

Estonian Cinescapes:
Spaces, Places
and Sites in Soviet
Estonian Cinema
(and Beyond)

Eesti filmimaastikud.
Ruumid, kohad ja
paigad Nõukogude
Eesti filmis
(ning edaspidi)

Doctoral thesis



EESTI
KUNSTIAKADEEMIA
Kunstikultuuri teaduskond
Kunstiteaduse instituut
2011

Estonian Cinescapes: Spaces, Places and Sites in Soviet Estonian Cinema (and Beyond)
Eesti filmimaastikud. Ruumid, kohad ja paigad Nõukogude Eesti filmis (ning edaspidi)
Doctoral thesis

Supervisors

Prof. Virve Sarapik, Prof. Mart Kalm

External Reviewers

Prof. Ewa Mazierska

Dr. Michael Goddard

Opponent

Prof. Ewa Mazierska

Public defence

24 August 2011

Introduction copy-edited by Richard Adang

Design and layout by Andres Tali

The research has been supported by

Archimedes Foundation and the European Social Fund



Target-financed research topic no. SF0030054s08,
Rhetorical Patterns of Mimesis and Estonian Textual Culture



The Estonian National Culture Foundation

© Eva Näripea, 2011

ISBN 978-9949-467-15-0

ISSN 1736-2261

Printed by

Alfapress

INTRODUCTION 9

Space: The framework of analysis 14

Previous research on representations of urban environments and landscapes in film 25

Structure and summaries 26

Some conclusions and suggestions 29

A VIEW FROM THE PERIPHERY. SPATIAL DISCOURSE OF THE SOVIET ESTONIAN FEATURE FILM: THE 1940s AND 1950s 39

The (new) beginning 41

Film form 43

Tourist gaze I: The landscape 44

Tourist gaze II: The cityscape 46

Tourist gaze III: Hygiene 47

The conquest of territories 48

Centre and periphery 49

Sacred lights 50

Idyll and borders 51

Vicious villas 52

NATIONAL SPACE, (TRANS)NATIONAL CINEMA: ESTONIAN FILM IN THE 1960s 57

(Trans)national cinema 60

National space 68

Nation-space: Back to the past 69

Conclusion 75

NATURE, MOVEMENT, LIMINALITY: REPRESENTING THE SPACE OF THE NATION IN 1960's ESTONIAN CINEMA 79

Introduction 81

Movement/liminality: From the centre to periphery and beyond 87

Conclusion 95

FILM, RUUM JA NARRATIIV: "MIS JUHTUS ANDRES LAPETEUSEGA?" NING "VIINI POSTMARK" / FILM, SPACE AND NARRATIVE: 'WHAT HAPPENED TO ANDRES LAPETEUS?' AND 'THE POSTAGE-STAMP OF VIENNA' 101

Narratiiv ja esitus. Seoseid nõukogude uue laine filmikunstiga 105

Filmi ruum 113

"Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?": ruumid ja tegelased 114

“Viini postmark” ja arhitektuursed opositsioonid 118

Summary 121

SPOJRZENIE TURYSTY JAKO STRATEGICZNE NARZĘDZIE
PRZEDSTAWIENIA ARCHITEKTONICZNEGO: STARÓWKA
TALLIŃSKA A SOWIECKI MARKETING TURYSTYCZNY W LATACH
SZEŚĆDZIESIĄTYCH I SIEDZEMDZIESIĄTYCH XX WIEKU 125

TOURIST GAZE AS A STRATEGIC DEVICE OF ARCHITECTURAL
REPRESENTATION: TALLINN OLD TOWN AND SOVIET TOURISM
MARKETING IN THE 1960s AND 1970s 137

