

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# The 'other' in the context of everyday life in Kaurismäki's Le Havre and The Other Side of Hope <sup>1</sup>

Merve Engür<sup>1</sup> | Tuğba Elmacı<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Master's Student, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale/Türkiye  
ORCID: [0000-0001-7809-9969](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7809-9969)  
E-Mail: [merveengur@gmail.com](mailto:merveengur@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale/Türkiye  
ORCID: [0000-0002-8545-2836](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8545-2836)  
E-Mail: [tugbaelmaci@comu.edu.tr](mailto:tugbaelmaci@comu.edu.tr)

**Corresponding Author:**  
Merve Engür

## Abstract

*The cinema of Aki Kaurismäki has a special place in world cinema as the synergy of the oppressed and the rabble. Le Havre and The Other Side of Hope, which belong to the unfinished Harbor Town Trilogy of Aki Kaurismäki, are important films of the director on refugee others. Both films aimed to destroy the perception of immigration and the hate speech that Western societies develop by marginalizing ethnicity from a humanist focus. Kaurismäki's approach coincides with the theories of Michel de Certeau and Erving Goffman, based on the fact that social actors develop tactics in the face of powers. The local others, who stand in solidarity with the refugee others, are De Certeau's dishonest and unclear tacticians against authority. Moreover, these perpetrators find partners in crime within the strategy and use the system to their advantage. Kaurismäki has built a strong narrative, that escaping from power will make a humanistic world order possible, by applying all the tactics to his characters. As basic analysis methods; Lacanian psychoanalysis was used to examine the others of the cinema of Kaurismäki and the sociological criticism approach was used to analyze the actions of others in everyday life.*

**Keywords:** Aki Kaurismäki, 'the other', everyday life sociology, refugee films

## Öz

*İskandinav Sineması'nın auteur kabul edilen yönetmeni Aki Kaurismäki'nin sineması ezilen, hor görülen ötekilerin sineması olarak dünya sinemasında kendine özel bir yer edinmiştir. Filmlerini genellikle üçlemeler olarak devam ettiren Aki Kaurismäki'nin henüz tamamlanmamış olan liman şehri üçlemesine ait, göçmen ötekiler üzerine çektiği önemli filmleri Umut Limanı ve Umudun Öteki Yüzü bu çalışma bağlamında incelenmiştir. Bu iki film, yakın dönemin en önemli insanlık trajedilerini de beraberinde getiren göçmenlik kavramı ve batılı toplumların etnisite üzerinden ötekileştirerek geliştirdikleri nefret söylemini hümanist bir odaktan yıkmayı hedeflemiştir. Kaurismäki'nin bu yaklaşımı Michel de Certeau ve Erving Goffman'ın güçlü iktidarlar karşısında toplumsal aktörlerin kaçış taktikleri geliştirmeleri üzerine kurdukları teoriler ile örtüşmektedir. Bu iki filmdeki göçmen ötekiler ve onlarla dayanışan yerel ötekiler, otoriteye karşı De Certeau'nun pek dürüst olmayan, arka kapıdan dolanan ve açık oynamayan taktikçileridir. Dahası bu taktikçi failler otoritenin yani stratejinin içinden suç ortakları bularak sistemi kendi lehlerine kullanırlar ve amaçlarına ulaşarak mutlu sonu hak ederler. Kaurismäki, sosyolog De Certeau'nun toplumsal aktörler için belirlediği tüm taktikleri kendi karakterlerine uygulatarak, iktidarlardan kaçmanın hümanist bir dünya düzenini mümkün kılacağına ilişkin güçlü söylemini sinemasal bir anlatı üzerinden kurmuştur. Kaurismäki sinemasının ötekilerini açıklarken Lacancı psikanaliz ve öteki karakterlerin gündelik hayat içerisindeki eylemlerini çözümleyen de sosyolojik film eleştiri metodu temel çözümleme yöntemleri olarak kullanılmıştır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Aki Kaurismäki, 'öteki', gündelik hayat sosyolojisi, göçmen filmleri

May 2023  
Volume:20  
Issue:53  
DOI: [10.26466/opusjsr.1245475](https://doi.org/10.26466/opusjsr.1245475)

**Citation:**  
Engür, M. & Elmacı, T. (2023).  
The 'other' in the context of  
everyday life in Kaurismäki's Le  
Havre and the other side of  
hope. *OPUS- Journal of Society  
Research*, 20(53), 375-385.

<sup>1</sup> This paper is produced from the unpublished Master thesis entitled "The other' and urban spaces in the context of everyday life in Aki Kaurismäki's films" written by Merve Engür under the supervision of Tuğba Elmacı.

