to Kazakhstan. His latest film, *Mongol* (2007), an epic on Genghis Khan's early life, was co-produced by Kazakhstan, Germany, Russia and Mongolia and shot in China and Kazakhstan. For the role of young Mongol Temujin, Bodrov cast Japanese actor Tadanobu Asano. His creative team consisted of a Russian and a Dutch cinematographer, an Icelandic editor, a Finnish composer, as well as scores of Chinese, Koreans, Germans and Russians employed in 'below the line' roles.

Other successful directors, like Szabó or Kusturica, have not wasted time to deliberate on the pains of migration and identity. They enjoy a high pan-European profile and could presumably settle, if they wanted, in any country of their choosing. Yet, maybe because they can work in a variety of countries on ventures that attract transnational financing, they do not really need to migrate. They are regularly invited to head juries at international festivals, to lecture at the European Film Academy and other public relations forums, and benefit from a supranational status that supplies them with a unique immunity (Kusturica has not been shattered by public criticisms about his dubious allegiances in Yugoslavia's aftermath and has successfully transformed himself from a Bosnian into a Serbian and even recently changing his given name to Nemanja; recent revelations about Szabó's past as an informer to Hungary's secret services do not seem to affect his international standing). Kusturica left his native Bosnia before the Yugoslav wars for succession, had a stint in the US, then settled in France temporarily (where he also obtained French citizenship), but has now more or less permanently settled in his country of choosing, Serbia, maintaining residences near Paris and

in Greece, while continuing to work internationally (for example on the documentary about the Argentinean footballer *Maradona by Kusturica*, France 2008, which took him to Buenos Aires on a number of occasions). Hungarian Szabó had been engaged with international co-productions since the early 1980s, and, in the aftermath of 1989, expanded his international presence even further, making films with American, British, German, and Swedish partners and working with A-list actors, such as Glenn Close, Jeremy Irons, Harvey Keitel, Adrien Brody, Annette Benning, Michael Gambon, and Ralph Fiennes, without the need to migrate out of Hungary.

The post-Cold War situation also enabled another type of artistic trajectory: the art-house East European. Members of this group – representatives would include directors like Lithuanian Sharunas Bartas or Macedonian Milcho Manchevski – are typically born around 1960 and have seen their careers take off after 1989. They come from smaller European countries and bring along locally flavoured sensibilities. They were either educated or worked abroad temporarily, thus acquiring practical savvy on how things are done on the international arena and developing international contacts. Their films are, in most cases, financed internationally. Their stories often have a transnational slant and concern cross-cultural encounters, sometimes taking place in remote settings while at the same time retaining references to their original culture. Whatever films they make, they are always fully conscious of the international dimension of the film's narrative.

These directors spend extended periods of time abroad, but they return to work at home.[vii] They are globetrotting for fundraising and for festivals, yet they see advantages in shooting within their domestic environment and opt to stay in their native countries for the most intense periods of their work. Here they enjoy the support of a small but strongly committed fan base; internationally they benefit from the appreciation of a narrow circle of influential connoisseurs that help them maintain sufficient attention to guarantee their

international stature. Thus while neither migrant nor diasporic, their work is characterised by interstitial transnationality. In the current conditions of film financing and distribution, there is no need for them to migrate permanently. They can set up home wherever they want and stay for as long as they want, yet they seem to be better off retaining affiliation with their small Eastern European countries rather than permanently moving to the West.[viii]