NEW WAVES, NEW SPACES: ESTONIAN EXPERIMENTAL CINEMA
OF THE 1970s 147

Introduction 149

Stagnation and innovation 149

Form: Image, narrative, space 152

Spaces and places: From Stalinist fantasy to experimental ferment 159

Endless Day: The expansion of Tallinn on film 161

Haptic spaces, dialogic selves 165

Retreat 169

Conclusion 171

ALIENS AND TIME TRAVELLERS: RECYCLING NATIONAL SPACE
IN ESTONIAN SCIENCE-FICTION CINEMA 177

Between modernist mnemoscapes and postmodernist mythoscapes 184

Aliens and time travellers: A critique of late socialism 189

Conclusion 191

POSTCOLONIAL HETEROTOPIAS IN MAREK PIESTRAK’S ESTONIAN
CO-PRODUCTIONS: A PARACINEMATIC READING 195

Socialist science fiction and postmodern heterotopias 199

Postcolonial critiques 206

Conclusion 209

FROM NATION-SCAPE TO NATION-STATE: RECONFIGURING FILMIC
SPACE IN POST-SOVIET ESTONIAN CINEMA 213

Introduction 215

Negotiating space: Soviet-scape and nation-scape 216

From nation-scape to nation-state 217

From time-image to movement-image: drifters and mobsters 220

Eesti filmimaastikud. Ruumid, kohad ja paigad Nõukogude Eesti filmis (ning edaspidi)

Resümee 227

Bibliography 261

Introduction

The Estonian filmic field is, to a large extent, unmapped territory. Almost a century has passed since the ‘official’ birth of Estonian cinema, yet a ‘canonical’ narrative of its history still remains to be constructed and published. Even though several local film critics and lately also a number of native and foreign scholars have worked on various aspects and periods of Estonian cinema,¹ its domain continues to be severely under-researched. This study focuses largely on the productions of the Soviet period and mainly on narrative cinema, because the latter, I believe, forms the backbone of any full-fledged (national) film culture, and the Soviet era saw the establishment of a multifaceted and advanced system of filmmaking in Estonia.² While shaped and flavoured by a certain ideology, its results form a considerable part of the local film history and, importantly, of the broader domestic cultural heritage. On the whole, although with a few notable exceptions, Soviet Estonian film has been frequently and unjustly overlooked, as a ‘cultural orphan’, leaving an enormous lacuna in the collective cultural consciousness.

I embarked on my project with the objective of filling in some of the gaps by studying spatial representations in Soviet Estonian cinema, motivated by the assumption that investigating aspects of non-verbal (and thus frequently non- or loosely scripted) material might provide fresh insights into both the narrative and discursive layers of a cinema which has been too often neglected as ‘alien’ territory. The initial interest in portrayals of urban and manmade environments was soon complemented by the need to look at filmic space in a much broader framework of spatiotemporal structures, in terms of *city-*, *land-* and *minds*capes, scrutinizing not only aspects of setting, various cinematic techniques, narrative devices etc., but also issues of identity and history, power and subversion, and national (and transnational³) cinema. In short, it quickly became clear that

¹ Of crucial importance in forming the *bricolage* of Estonian film history are the (mainly journalistic) writings of Tatjana Elmanovitš, Ivar Kosenkranius, Õie Orav, Veste Paas, Jaan Ruus and Valdeko Tobro from the Soviet period, which also cover, to some extent, earlier decades and stretch in some cases into the 1990s and beyond, as well as the works of Lauri Kärk (see e.g. Kärk 2000), Peeter Linnap, Tiina Lokk, Jaak Lõhmus, Olev Remsu, Peeter Torop and Aune Unt, who form the ‘middle generation’ of local film critics and scholars. Of the work of local critics, Annika Koppel’s recent book on Arvo Kruusement’s legendary film trilogy (Koppel 2010) and Paavo Kangur’s book on Grigori Kromanov’s equally legendary film *The Last Relic* (2011) continue this long tradition of journalistic accounts, which need to be supplemented with more in-depth analyses. Of younger academics, the research by Kaire Maimets-Volt, Mari Laaniste and Andreas Trossek continues to provide new insights into Estonian film music (Maimets 2003 and Maimets-Volt 2009), animation and contemporary cinema. Ewa Mazierska has written several perceptive essays on post-Soviet Estonian film, introducing the illuminating perspective of the ‘outsider’. The same could be said of the Canadian researcher Chris J. Robinson, whose book-length study on Estonian animation was first published in English as *Between Genius & Utter Illiteracy: A Story of Estonian Animation* (2003), and translated into Estonian only in 2010 (see Robinson 2010).

² It is also true, however, that the onset of World War II and the Soviet occupation cut short the development of film culture in the independent Estonian Republic of the interwar period, dismantling, to a large extent, what had been achieved previously.