## Introduction

The cinema of Aki Kaurismäki has a unique style that develops different narratives in the political wing of European cinema. Kaurismäki pivots his narrative around oppressed, excluded, and marginalized people. For him, it is an important mission to be the voice of others and bring back holistic European thinking, which is losing its spirit of humanism. In the context of this study, while searching for the lost humanism in his films *Le Havre* and *The Other Side of Hope*, which belong to the harbor town trilogy, he argues that in the absence of authority, people can still act and cooperate with this spirit. In Nestingen's interview (2013) with Kaurismäki, he genuinely criticizes the European Union's and Finland's "shameful" refugee policy (p.151). In another interview, the Finnish director summarizes what he is trying to do by saying "That's why I rushed this one out. I wanted everyone to see that refugees are human too. Cinema can influence a tiny bit. One penny makes a big river." (Gilbey, 2017). This study aims to examine the cinematic style of Kaurismäki which establishes a hope-based story universe apart from the clichés about refugee others told by his contemporaries and focuses on *others*. In this sense, the cinema of Kaurismäki prefers a narrative that leaves room for deep reflection without falling into the trap of sentimentalism about refugee others.

Everyday life is one of the areas where marginalization and the others in social life can be examined which is a set of repetitive and seemingly simple activities. The everyday life cycle includes ordinary actions such as what to wear, how to act, and how to talk in public places. Since classical sociology theories have a macro perspective, it can be said that the focus is on society rather than the individual. In other words, the structural codes which usually determine the actions of the actors, are emphasized rather than what individuals do in daily life (Esgin & Özben, 2020, pp.35-39). Sociology, which emerged from the need to understand modern societies, focused on the perpetrator and everyday life issues that are neglected, after proving itself by developing scientific methods. Georg Simmel, Henri Lefebvre,

Pierre Bourdieu, Erving Goffman, and Michel de Certeau are the important philosophers who have studied everyday life sociology. Erving Goffman states that social behaviors are performances and social relations are portrayed just like a theater play (Goffman, 1959). Performers act momentarily for their benefit while they are performing. Similarly, Michel de Certeau states that ordinary people in society develop tactics to live with the dominant power's strategies (De Certeau, 2008). Considering the cinema of Kaurismäki, social actors who fulfill De Certeau's tactics have always been the protagonists of the narrative. For example, he narrates characters who are exploited both economically and socially. Unlike his contemporaries like Ken Loach or the Dardenne Brothers, he prefers a humorous plot rather than a heavy dramatic universe. The others in this trilogy are not the classical exploiters, but rather lower-class agents trying to defeat strategy. However, the consequences of the actions of the social actors in these films are far from escape tactics that predict a rational goal that De Certeau refers to. For this reason, main films such as the Proletariat trilogy and the loneliness-themed Finland trilogy were excluded from the study.

Unlike his contemporaries, Kaurismäki embellishes refugee stories with plenty of hope. Impossible to see a sentimentalist ending of melodrama in them. Both films have 'hope' in their names. He believes that Europe, surrounded by strict laws, has lost its humanism only with political ideologies. He shows that social actors can reverse their situation of being the other with the tactics they will develop against the strategy. As Bacon (2016) states, "He depicts another kind of Europeaness one characterized by the solidarity of ordinary people over national and ethnic boundaries" (p.190). It has also been noticed in the cinematic stories of the protagonists of the two films analyzed throughout this study that refugees do not compromise their journey to freedom and hope with their local accomplices. Humanity, solidarity, and hope have won anyway.

## The Other of Lacan

Otherness is based on binary logic and according to this dialectic Western way of thinking, when the other is considered, it automatically means that there is the self. Working on the structure of the mind, Freud, who is the founder of psychoanalysis, identifies the self as *the ego*. According to Freud's theory, the ego is the rational part of the mind that balances the id, which acts with primitive impulses, and the superego, which tries to accord with the social order (Rennison, 2001, p.39). Freud's follower Lacan brings a different interpretation to basic psychoanalytic theory by making use of linguistics, sociology, and anthropology. Lacan states that the formation of the self is provided by the realization of the other, and as a result, the human evolves into a subject. He identifies personality formation as *the mirror stage* and mentions three orders in this period: symbolic order, imaginary order, and the real. In the mirror stage, the infant essences the real self and creates *the other* in the imaginary order. Infants don't realize themselves as individuals until they see their reflection in the mirror. When they see the mirror, they don't see themselves but an image of themselves and they consubstantiate with the image. (Türkoğlu, 2011, p.145). "The mirror stage shows that the ego is the product of (*méconnaissance*) and the site where the subject becomes alienated from himself." (Evans, 2006, p.118). The subject defines its reality in the image it sees and becomes a whole with it. It is impossible to know or to reach *the real* so, the subject has to establish its fictional reality.

The subject belonging to the symbolic order is the subject of the unconscious produced by the ego, which is a part of the imaginary order (Evans, 2006, pp.197-198). While the other is the specular image and reflection of the ego in the imaginary order, Lacan uses another term, the big Other, to describe the otherness in the symbolic order. The big Other is the language, law, and order of the Father, which means the Father metaphorically rules the symbolic order. As Lacan stated, "It is in the Name of the Father that we must recognize the support of the symbolic function which, from the dawn of history, has identified his person with the figure" (Lacan 1977, p.67, as cited in Şen, 2021, p.24). The other is mostly used to define the other

groups that are different from the dominant culture, in other words, *the other* definition is only accepted if it is made by the cultural power, cultural hegemony (Posos Devrani, 2017, p.930). Similar to the formation of the ego, group belonging can only exist with the other groups coming into existence. Immigrants, the working class, women, and children are common examples of other groups that are not in power in the symbolic order. This otherness is internalized by the subject almost without being aware of it because it is about the structure in which the subjects are (Abedkouhi, 2021, pp. 73-74). 'Without being aware of it' statement is the key to comprehending the big Other. As Levinas mentioned, the best way to encounter *the other* is not noticing what it looks like (Levinas, 1985, as cited in Ahmed, 2009, p.178).