As cinema is a collective art, there is much more mobility and fluidity than we can acknowledge, and personal trajectories are much more diverse. The traditional framework we use in approaching migrant and diasporic cinema often leaves out of focus a large group of those other 'above the line' professionals who have migrated and work in other European countries. No matter what we think of the shortcomings of the *auteurist* approach, we still mostly scrutinise and study the migration of directors. What other migrant film professionals might do – screenwriters, editors, cinematographers, set designers and composers – does not count as 'migrant cinema', and is often not even acknowledged as 'diasporic'. But are not the inputs of editors, cameramen and -women, or set designers definitive for the look and feel of a film? Cinematographers like Sławomir Idziak (known from his work with Kieslowski) and Lajos Koltai (known from his work with István Szabó) have worked across a range of European countries like Italy, Germany and the UK, whereas Czech cameraman Igor Luther, a seasoned professional who has worked across Europe with directors like Polish Andrzej Wajda and German Volker Schlöndorff, was responsible for the cinematography of the Thai historical epic *Suriyothai* (Thailand 2001, dir. Chatrichalerm Yukol). Zbigniew Preisner and Goran Bregovic, whose remarkable scores were first heard in the films of Kieslowski and Kusturica respectively, have since provided staple soundtracks for Scandinavian or French cinema.

In the specific case we investigate, the mobility of film professionals has significantly intensified since the end of the Cold War and is often linked to periods of slowdown in their

respective domestic industries. In some cases professionals migrate, settle in another country, and after some time become regular members of the film community in the new place; they are often engaged in term contracts, or teaching at a variety of film schools. In many more instances, however, these people move between projects rather than retaining national affiliations, meaning that within a year they may work on an internationally financed shoot in one European country, then participate in a locally funded project in another European country, and then move on and work for a few months back in their Eastern European country of origin, before taking off for a project in America or Asia. These fuzzy and flexible border crossings do not precisely qualify as migrations; there is no steady flow here but rather dispersal to multiple national, regional, industrial, and linguistic environments. These shifts have rarely been examined in the context of the clearly delineated phenomenon of migrant and diasporic cinema, yet they are a direct consequence of the post-Cold War opening of Europe's newly unified space.[ix]

In this range of consideration, the trajectories of actors are the most visible and accessible to study. At the same time, scrutinising their creative paths is most instructive, especially as one traditionally believes that for actors, faced with the hardship of mastering new languages and accents, emigration often spells the end to a career. It is only singular actors who are able to sustain meaningfully visible careers abroad, and it is a mixture of resilience and luck that proves decisive in the process. Many vanish, or even worse, keep appearing in films, having moved over to the nearly invisible periphery where they are never noticed.

Migrant actresses remain invisible even when cast in key roles. For example, international critics nearly unanimously destroyed Bruno Dumont's controversial *Twenty-nine Palms* (France/Germany/USA 2003), featuring Russian-Lithuanian-French Actress Katia (Yekaterina) Golubeva; their criticisms of the film were directed elsewhere, yet most of them

spoke of the actress as a completely unknown face dug out by Dumont from who knows where. In fact, Golubeva has been a more or less permanent presence in films by Sharunas Bartas since the late 1980s, so these same critics are likely to have watched her in a range of films at the festivals they frequent. In addition, she played significant parts in well-known French art house films such as Claire Denis's *J'ai pas sommeil*/*I Cannot Sleep* (France/Switzerland 1994) and *L'Intrus/The Intruder* (France 2004) and Leos Carax's *Pola X* (France/Switzerland/Germany/Japan 1999), all extensively covered by these same international critics. Yet, in her new reincarnation in the Californian desert, Katia Golubeva remained unrecognised and was treated as a newcomer. Similar examples can be made of other many migrant actresses (e.g. Russian Chulpan Khamatova, Polish veteran Grazyna Szapolowska, the Lithuanian-Russian Ingeborga Dapkunajte, Serbian Branka Katić), all stars of award-winning films, yet unrecognised in the Western productions they have appeared in lately. One discovers that these actresses have managed to keep themselves employed by appearing in perfectly respectable Western European films even after changing countries. In reality, however, they remain well known only in the context of their original national cinema and they effectively lose career continuity.[x]

The situation with migrant male actors is similar. The most successful among them are those who, while abroad, are happy to embrace the limitations of typecasting and play the roles of Eastern European villains or migrant patriarchs. This fully applies, for example, to former DEFA star Armin Mueller-Stahl and to Yugoslav Rade Serbedzija, who enjoy high-profile international careers today. Both actors maintain a remarkable transatlantic schedule by regularly taking on roles in Hollywood, in American art-house and indie films, as well as in films made in a range of European or other countries (New Zealand, Canada, Australia), and in their countries of origin. They both are well-known for roles that link them to their Eastern European heritage and tradition: Armin Mueller-Stahl played a London-based

Russian Godfather in David Cronenberg's *Eastern Promises* (2007) while Serbedzija has readily embraced the roles of an Eastern European mafioso, Russian gangster or underground trader, in a range of international productions since the mid 1990s.