³ I understand transnationalism in the context of Soviet cinema, firstly, to be a method of comparative analysis (cf. Bergfelder *et al.* 2007) which emphasises cross-cultural dialogues instead of isolation, and goes beyond the viewpoint of colonialism as a victim discourse, referring to a more complex set of

the principal goal of my investigation – to chart the terrain of spatial representations of Soviet Estonian cinema – had to be expanded, in order to map Soviet Estonian cinema in a much more general sense. Thus, what started out as a project on film architecture, turned into the rather ambitious task of (re)writing the (his)story of national cinema from the perspective of spatial representations. By analysing film settings, their relations with characters and narratives, their presentations by means of cinematic techniques (cinematography, editing and sound) and some of their extratextual connotations, it became quite apparent that Soviet Estonian film, despite its unpopular status with native audiences,⁴ was in actual fact intimately tied to the project of constructing and negotiating national/local identity(-ies), articulating collective dreams and social anxieties, and conveying intricate strategies of suppression, resistance and adaptation, although not always successfully in terms of communicating them to contemporary spectators. As Tiina Lokk (2003: 15) has aptly noted, this mode of negative reception was effectively shaped by local film critics in the 1960s, many of whom judged screen adaptations of Estonian literary classics unfavourably as compared to the source material, thus initiating a long tradition of prejudiced public opinion. It is also true that the prevailing attitudes and identificatory patterns of local film spectatorship were fashioned, to a great extent, by the general perception that films seemed to ‘tell blatant lies’ (*ibid.*), especially when compared to literature, theatre or fine arts, even after the most severely Stalinist years. Naturally, the core reasons behind these suspicions were rooted in the industrial conditions: the fact that cinema on the whole was a cultural sphere most carefully and directly controlled by central authorities, who manned the peripheral studios, such as Tallinnfilm, first with ‘imported’ directors and administrators, and later with local filmmakers trained almost exclusively in Moscow, the colonial centre seen by the natives of the recently incorporated Baltic republics as the stronghold of the alien and oppressive Soviet ideology.

As already implied by the above-mentioned example, Soviet Estonian cinema constructed, (re)produced and represented national identity(-ies) in constant dialogue with various inter- and transnational currents, which means that it is also necessary to position Estonian cinema within a wider regional framework: principally the filmic field of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but also within European and Western

interactions and intricate patterns of adaptation and influence. Secondly, transnationalism also indicates specific conditions of the Soviet film system: multinational republican talent was trained exclusively in the metropolitan centre of Moscow; the work of republican studios was centrally coordinated in terms of ideological instruction and control, as well as allocation of finances; and the finished products, frequently made by multinational crews and casts, were distributed in the Union-wide network (*cf.* Higson 2010).

⁴ A fact sheet published by the Estonian Institute in 1999 posits that ‘[t]he position of Estonian film in society has, throughout the ages, resembled the function of a jester at the king’s court—nobody takes him seriously, he is ridiculed, even hated but, at the same time, everyone is aware that he reflects courtly life in a distorted way’ (<http://www.einst.ee/publications/film/film.htm>).

cinema in general. Moreover, it is important to stress that not only is Estonian cinema itself closely linked with the circuits of regional film culture in creative, industrial and spectatorial terms, but so are its studies, writings on its history, which belong to the wider discourse on Eastern European cinema⁵. In the post-socialist period, research on Eastern European film has gone through decisive methodological diversification, as described by Ewa Mazierska in the opening issue of the journal *Studies in Eastern European Cinema*, demonstrating, besides other new methodologies, a trend of ‘moving away from the domination of history towards exploration of space’, both in terms of studying various ‘socialist cities, estates, buildings etc., as well as geographic regions’, and of investigating ‘genres or paradigms, specific to Eastern European cinema, using spatial discourse’ (Mazierska 2010a: 12). My research has received positive impulses from a whole array of recent studies on various aspects of Eastern European cinemas, and I’ve attempted to approach Soviet Estonian film history from a regional point of view, both in terms of employing comparative methodology and drawing attention to actual historical connections.