When language comes into the life of a person who constructs themselves through the other they see in the mirror, they switch to the symbolic order and become a subject. The subject, who gives up their *jouissance* to adapt to the symbolic order, experiences a loss and a lack. They feel hate because they think this surplus pleasure, which was theirs before, has been stolen by the Other. This hatred is "the strategy that the subject resorts to in order not to take responsibility for his shortcomings" (Nacak, 2019). Nacak mentions that modern racism is formed with similar motivation and even if the hated groups disappear, the hatred will continue. The big Other, like the language, regulates social, political, and economic, even everyday life. Everyday life is a normal space where the ego and the other are encountered and the other is marginalized (Özensel, 2020). The concept of the other, which affects both individual and social behaviors, occupies an important place in everyday life studies.

### **Goffman and De Certeau in Everyday Life Sociology**

Sociology, which emerged from the need to understand modern societies, focused on the perpetrator and everyday life issues that are neglected, after proving itself by developing scientific methods. After the industrial revolution

western cities are focused on production (hence consumption), the everyday life adapted to the texture of modern cities, and the migration from rural to the needs of the city, cannot be explained as completely natural processes. The power also plays a major role in the formation of urban spaces, planning how social relations will take place in these spaces, and regulating which period of daily life will be spent where. George Herbert Mead from Chicago School, who is the author of the book titled *Mind, Self & Society*, is one of the first social psychologists to show that mind and memory are produced in a social process (Mead, 1972, p. XV). Influenced by Mead, Goffman develops a dramaturgical theory in which he explains the formation of the self by likening social relations to a theater stage (Goffman, 1959). Goffman, one of the contemporary representatives of the Chicago School, tried to express the ideological reality with his way of dealing with everyday life and with rhetorical expression. He has succeeded in reaching a wide audience because of his ability to keep the language simple while doing a scientific study. "Goffman's books were immediately seen as vital and contemporary and they filled a gap that was opening between everyday experience and sociological theory" (MacCannell 2000 [1983], p.13, as cited in Sahni, 2013, p.154). Although he fits the definition of a symbolic interactionist, Goffman has tried to distance his works from a traditional theoretical plane and stereotypes. He creates his concepts in an eclectic way and uses both linguistic ability and scientific knowledge together and gives very rare references in his works (Sahni, 2013, p.151). In his book called *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), Goffman mentions that the behaviors exhibited in social relations are roles and that the performers perform a play for their benefit to convince the audience (p.249). As both the audience and the performers believe in the play they are playing, the roles are now integrated with reality and the distinction between the two disappears. People in social life, which are actors, present themselves by applying certain tactics and methods while playing their roles (Goffman, 1959, p.15-16). According to this approach, the self is a consequence, not a cause, of an individual's social performance. The

presentation of the self, which he explains with his social psychological approach, is discussed in detail within the scope of this study and used as one of the theories in the analysis of *other* characters in Aki Kaurismäki's films.

Discussing everyday life with modernity, Lefebvre, on the other hand, takes an approach from a Neo-Marxist perspective and emphasizes the importance of power both in urban spaces and everyday life. Lefebvre, who defines everyday life as repetitive and ordinary behaviors, relationships, and fields, mentions the changing conditions of social life with the industrial revolution. Everyday life cannot be dissociated from modern cities and "specifies how people's social existence is produced" (Lefebvre, 2007, p.34). The reproduction of social relations through urban spaces looms large in the works of Lefebvre. The importance of the concept of *reproduction* in Lefebvre's work comes from its assertion that social relations are not passive. Moreover, social relations are not inactive and reproduced in a complex structure. However, this production does not occur in the upper circle of society such as the state, science, and culture. Everyday life is a misery that is a field of duties and humiliations for the working class. In addition, it is macro because it contains continuity. Repetitive practices in everyday life are "adaptation of body, space and time, desire" (Lefebvre, 2007, p.47). This continuity is first shaped by style, then by the culture that includes ideology. In this sense, everyday life is a place where power and power relations are evaluated. In early studies about everyday life, which is an area of domination and resistance, there are no tactics that the weak can escape or use against strategic manipulation. Social behavior was defined either by cultural frame or by rules set by power. Michel de Certeau bridged this gap in theory by appealing to ordinary people who developed tactics against power strategies.