Conclusion

Interestingly enough, directors based firmly in their native countries who have never migrated seem to have made the most important films about post-Cold War migratory identities. It appears that it is not the experience of migrating, but rather the experience of observing the effects of migration on individuals and communities that allows these cineastes to make important contributions to the post-Cold War representations of migrant and diasporic identities. One such director is Ibolja Fekete in Hungary, with her perceptive observations on displacement and the migratory condition in remarkable films like *Bolshe Vita* (Hungary 1996), featuring the influx of Russian and other Eastern migrants into a Central European capital, Budapest. Fekete's *Chico* (Germany/Croatia/Hungary/Chile 2001) is a film tracing the identity conundrums of a Bolivian-born Chilean-and-Hungarian-raised Jew, whose search for ideals and faith forms the basis of a finely crafted psychological study of migration, split not only geographically between Latin America, Asia, Europe and the Middle East but also between systems of belief and social order, showing the ideological insecurities and undermined allegiances that characterise the post-Cold War condition (Waller 2008). Another example is the acclaimed Romanian Cristian Mungiu,[xi] whose black comedy *Occident* (Romania 2002) scrutinised the gloomy everyday lives of present-day Romanians, agonising over the decision to emigrate or to stay at home.

The picture of post-Berlin Wall Europe that emerges from these films is of an area where old evils have been swept away while a host of new ones has emerged. Their protagonists belong to the confused post-Cold War generation that had to live the volatility of

crumbling political systems, incessantly patch up past and present-day realities, and continuously adjust to changing circumstances. Confronted with relentlessly contested claims on history and with a collapse of coherent ideologies, with linear efforts to progress towards free market economies in the context of intricate postcolonial realities, many of them are plunged into irreconcilable identity quests. Witnessing the complex and often distressing events evolving right in front of their eyes, filmmakers from the 'New' Europe deal time and again with gloom and despair, presenting frail characters faced with the mighty sweep of historical change.

Bibliography

Ang, I. (2001) 'Undoing Diaspora,' In: *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living Between Asia and the West*. London, New York: Routledge. 75-92.

Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large*: *Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bakic-Hayden, M., and R. M. Hayden (1992) 'Orientalist Variations on the Theme "Balkans": Symbolic Geography in Recent Yugoslav Cultural Politics', *Slavic Review*, 51.1, 1-19.

Bakic-Hayden, M. (1995) 'Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia', *Slavic Review*, 54.4, 917-31.

Bergfelder, T. (2005) 'National, Transnational or Supranational Cinema', *Media, Culture and Society*, 27.3, 315-31.

Burns, R. (2006) 'Turkish-German Cinema: From Cultural Resistance to Transnational Cinema?' in D. Clarke (ed.) *German Cinema since Unification.* London, New York: Continuum.

Cunningham, S., and J. Sinclair (eds.) (2001) *Floating Lives: The Media and Asian Diasporas*. Lanham etc.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dennison, S., and Song Hwee Lim (eds.) (2006) *Remapping World Cinema: Identity, Culture and Politics in Film*. London: Wallflower.

Egoyan, A., and I. Balfour (eds.) (2004) *Subtitles: On the Foreignness of Film*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Ezra, E., and T. Rowden (eds.) (2006) *Transnational Cinema:The Film Reader*. London: Routledge.