My interest in the ‘organizing category’ (Shiel 2001: 5) of ‘space’ in film grew out of a previous interest in architecture, and stemmed from a very practical need to determine my focus of research as an undergraduate student. This ‘accidental’ pursuit developed into a two- (and later multi-) focus project, which gravitated quite quickly towards the film medium and has undoubtedly opened up new perspectives for examining cinema in Estonia, and perhaps even beyond. In the Estonian context, in particular, concentrating on spatial representations has made it possible to delve more deeply into the local cinematic terrain, pushing aside the hitherto prevalent evaluative categories and preconceptions of ‘national cinema’, such as the assumed ‘value’ of literary classics, which have frequently resulted in a distorted point of view on certain films,⁶ as well as in disregarding a whole array of intriguing productions altogether, only too often deeming the lion’s share of Soviet Estonian cinema ‘mediocre’ or ‘ideologically blemished’ (Koppel 2010:

⁵ It is interesting to note that in the post-socialist situation, research on Soviet film history is nearly exclusively equated with production from Russia (and sometimes also from Central Asian republics), omitting almost without exceptions the Soviet Baltic cinemas. The journal *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema* reflects this situation quite tellingly, having published no material on Soviet Baltic cinemas, while John Cunningham, the Principal Editor of *Studies in Eastern European Cinema*, a new journal launched by Intellect in 2010, lists Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia among the cinemas targeted by the journal. However, the online journal *Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema* has in recent years published a series of special issues on cinemas of nations that formerly belonged to the Soviet sphere of influence, including one on Estonian cinema, edited by Ewa Mazierska, Mari Laaniste and myself (see Närpea *et al.* 2010). From a different angle, a rather fruitful attempt at situating Estonian cinema in the context of Eastern European cinemas was the conference *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc* (Kumu Art Museum, Tallinn, 5–6 October 2007), organised by Andreas Trossek and Maria-Kristiina Soomre and myself. The event resulted in a volume of the same title, comprised of papers of the conference, developed into academic studies, as well as articles by scholars in the field who did not attend the conference (Närpea and Trossek 2008).

⁶ According to Ōie Orav, ‘[a] screen adaptation is usually weaker than its literary source’ (Orav 2003: 27).

70). Spatial research considers national cinema from a slightly different angle than, for example, the analysis of narratives, which in the Soviet Estonian case would probably lead to regarding adaptations of literary classics and films with 'national' topics/allusions as being at the top of the 'qualitative hierarchy' (and thus designating everything else as less worthy), as well as to paying insufficient attention to the fact that *any* national cinema is deeply affected by a number of transnational factors.⁷ At the same time, spatial analysis is a useful instrument for revealing the interplay of multiple and often contradictory aspects, including discerning 'national' (or at least 'indigenous' or intentionally 'differential') elements in what seems like a politically correct (or socialist realist) way, from the Soviet point of view.

While this multifocal perspective on Estonian cinema hopefully reveals something previously unnoticed by local audiences, the fact that the following series of essays is written and published mostly in English (and in small part also translated into Polish) reveals its conscious intention to address an international community of scholars concentrating on (national) cinemas in Eastern Europe and perhaps even elsewhere. An aspect of this research that might have value to studies of other cinemas of the region could be the distinction made between nation-scape/-space and Soviet-scape/-space. I coined these central notions in relation to the emergence of the 'national school' in Estonian cinema in the 1960s, in order to distinguish the approach of this new generation from the disposition of the 'visiting filmmakers' of the previous decade, who had been appointed to the newly established republican studio by the central cinema authorities in Moscow. These 'guest artists' imported to the screen an imagery intensely imbued with the formulas of Stalinist socialist realism, following the centrally implemented thematic plans that prescribed contemporary subjects and episodes from the Sovietised model of historical narrative, favouring either the environments of recently formed collective farms or urban settings invested with progressive socialist spirit. In contrast, in the 1960s, as the first ethnically Estonian filmmakers graduated from the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography⁸ in Moscow, a refreshing creative breeze wafted through the local filmic arena, inducing a noticeable break on both the narrative and spatial levels. These filmmakers often attempted to avoid contemporary subject matters, kolkhoz settings and the 'nodal points' of the Sovietised historical timeline. Instead, they frequently sought to construct 'nation-spaces' that consciously dissociated

⁷ Eric Hobsbawm has aptly noted that '[o]ur era is still one of nation-states – the only aspect of globalisation where globalisation does not work' (Hobsbawm 2007: 156), and my focus on the cinema of a single nation thus reflects this overall situation to a certain extent. Yet, it is also crucial to pay due attention to the fact that no nation (or national cinema) exists in a vacuum and each is fundamentally shaped by 'external' impulses. Moreover, the framework of comparative studies has the advantage of bringing to light certain aspects that might otherwise go unnoticed.