De Certeau, who used Lefebvre's works as the main source, examined everyday life through the daily activities of individuals such as walking, reading, and cooking. He mentions that individuals consume the dogmatic reality imposed by the power in everyday life and start a second production (De Certeau, 2008, p.23-24). He defines

the regulations made by the power in everyday life and depending on a place as a *strategy*. Distinctly to Lefebvre, De Certeau emphasizes that ordinary people have a way of coping with these imposed regulations. Ordinary people are not passive members of society as they use *tactics* that are escape plans to develop depending on time, not space (De Certeau, 2008, pp. 54-55). Positioning his work to cover all everyday life practices, De Certeau states that Foucault's disciplinary procedures, Bourdieu's strategies, and tactics in general constitute the fields of operation that produce a theory. He criticizes that Foucault wrote the narratives and Bourdieu made the narratives pioneer of the system by including them in scientific discourse (De Certeau, 2008, p.168). He argues that Bourdieu's anthropological work as an outsider and an *observer* in Kabylia and Bearn can be fraught with misinterpretations while making more general sociological inferences. Bourdieu's concept of habitus conceals the tactics used by the weak. According to Bourdieu (1995), habitus is the likes, preferences, behaviors, and lifestyles that an individual internalizes through the group or class to which they belong (p.23). Habitus determines the way people practice, so it is a distinctive feature of social groups. When an agent acquires a habitus, they are produced as a subject. De Certeau, on the other hand, argues that the habitus in Bourdieu's theory is based on a higher determining position in the decision-making of the perpetrators and that the perpetrator's escape decisions are taken from their own hands and pacified. Schirato & Webb (1999) explains De Certeau's criticism of Bourdieu's habitus as follows:

"However, the logic of his theory of habitus and this last self-exemplification of that logic means that the overdetermining effect of Bourdieu's habitus renders the 'other' of that habitus, and any metalogic about habitus as a generalized, theoretical tool, invisible to him" (p.95).

From this point of view, the inference can be made that the personal decisions of the weak are as effective as habitus in behavioral choices. The *other* characters in Aki Kaurismäki's films make decisions outside of their social groups and they go beyond their habitus and implement tactics by

making *impulsive* decisions as De Certeau mentioned in his theory.

### Methodology

As a cultural representation tool, cinema produces social performances in terms of its relationship with the audience. Therefore, a film has a multi-layered structure beyond its aesthetic dimension. This layered structure reveals the meanings of the film. Film criticism also follows this multi-layered structure and makes films understandable with various methodologies. Since the films examined within the scope of this study focus on refugee stories and the psychology of the characters, sociological and psychoanalytic film criticisms were used as methods.

Kabadayı explains that in sociological film criticism, it is possible to question how the society described in films progresses together with the existing society, to reveal the hidden thoughts, by deciphering concepts such as reality, representation, allegory, rituals, tradition, cultural values, violence, everyday life, identities, social roles, and gender. Sociological film criticism helps to understand how these structures are constructed in films (Kabadayı, 2014, p.57). On the other hand, what determines the actions of the characters within social norms is not only cultural norms but also a result of the character's psychological processes. Although the processes that put the characters into action in films are determined by social norms, both the progression and impulsive fixations that identify them necessitate a different examination. The instrument that best analyzes the psychology of character in the methodology of film criticism is psychoanalysis. While psychoanalytic film criticism was based on Freud's psychoanalytic theory, it has been very instructive in consideration of the concepts developed by his successors, especially Lacan. Film criticism based on psychoanalytic theory tries to find the expression of the unconscious or the traces of the expression of the collective unconscious (Özden, 2004, p.180). This method reviews the films like daydreams and tries to reveal the tacit content. Psychoanalytic film criticism is used as the most

important tool to uncover the characters' tacit actions. In the context of this study, the films *Le Havre* and *The Other Side of Hope* are analyzed in light of the basic concepts of both sociological and psychoanalytic film criticism.

## Findings

### The conceptualization of 'the other' in Kaurismäki's *Le Havre* and *The Other Side of Hope*

In addition to the trilogies of the proletariat and Finland, Kaurismäki continues his filmography with the harbor town trilogy, which he developed on the theme of migration, one of the most basic sociological phenomena of recent years. Although Kaurismäki does not complete the harbor town trilogy, the first two films hang together and ensure continuity. Therefore, the two films are enough to produce meaning on immigration and otherness. *Le Havre*, the first film of the trilogy, is about a young African boy who tries to reunite with his mother who is in London but lands in the harbor city of Le Havre accidentally.