Forrester, S., M. J. Zaborowska and E. Gapova (eds.) (2004) *Over the Wall/After the Fall: Post-communist Cultures Through an East-West Gaze*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Fukuyama, F. (1993) *The End of History and the Last Man*. London: Penguin.

Gentleman, A. (2003) 'Bollywood on the Seine', *The Guardian*, November 7, Friday Review, 12-3.

Ginsburg, F., L. Abu-Lughod and B. Larkin (eds.) (2002) *Media Worlds: Anthropology on New Terrain*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Göktürk, D. (2002) 'Beyond Paternalism: Turkish German Traffic in Cinema', in T. Bergfelder, E. Carter and D. Göktürk (eds.) *The German Cinema Book*. London: BFI.

Goldsworthy, V. (1998) *Inventing Ruritania: The Imperialism of the Imagination*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.

Hannerz, U. (1996) *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London: Routledge.

Hjort, M., and S. McKenzie (eds.) (2000) *Cinema and Nation*. London: Routledge.

-----. (2005) *Small Nation, Global Cinema: The New Danish Cinema*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

-----, and D. Petrie (eds). (2007) *Cinema of Small Nations*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Huntington, S. P. (1993) 'The Clash of Civilizations?' *Foreign Affairs*, 72.3: 22-49.

Imre, A. (1999) 'White Man, White Mask: Mephisto Meets Venus', *Screen* 40.4, 405-22.

-----. (2005) 'Whiteness in Post-Socialist Eastern Europe: The Time of the Gypsies, the End of Race', in A. J. Lopez (ed.) *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*. Albany: SUNY Press, 79-103.

-----. (ed.) (2005) *East European Cinemas* (AFI Film Readers). New York, London: Routledge.

Iordanova, D. (2000) 'The New Russians in Film: Nostalgia for the Occupier, Commiseration for the Immigrant', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 17.1-2, 113-31.

-----. (2001a) *Cinema of Flames: Balkan Film, Culture and the Media.* London: BFI.

-----. (2001b) 'Displaced? Shifting Politics of Place and Itinerary', *Senses of Cinema*, 14 (June). Online. Available: http://www.sensesofcinema.com/contents/01/14/displaced.html (15 November 2007)

-----. (2003) *Cinema of the Other Europe: The Industry and Artistry of East Central European Film*. London: Wallflower Press.

-----. (2007) 'Transnational Film Studies,' in P. Cook (ed.) *The Cinema Book.* London: BFI pages.

-----. (2008) 'Mimicry and Plagiarism: Reconciling Actual and Metaphoric Gypsies', *Third Text*, 22.3, 305-10.

Kelertas, V. (ed.) *Baltic Postcolonialism*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.

Kennedy, M. D. (2002) *Cultural Formations of Postcommunism: Emancipation, Transition, Nation and War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Korte, B., and C. Sternberg (2004) *Bidding for the Mainstream? Black and Asian British Film since the 1990s*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Kovacevic, N. (2005) *Narrating Post/Communism: Colonial Discourse and Europe's Borderline Civilization*. New York, London: Routledge.

Kristensen, L. (2007) 'Divergent Accounts of Equivalent Narratives: Russian-Swedish *Interdevochka* Meets Swedish-Russian *Lilya 4-ever*', *Portal*, 4.2. Online. Available: http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/ojs/index.php/portal/article/view/488 (29 November 2007).

Lopez, A. J. (ed.) (2005) *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Marciniak, K. (2006) *Alienhood: Citizenship, Exile, And The Logic Of Difference*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

-----. (2007) 'Palatable Foreignness', in K. Marciniak, A. Imre and A. O'Healy (eds.) *Transnational Feminism in Film and Media: Visibility, Representation, and Sexual Differences*. New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 187-207.

Marks, L. U. (2000) *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Mazierska, E., and L. Rascaroli. (2002) *From Moscow to Madrid: European Cities, Postmodern Cinema*. London: I.B. Tauris.

-----., and L. Rascaroli. (2006) *Crossing New Europe: Postmodern Travel and the European Road Movie*. London: Wallflower.