⁸ The graduates of the 'Estonian Studio', established at the Lunacharsky State Institute for Theatre Arts (GITIS) in 1948, were also essential to the history of Estonian film: Kaljo Kiisk, Grigori Kromanov, Arvo Krusement and Tõnis Kask as film directors, and Rein Aren, Ervin Abel, Ita Ever and others as actors.

themselves from the immediate Soviet surroundings and realities, generating a somewhat nostalgic, escapist atmosphere, where once again the sense of longing and subtle sadness evoked by failed hopes, cancelled opportunities and inaccessible aspirations surfaced as an apparent, stubbornly enduring, although more often than not carefully veiled, surge. Instead of the spaces appropriated by the mechanised and gargantuan Soviet 'agrocraçy', they provided a mnemoscape of the pre-war countryside, intimate, tender and familiar. In the subsequent years, these two modes of spatial (as well as cultural and historical) sensibility – the nation-scape and the Soviet-scape – competed, inter-reacted and evolved, creating numerous variations and revealing intricate patterns of power relations, not only in narrative cinema but also in documentary films⁹, as is evident in the essay on the short 'view films' produced in bulk, with the intention of advertising Tallinn as a desirable tourist destination.

As it is an impossible task to comprehensively address the multitude of spaces, places and sites, the specific devices of their narrative and visual representation, the range of their denotative and connotative meanings, and the multiple fields of (regional) influence and exchange across the entire cinematic production of Soviet Estonia, despite its relative smallness, within the limits of *one* doctoral dissertation, the following series of articles should be considered a work still in progress, an 'interim report', the contents of which, furthermore, reflect to some extent the process of its conception and development, both in terms of productive discoveries and apparent deadlocks. Thus, while the narrative cinema of the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s is discussed mainly from a 'bird's-eye view', sketching some general spatial trends and leitmotifs of these decades, complemented by a few closer analyses of particular films, the cinema of the 1970s is approached from various narrower generic and/or authorial perspectives, pushing the broader tendencies into the background (or even aside), and concentrating intentionally on lesser known, relatively peripheral and more intriguing episodes of the decade's cinematic production. Finally, the cinema of the 1980s and early 1990s has only been examined in the form of a comparative case study of two films from the 'transition era', at the turn of the decades. All in all, with a couple of noticeable exceptions, I have consciously and deliberately concentrated on the films excluded from the 'Pantheon' of Estonian cinema, or sometimes even demonised by the local 'filmic elite' (occasionally despite continued success with audiences, as in the case of Marek Piestrak's infamous *The Test of Pilot Pirx* (*Test pilota Pirxa / Navigaator Pirx*, 1978)). Clearly, this uneven 'coverage' needs to be supplemented in the future by additional accounts, in order to achieve a more exhaustive version of the 'spatial history' (or, rather, 'spatial mélange') of Soviet Estonian cinema.

⁹ I believe that filmic space and the way its denotative and connotative mechanisms work is not fundamentally dissimilar in fictional, narrative cinema and documentary film. This is supported, for instance, by David Bordwell's and Kristin Thompson's discussion of the blurry boundaries between documentary and fiction (Bordwell and Thompson 2004: 130ff). Bordwell's and Thompson's understanding draws on a long tradition of debates initiated as early as the 1920s.