In this film, Marcel Marx is a shoe shiner who lives in a small port city with his partner, Arletty. One day during a night shift at the port, the security encounters African refugees inside one of the containers after he heard a baby crying. When the police open the container to arrest the refugees, a young boy Idrissa runs away. Marcel first comes across Idrissa at the harbor where he was hiding and doesn't denounce him. Meanwhile, Marcel's partner falls ill and hospitalizes. When Marcel returns home alone, he sees Idrissa sleeping in the pantry. Marcel decides to help him to go to his mother in London, while one of his neighbors calls the police and reports Idrissa. Knowing that Marcel is hiding Idrissa, Inspector Monet amicably warns him. Marcel finds Idrissa's grandfather in a refugee camp and takes his mother's address. Monet receives a harsh warning from his superiors to solve the case so, he increases the pressure on Marcel. Meanwhile, Marcel organizes a benefit concert to balance the smuggler's money for Idrissa. Inspector Monet visits Marcel's house and again warns him implicitly that he has to send the

child as soon as possible. Police raid Marcel's house while his friends are carrying Idrissa out of the neighborhood secretly inside the greengrocer's wheelbarrow. After Marcel escapes from the police, he meets with Idrissa at the harbor to say goodbye. Before the boat moves, the police come but Monet sits on the cover where Idrissa is hiding and protects him from the police. Finally, Marcel's partner Arletty miraculously recovers from a hopeless illness after Idrissa departs.

The second film, *The Other Side of Hope*, focuses on the Syrian refugee story that determines the recent period politically and sociologically. This film is about the Syrian refugee Khaled who comes to Finland among coals on a ship and surrenders to the police to apply for asylum. During his stay at the refugee processing facility, the litigation process begins. He shares his escape story with the authorities that he lost his whole family after a bomb hit their house, except his sister Miriam. He traveled to Europe with Miriam until they lost each other at the Serbia-Hungary border, and now he wants to find her. Despite all the memories that Khaled told and the news about the ongoing bombings in Syria, the court decided to send him back. After the verdict, Khaled escapes and starts to live on the streets. Meanwhile, Wikström is separated from his partner and wants to change his job. He sells all the shirts that are left from his job and gambles to balance the money to go into the restaurant business. He takes over the restaurant called 'Golden Pint' with the existing employees and starts to try different ways to put his business in order. One day, when he goes to take out the garbage in the restaurant, he meets Khaled and after their fistfight, he takes him to the restaurant. Wikström arranges accommodation for Khaled, hires him, and helps him to have a fake id card. Khaled learns that his sister is in a refugee camp in Lithuania and wants to pick her up but Wikström doesn't let him. He easily finds someone to bring Miriam to Finland. Miriam tells Khaled that she doesn't want a fake id card and she will surrender. That night, a racist stabs Khaled and calls him a "Jew". Despite being injured, Khaled catches up with Miriam before she surrenders to the police and gives her some tactics for the interview. The

film ends as Khaled sits under the tree by the sea, smokes, and smiles.

In these two films, Kaurismäki put refugee others and local others in the center of the narrative. The other characters in both films are the people who struggle to survive in a disadvantaged position in the social arena. The spirit of class solidarity is a general pattern in Kaurismäki's narration and is again reinforced in these films. This time he focuses on the low social classes' dreamy solidarity, including refugees.

What local others find or try to find in refugee others in Kaurismäki's characters coincides with Lacan's theory. The subject must integrate with the small other, as in the mirror stage, to reach itself, that is, it must add meaning to what is not itself (Tura, 2010, p.76). To be itself, it must renounce itself. The subject finds everything in the other, that does not belong to itself. It seeks its desires and shortcomings in the field of the other. But the signifiers of the other are as incomplete as his own. So, both are incomplete. While Westerners as the subject wait to complete themselves with the others they encounter, Kaurismäki again leaves the subject incomplete by making fictional tricks here. To realize these tricks, Kaurismäki goes beyond the stereotypes while characterizing the refugees.

The out-of-places refugee character Khaled is a presentable and educated person who speaks English very well. Again, Idrissa, the other of *Le Havre*, is a fairly well-educated non-stereotypical African refugee whose father is a professor. Both characters are objects that threaten *jouissance* for the subject, which Lacan turns Freud's pleasure principle into a broader study. For the subject, *jouissance* turns into something that they cannot reach but that the other reaches. This is one of the reasons for the hatred developed for the *other*. Nacak (2019) mentions that the subject thinks there is a pleasure only the other has. Hatred targets this surplus enjoyment that does not belong to the subject identified in the other. Racist or exclusionary narratives always assume added enjoyment in the other. These others are the people who exploit the achievements they deserve for the subject. Therefore, it is an unconscious strategy that the subject develops to cope with his deficiency, especially in these narratives based on

ethnic discrimination. Whatever the case, the idea that the other has a pleasure that they do not deserve, namely *jouissance*, is dominant for this discriminatory subject. They think that they once had this surplus pleasure, but the other came and stole it from them. However, *jouissance* has already been stolen long before that, with the symbolic order.

The main focus of Kaurismäki's harbor town films, the subject and their positioning against the big Other determined by the authority are the objects that threaten *jouissance*. In *The Other Side of Hope*, this is the psychology that mobilized the racist Nazi-sympathizer people. Kaurismäki confronts Khaled with racist attitudes and shows him as the target of anger. Moreover, this feeling leads the masses to xenophobia in today's Western societies. Xenophobia, which can be defined as extreme fear and dislike of ethnicity, represents a mass mood directed at others who try to be partners in the *jouissance* in both *Le Havre* and *The Other Side of Hope*. In particular, the immigration authorities who questioned Khaled decided to deport him to Syria as it is a safe place to live, even though the news on the television shows otherwise. In *Le Havre*, Inspector Monet searches for Idrissa with the same motivation.