Moore, D. C. (2001). 'Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique'. *PMLA*, 116.1: 111-28.

Morley, D., and K. Robins. (1995) *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. London, New York: Routledge.

-----. (2000) *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*. London, New York: Routledge.

Naficy, H. (2001) *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Nestingen, A., and T. G. Elkington (eds.) (2005) *Transnational Cinema in a Global North: Nordic Cinema in Transition.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

O'Healy, A. (2007) 'Border Traffic: Reimagining the Voyage to Italy,' In K. Marciniak, A. Imre and A. O'Healy (eds.) (2007) *Transnational Feminism in Film and Media: Visibility, Representation, and Sexual Differences*. New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 37-53.

Rose, R. (2006) 'Europe's Largest Minority Roma and Sinti Demand Equal Rights,' *UN Chronicle Online Edition*. Online. Available: http://www.un.org/Pubs/chronicle/2006/webArticles/120106_rose.htm (27 August 2008)

Rosenbaum, J., and A. Martin (eds.). (2003) *Movie Mutations: The Changing Face of World Cinephilia*. London: BFI.

Ruhe, C. (2006) *Cinéma beur*: *Analysen zu einem neuen Genre des französischen Kinos.* Konstanz: UVK.

Santaolalla, I. (2005) *Los "Otros": Etnicidad y "raza" en el cine español contemporáneo*. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza.

Shohat, E., and R. Stam (eds.) (2003) *Multiculturalism, Postcoloniality, and Transnational Media*. Rutgers University Press.

Sassen, S. (1998) *Globalization and its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money.* New York: New Press.

Spagnoletti, G. (ed.) (2000) *Il cinema Europeo del metissage*. Peasro: XXXVI Mostra Internazionale del Nuovo Cinema.

Tarr, C. (2005) *Reframing Difference: Beur and Banlieue Filmmaking in France*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Todorova, M. N. (1997) 'Between Classification and Politics: The Balkans and the Myth of Central Europe', in M. N. Todorova (ed.) *Imagining the Balkans*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 140-61.

Tötösy de Zepetnek, S. (1995) 'Post-Colonialities: The "Other," the System, and a Personal Perspective, or, This (Too) Is Comparative Literature', *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* 22.3-4: 399-407.

Tudor, A. (1986) 'Genre', in B. K. Grant (ed.) *Film Genre Reader*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 3-11.

Vincendeau, G. (2005). *La Haine.* London: I.B. Tauris.

Waller, M. (2007) 'The Abjection of Patriarchy: Ibolya Fekete's *Chico* and the Transnational Feminist Imaginary', in K. Marciniak, A. Imre, A. O'Healy (eds.) *Transnational Feminism in Film and Media: Visibility, Representation, and Sexual Differences*. New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 227-41.

Willemen, P., and V. Vitali (eds.) (2006) *Theorising National Cinemas*. London: BFI, 2006.

Wolff, L. (1994) *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Filmography

4 luni, 3 saptamani si 2 zile/4 Months, 3 Weeks & 2 Days (Romania 2007, dir. Cristian Mungiu)
Aprile (Italy 1998, dir. Nanni Moretti)
Babas Bilar/Baba's Cars (Sweden 2006, dir. Rafael Edholm)
Bleeder (Denmark 1999, dir. Nicolas Winding Refn)
Bolshe Vita (Hungary 1996, dir. Ibolja Fekete)
Breaking and Entering (UK/USA 2006, dir. Anthony Minghella)
Bure baruta/*Powder Keg* (France/Greece/Turkey/Macedonia/Yugoslavia 1998, dir. Goran Pasklajević)
Chico (Germany/Croatia/Hungary/Chile 2001, dir. Ibolja Fekete)