The local other character in *Le Havre*, Marcel Marx is a poor individual who owes money to shopkeepers such as bakeries and grocers in the neighborhood, who barely lives the day financially. In the opening scene, the appearance of Marcel Marx with his Vietnamese friend Chang, who is also a shoe shiner, creates the first perception in terms of understanding the character's social position. Kaurismäki underlines that Marcel Marx is living surrounded by 'the others' and uses him as thematic continuity among his films *La Vie de Bohème* (1992) and *Le Havre*. Marcel Marx first appears in Kaurismäki's black-and-white film *La Vie de Bohème*, as an unpaid writer who is helping his illegal immigrant friend, again played by André Wilms. The fact that Kaurismäki carried the character to this film is like proof of his consistency in his cinema and that his stories are 'the other's story.'

In *The Other Side of Hope*, Waldemar Wikström leaves his partner and closes his job. This shows

that he is not a member of the power class and that he has returned to the zero point by leaving the bases of his life. He gambles with the money left over from his job and, by miraculous luck, buys a restaurant 'Golden Pint' with his overnight earnings and starts working with three existing staff. The fact that he does not lay off his staff and helps them with basic matters such as cleaning, taking out the garbage, and cooking are signs that Wikström stands by the others. Although he is the owner and boss of the restaurant, the character does not have the characteristics of a dominant class, on the contrary, he behaves like an employee. The fact that his character did not change after getting rich and still behaved modestly shows that Wikström earned this money not to gain power, but to change his life and start over. In a way, he knew that he is not going to be the subject, thus he doesn't have any negative approaches to the other. Therefore, he has no hesitation to share jouissance. In other words, like Marcel Marx, Wikström is one of Kaurismäki's other characters.

The dominant culture, which represents the language, rules, and state, which Lacan identifies as the big Other, marginalizes those who are different from themselves. Just like the ego, the others must exist for the ruling group to exist. Groups such as the working class, the oppressed, the poor, women, and immigrants are those who are marginalized, create the power class, and do not have power in the symbolic order (Chanter, 2009, p.98). Moreover, the big Other maintains the rules of the culture of power in social, political, and economic fields and even in everyday life. In this context, the others of the capitalist society, Marcel and Wikström are in the position of the other who develop tactics against the strategies of power that De Certeau mentioned in his theory. Every regulation by the power in everyday life is a strategy, and these strategies are built on a specific place, ownership, and belonging (De Certeau, 2008, p.55). De Certeau states that strategies take place based on space in the face of these. Besides, the oppressed and powerless citizens develop tactics based on time in line with their interests. In both Kaurismäki's films, the characters similarly develop tactics against power strategies. The relationship and cooperation developed by Marcel

with Idrissa and by Wikström with Khaled have become a game they play together against the rules of power.

This association also occurs between refugee others. After Khaled surrendered to the police, he met Iraqi Mazdak at the refugee processing facility. Mazdak gives clues about how Khaled should behave in his interviews for an asylum application. He tells humorously that they first deport the melancholics and that he should look happy. This friendship between Khaled and Mazdak corresponds to the backstage performance in Goffman's theory of dramaturgy. The preparation process of the performances to be exhibited on the social front is planned backstage, and also there are class differences in these performances (Goffman, 1959, pp.15-16). The performance of the dominant class is idealized, while the weaker ones tend to rise as they perform in line with the ideal. Mazdak's clues are the backstage talks to approach the ideal performance within his knowledge. The two characters share strategic secrets to keep the audience from getting involved in the performance. The backstage, where the performance is prepared, is a safe area that the audience cannot enter (Goffman, 1959, p.113). In *Le Havre*, a similar situation occurs between local others Marcel and his neighbors. They are equal to the term 'team' in Goffman's theory. Not giving up on Idrissa, organizing a Little Bob concert for the money to be collected for the ship that will take him to England, and being taken to the harbor by hiding from the police can be given as examples of solidarity, which Goffman calls strategic secrets (Goffman, 1959, pp.141-142). Unity and solidarity without imposed rules, terms, and mutual benefits can be the product of a nostalgic feeling. In reality, such nostalgia and solidarity are not in line with the policies of the European Union. Both films expose the discrimination experienced by refugees in developed countries (Gültekin, 2021, p. 83). Idrissa's false image in the media as an Al-Qaeda member and attacks on Khaled can be examples of discrepancies. Since it is precisely this hypocritical stance that Kaurismäki criticizes, it allows the characters in his film to act with nostalgic feelings, and therefore develop tactics (Bunbury, 2018).



Kaurismäki has interpreted not only the others who use tactics but also the representatives of the dominant class who serve the strategy. He fictionalizes Inspector Monet in *Le Havre* and the personnel in charge of the refugee processing facility in *The Other Side of Hope* to represent the strategy. Monet warns Marcel off the record and secretly helps the others despite being a part of the strategy. Additionally, the facility officer delays the cops who came for Khaled and opens the back door for him to escape. This addresses that the officer commits a behavior contrary to the strategy. In short, the bureaucrats to whom the strategy expects to be loyal, betray themselves. In his theory, these performances are the secrets that the performer necessarily hides from the team he belongs to, which Goffman (1959) refers to as 'entrusted secrets' (p.143). Along with the performances, Kaurismäki makes references through character names. In *Le Havre*, he refers to Marcel Carné, Jacques Becker and Claude Monet. Marcel's partner is named after Arletty who played Garance in *Les Enfants du Paradis* (1945), one of the leading films of French poetic realism (Holst-Knudsen, 2018, p.115). Both films are shot in Le Havre. In *The Other Side of Hope*, the name of the dog that secretly stays in the restaurant and is later adopted is a reference to the director's lead character Koistinen in *Lights in the Dusk* (2006). This intertextual style also contributes to the director's narrative.

After Idrissa escaped from the police, Marcel reads in the newspaper: "One of the container refugees escaped, armed and dangerous. There may be an Al-Qaeda connection". Mass media, one of the biggest strategy tools of power, creates its reality and defines an unguarded African child as an armed terrorist. Similarly, while Marcel was working in front of a shoe store, the store employee chases him away and calls him a 'terrorist'. The use of the adjective 'terrorist', which is disconnected from reality, shows that both characters stand against the same power. Before meeting Idrissa, Marcel lives with his tactics against the dominant culture and strategies as a marginalized individual in society. The statement that an African child may have a connection to 'Al-Qaeda' can be counted as an example of xenophobia used by Kaurismäki in

both of his films. Just like the person who racially attacks Khaled and says "Jew". Kaurismäki empties the hate speeches arising from racism without directing them to an individual. Making news that is so disconnected from reality can also be read as Kaurismäki's criticism of the media and racism created in vain (Harkness, 2012).

Kaurismäki's other characters are quite determined not to stay where the subject tries to hold them. In particular, the solidarity they develop with local others encourages them to take different actions against the strategy sociologically as the big Other. The tactics developed by Kaurismäki's local others against the strategy proceed as the main theme. In this context, the meaning of tactics in the political view of Kaurismäki is also very important (Harkness, 2012). The characters have to take shelter in tactics, which is the strongest instrument of the weak against the marginalizing attitudes of the strategies. These tactics include telling white lies, preparing fake id cards, hiding from officers, and being in solidarity. Especially, tactics that De Certeau sees as cheating, inconsistent with strategy, and changing according to time, are forcible tools for others. Kaurismäki also assigned tactics and roles to others in Northern Europe, where the strategy was drawn with strict rules. In doing so, it has built local accomplices. In this context, the cinema of Kaurismäki is the cinema of others who resist strategy.

## Discussion and Conclusions

The auteur director of Scandinavian Cinema, Aki Kaurismäki, has opened a special area for himself in European cinema. The main focus of his cinema is the lower classes, the oppressed, and others. Unlike other contemporaries, Kaurismäki portrays these masses that society wants to ignore, not as a melodramatic image, on the contrary, he fictionalizes them as subjects who are strong with their differences and who know how to enjoy life despite everything. In the context of this work, in *The Other Side of Hope* and *Le Havre*, which belong to the Harbor Town Trilogy, he instills hope and solidarity in his audience through the refugee and local others. As is seen, Kaurismäki acts with a

holistic humanism, reflecting his political view and not letting hope be seen in the heavy melodramatic mood of immigrant stories. Although his hope occurs in a utopian reality, he allows his audience to imagine the possibilities of making another world possible.

Kaurismäki does not beware of criticizing Western societies and fashions, even while focusing on the real problems of everyday life. While humanity is suffering because of starvation and wars, he uses a humorous scene about fusion cuisine. On the other hand, he makes sarcastic imagery of the bureaucrats who send the Syrian protagonist to bombed-out Aleppo. In this sense, Kaurismäki turns humor into a counter weapon for his criticism of the big Other.

In this sense, the cinema of Kaurismäki is compatible with De Certeau's social engineering, that is, the power of ideology to direct the masses, to the construction of society, where it's impossible. The others of Kaurismäki find the power to defeat the strategy with the tactics they develop. While both refugees and local others are performing tactics against the strategy of the big Other, they also stand firm. The spirit of solidarity given by being the other makes it possible for them to play a wide range of tactical roles against strategy. Even while doing this, he doesn't neglect to make an ironic wound in the strategy by finding accomplices within. In this sense, the agents in everyday life overcome the state of being the other with a total union against the strategy. The utopian happy endings of *Le Havre* and *The Other Side of Hope* take place with the defeat of strategy. With these endings, Kaurismäki surpasses his contemporaries and adds his touch to the refugee other narratives with a different story universe.