Det Nya Landet/The New Country (TV mini-series, Sweden 2000, dir. Geir Hansteen Jörgensen)
Eastern Promises (UK/Canada/USA 2007, dir. David Cronenberg)
Fräulein, Das (Switzerland/Germany 2006, dir. Andrea Staka)
How Harry Became a Tree (Italy/France/UK/Ireland 2001, dir. Goran Pasklajević)
In This World (UK 2002, dir. Michael Winterbottom)
Interdevochka/Intergirl (Soviet Union/Sweden 1989, dir. Pyotr Todorosvky)
L'Intrus/The Intruder (France 2004, dir. Claire Denis)
It's A Free World ((UK/Italy/Germany/Spain/Poland 2007, dir. Ken Loach)
J'ai pas sommeil/I Cannot Sleep (France/Switzerland 1994, dir. Claire Denis)
Jalla! Jalla! (Sweden 2000, dir. Josef Fares)
Jerusalem (Sweden 1996, dir. Bille August)
Kiss of Life (UK 2003, dir. Emily Young)
Kurz und schmerzlos/Short Sharp Shock (Germany 1997, dir. Fatih Akin)
Lamerica (Italy 1994, dir. Gianni Amelio)
Last Resort (UK 2000, dir. Pawel Pawlikowski)
L'esquive/Games of Love and Chance (France 2003, dir. Abdellatif Kechiche)
Lilja 4-Ever (Sweden/Denmark 2002, dir. Lukas Moodyson)
'Loin du 16ème/ Far from the 16th [arrondissement]', dir. Walter Salles and Daniela Thomas, in *Paris je t'aime/Paris, I Love You* (France/Liechtenstein/Switzerland 2006, various directors)
Maradona by Kusturica (France 2008, dir. Emir Kusturica)
Mongol (Kazakhstan/Germany/Russia/Mongolia 2007, dir. Sergei Bodrov)
Nordrand/Northern Skirts (Austria 1999, dir. Barbara Albert)
Nybyggarna/The New Land (Sweden 1972, dir. Jan Troell)
Promesse, La/The Promise (Belgium 1996, dir. Jean-Pierre and Luc Dardenne)
Occident (Romania 2002, dir. Cristian Mungiu)
One Dollar Curry (France/India/UK, 2004, dir. Vijay Singh)
Pelle erobreren/Pelle the Conqueror (Denmark/Sweden 1987, dir. Bille August)
Pola X (France/Switzerland/Germany/Japan 1999, dir. Leos Carax)
Pusher series (Denmark 1996-2007, dir. Nicolas Winding Refn)
Rezervni Deli/Spare Parts (Slovenia 2003, dir. Damjan Kozole)
Suriyothai (Thailand 2001, dir. Chatrichalerm Yukol)
Tudja Amerika/Someone Else's America (France/UK/Germany/Greece 1995, dir. Goran Goran Pasklajević)
Tvrdjava Evropa/Fortress Europe (Slovenia 2001, dir. Zelimir Zilnik)
Twenty-nine Palms (France/Germany/USA 2003, dir. Bruno Dumont)
Utvandrarna/The Emigrants (Sweden 1971, dir. Jan Troell)
Wild Side (Belgium/France/UK 2004, dir. Sébastien Lifshitz)
Zozo (Sweden 2005, dir. Josef Fares)

[i] The estimates on the total number of Roma in Europe vary between eight and twelve million people (compared to about two million Jews). For a complexity of reasons, no definitive

census data on the matter exist, but Roma and Sinti constitute Europe's largest minority (Rose 2006). On issues of cross-cultural representation see Iordanova (2008) and the other articles in this special issue of *Third Text* (22.3 [2008]), edited by Paloma Gay y Blasco and Dina Iordanova.

[ii] The online journal *Spaces of Identity*, edited in Edmonton and Vienna, is one of the publications in which interdisciplinary transnational postcolonial studies relating to Central and Southeast Europe have evolved over the years.

[iii] For a detailed analysis of *Lamerica* within a postcolonial framework see my *Cinema of Flames: Balkan Film, Culture and the Media* (Iordanova 2001).