## References

- Abedkouhi, F. (2021). *Lacan ve Levinas'ta Öteki ve Özne* (664862), [Doctoral dissertation, Ankara University].
- Ahmed, S. (2009). Bu Öteki ve Başka Ötekiler, *Cogito*, 58, 173-192.
- Bacon, H. (2016). An Increasingly European Nation. In H. Bacon (Ed.), *Finnish Cinema a Transnational Enterprise (187-190)*. Palgrave European Film and Media Studies. DOI10.1057/978-1-137-57651-4.
- Bhaskaran, G. (2015, December 16). Finnish legend Aki Kaurismäki returns with an immigrant tale, Refugee. *Hindustan Times*. <https://www.hindustantimes.com/world-cinema/finnish-legend-aki-kaurismaki-returns-with-immigrant-tale-refugee/story-AxVOkKhajNSI3IrZXWIdFM.html>
- Bourdieu, P. (1995). *Pratik Nedenler*. Kesit Yayıncılık.
- Bunbury, S. (2018, March 14). Director Aki Kaurismäki on The Other Side of Hope (and why he doesn't have much). *The Sydney Morning Herald*. <https://www.smh.com.au/entertainment/movies/director-aki-kaurismaki-on-the-other-side-of-hope-and-why-he-doesnt-have-much-20180313-h0xf6y.html>
- Chanter, T. (2009). Psikanalitik ve Post-Yapısalcı Feminizm ve Deleuze. *Cogito*, 58, 93-129.
- Cineuropa, (2013). Interview: Aki Kaurismäki Protagonist of European Cinema in Lecce. <https://cineuropa.org/en/video/236430/>
- De Certeau, M. (2008). *Gündelik Hayatın Keşfi 1 – Eylem, Uygulama, Üretim Sanatları*, Dost Kitabevi.
- Erkan, Ü. (2019). Lacan'da öznenin kurulumu ve ötekinin inşası psikanaliz ve oryantalizm, *Turkish Studies*, 14 (3), 1425-1440. [10.29228/TurkishStudies.22741](https://doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.22741)
- Evans, D. (2006). *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*, Routledge. <https://www.davidbardschwarz.com/pdf/evans.pdf>
- Gilbey, R. (2017, May 26). Aki Kaurismäki: 'I can watch Marvel movies – if it's Sunday and I'm hungover', *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2017/may/26/aki-kaurismaki-interview-the-other-side-of-hope>
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Doubleday.
- Gültekin, G. (2021). Umudun Öteki Yüzü Filminin Göstergibilimsel Çözümlemesi Bağlamında Mültecilik, *Journal of Aksaray Communication*, 3(1), 62-85. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348759224>

- Harkness, A. (2012, February, 23). Interview: Aki Kaurismäki, film director. *The Scotsman*. <https://www.scotsman.com/arts-and-culture/film-and-tv/interview-aki-kaurismaki-film-director-2461834>
- Holst-Knudsen, H. (2018). Picturing the Other: Teaching Migration and Community with Aki Kaurismäki's Le Havre. *The French Review*, 92(1), 111-126. <https://doi.org/10.1353/tfr.2018.0096>
- Kabadayı, L. (2014). *Film Eleştirisi*, Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Lefebvre, H. (2007). *Modern Dünyada Gündelik Hayat*, Metis Yayınları.
- Mead, H. G. (1972). *Me, Self, and Society*, The University of Chicago Press.
- Nacak, O. (2019). *Nefret ve Öteki* <https://www.oguzhannacak.com/post/nefret-ve-b%C3%BCy%C3%BCK-%C3%B6teki>
- Nesting, A. (2013). *The Cinema of Aki Kaurismäki contrarian stories*. Wallflower Press.
- Özden, Z. (2004). *Film Eleştirisi: Film Eleştirisinde Temel Yaklaşımlar ve Tür Filmi Eleştirisi*. İmge Kitabevi.
- Özensel, E. (2020). Farklılıkların Birarada Yaşamasında Bir Sorun Alanı Olarak Ötekinin Ötekileştirilmesi, *SEFAD*, (43), 369-378. <https://doi.org/10.21497/sefad.756095>
- Posos Devrani, A. E. (2017). Medyada Öteki'nin Temsili: Etnik Komediler, *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergi*, 5(2), 926-949.
- Rennison, N. (2001). *The Pocket Essential Freud & Psychoanalysis*. Pocket Essentials.
- Sahni, I. P. (2013). Reading Goffman: On the Creation of an Enigmatic Founder. In J. Low & G. Bowden (Ed.), *The Chicago School Diaspora: Epistemology and Substance* (150-166). McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Schirato, T. & Webb, J. (1999). The Ethics and Economies of Inquiry: Certeau, Theory, and the Art of Practice. *Diacritics*, 29(2), 86-99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1566456>
- Şen, N. (2021). *A comparative work: Lacanian reading of Korkuyu Beklerken and The Bell Jar on alienation* (Publication No. 699254), [Master's dissertation, İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi].
- Tura, S. M. (2010). *Freud'dan Lacan'a Psikanaliz*, Kanat Kitap.
- Türkoğlu, N. (2011). Psikanaliz ve sinema üzerine. In M. İri (Ed.), *Sinema Araştırmaları: Kuramlar, Kavramlar, Yaklaşımlar* (143-156). Derin Yayınları.