[iv] And even where they move towards the city centre, it is in a context which foregrounds their peripheral standing. Walter Salles and Daniela Thomas's short 'Loin du 16ème/ Far from the 16th [arrondissement]' in the omnibus film *Paris je t'aime* (France/Liechtenstein/Switzerland 2006) gives a modern day take on older versions of migration that links class hierarchies to movements within urban space: Ana is a young single mother, a migrant who gets up in her dark apartment and then crosses the urban high rise jungle to take her baby son to the nursery where she leaves him for the day. She is then seen undertaking a lengthy journey on the RER to her employers' home in the affluent 16th arrondissement of Paris, where another baby boy, almost identical to her own, awaits to be taken care of. All day long she stays with him and sings the same songs that she will sing to her own son later that night after she has returned to her home in the *banlieue*.

[v] In the summer of 2008, British media reported extensively on the phenomenon of the 'returning Poles': migrants who had arrived in the UK after the EU enlargement of 2004 and had taken up jobs across the country, were now, in view of the UK's stagnating economy, packing up and leaving. It was claimed that the short-lived Polish migration had in some places led to tensions with disenfranchised local residents. Ken Loach's film *It's a Free*

World compellingly shows important aspects of this phenomenon. The fact that migrants leeave when they encounters difficulties (and will probably return when things improve) confirms my view that permanent resettlement is unlikely.

[vi] The middle generation includes filmmakers whose careers started before and continued after the turn of 1989. By comparison, cineastes of the younger generation entered the scene only after 1989, while many of those belonging to the older generation had a difficult time adjusting to the new production conditions and significantly reduced their outputs.

[vii] This is different from cases where directors have made a clear move to settle in another country – like Polish Stanislaw Mucha who lives in Germany or the Yugoslavs Aleksandar Manic, Mira Erdevicki, Sinisa Dragin and Zoran Solomun who live in the Czech Republic, the UK, Romania and Germany respectively. Many of these directors find it difficult to make the leap from documentary into features; like other migrants or even local filmmakers, they struggle to gain access to financing. They are quietly encouraged to stay within the thematic areas they are supposed to know best and make films mostly on Eastern European topics. They often revisit material from back home, yet are also sensitive to themes of cross-border migrations and exchanges.

[viii] Simultaneously, in the aftermath of the Cold War, there have been young filmmakers from the West who crossed earlier divides and migrated (temporarily) to Eastern Europe to learn the trade or make films. Some come from migrant families that are linked to the region, like Swiss-Croat Andrea Staka, whose early shorts, documentaries and acclaimed debut feature *Das Fräulein* (Switzerland/Germany 2006) are all concerned with stories linked to former Yugoslavia. British director Emily Young studied at Łodz in Poland and was said to have brought Eastern European sensibilities to her feature *Kiss of Life* (UK 2003), starring Russian-Lithuanian actress Ingeborga Dapkunaite, now based in the UK. Since the end of communist

rule, many West Europeans have studied at FAMU in Prague, some returning to their countries of origin and some opting to operate transnationally.

[ix] Of equal importance would be to explore migratory moves of professionals that have followed the West-East trajectory; they are particularly influential in the industry. The young Briton Matthew Stillman founded Stillking Films shortly after arriving in postcommunist Prague in 1993. It gradually grew into the main intermediary service company, facilitating the work of numerous large Hollywood productions shooting at the Barrandov Studios and across the Czech Republic, thus capitalising on locally available skilled labour and lower prices and building up a booming business throughout the 1990s.

[x] Anamaria Marinca, the star of the 2007 Cannes-winner *4 luni, 3 saptamani si 2 zile/4 Months, 3 Weeks & 2 Days* (Romania 2007) had migrated to the UK and launched her career there. By the time director Cristian Mungiu discovered her, she had only appeared in British TV dramas like the BBC's two-part *Sex Traffic* (2004); she had to be invited and brought back home to star in the film that became the most celebrated films of new Romanian cinema.

[xi] Mungiu also directed the multi-award winning *4 luni, 3 saptamani si 2 zile/4 Months, 3 Weeks & 2 Days*.