Space: The framework of analysis

The topic of spatial representations has been a major concern for many scholars and theorists – of film as well as other disciplines – since the earliest days of the medium’s existence, but especially since the ‘spatial turn’ that took place in the 1970s in leftist social and cultural theory, ‘involv[ing] a growing recognition of the usefulness of space as an organizing category, and of the concept of ‘spatialization’ as a term for the analysis and description of modern, and (even more so) of postmodern, society and culture’ (Shiel 2001: 5)¹⁰. Yet the efforts of numerous critics and thinkers have not resulted in a single coherent ‘grand theory of filmic space’, but rather in a multitude of different perspectives and various angles, shaped by the particular interests and objectives, specific backgrounds and frames of reference of the individual examiner(s), on the one hand, and the nature of the film(s) under examination, on the other hand. Robert Stam has aptly noted, that ‘[a]s a synaesthetic, multi-track medium which has generated an enormously variegated body of texts, the cinema virtually *requires* multiple frameworks of understanding’ (Stam 2000: 1; original emphasis). Furthermore, as the concept of space itself has been theorized by a myriad of geographers, sociologists, philosophers etc. from many perspectives in the course of the ‘century of cinema’ – for example, the recent volume on *Key Thinkers on Space and Place* includes as many as 52 ‘important thinkers informing *current* debates about space and place’ (Hubbard *et al.* 2004: 3; emphasis added; see also Crang and Thrift 2000)¹¹ – it is exceedingly difficult to even begin to imagine the possibility of a single ‘theoretical framework’ for analysing space in film. This discovery is, of course, quite predictable in the continuing era of the ‘postmodern condition’, which was as long as 30 years ago diagnosed by Jean-François Lyotard as incredulous towards metanarratives (see Lyotard 1984: xxiv).

Thus, representations of space in film have been contemplated and mapped by scholars from diverse disciplinary backgrounds, including cinema and media studies, literary studies, art history, cultural studies, philosophy, sociology, geography, the history of architecture and urban studies. Each interlocutor has enriched this ‘spatial discourse’ with new material and fresh perspectives, building upon, reworking and contesting previous knowledge and viewpoints. Broadly speaking, the discussions frequently seem to

¹⁰ Mark Shiel continues with a list of influential works by critical thinkers, such as Henri Lefebvre (*The Production of Space*, 1974), Michel Foucault (*Discipline and Punish*, 1977), Ernest Mandel (*Late Capitalism*, 1975), Marshall Berman (*All That Is Solid Melts Into Air*, 1982), David Harvey (*The Condition of Postmodernity*, 1989), Fredric Jameson (*Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, 1991), Edward Soja (*Postmodern Geographies*, 1989) and Mike Davis (*City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, 1990), of which Lefebvre’s, Harvey’s and Foucault’s writings have been relevant to different parts of my project.

¹¹ Moreover, Fredric Jameson notes in his essay ‘The End of Temporality’ that ‘[s]tatistics on the volume of books on space are as alarming as the birthrate of your hereditary enemy’, suggesting that, according to Worldcat, ‘[s]ome five thousand volumes in the last three years’ (i.e. between 2000 and 2003) have been published (Jameson 2003: 696).

revolve around one or both of two major, multifaceted, often inseparably intertwined and equally important issues: what is represented and how it is represented. Moreover, different disciplinary contexts have shown inclinations towards one or the other: film theorists, and sometimes also filmmakers, have, rather unsurprisingly, tended to concentrate on the latter issue and contemplated space as an integral element of film's formal and narrative structure, investigating, for instance, how three-dimensional environments are constructed on the two-dimensional screen by means of such cinematic techniques as *mise-en-scène*, cinematography, editing and sound, and how these configurations relate to presented stories, creating various textual patterns, and how certain cinematic conventions and codes are conceived, established, problematized, discarded, reworked and reinstated. Geographers, researchers and practitioners of architecture and 'urbanism', meanwhile, have gravitated towards focussing on the 'what' part of this twofold matter, analysing the city- and landscapes represented in films, examining them in relation to both the diegetic realm – the story world (and modes of its presentation) – and the 'transdiegetic' or 'extracinematic' sphere – the surrounding universe in the most general sense, encompassing actual cities and villages, urban and natural environs, physical, social and mental spaces, but also different and changing discourses about them, about architecture, landscape, social, cultural and ideological space etc.

Most studies of spatial representations in cinema, however, constitute a combination of these two approaches, scrutinizing films and their spatially organized fictional universes as historically and socially situated audiovisual products, seeing cinema, in contrast to the traditionally textual approach of many film studies, more as a spatial system than as a textual system (Shiel 2001: 6). Moreover, it is widely accepted that cinematic spaces 'are often symbolic, and frequently contribute to social formation, impacting upon human associations and societal norms', being 'never neutral in intention or reception' (Harper and Rayner 2010: 16).

In the following series of essays, filmic spaces, places and sites are examined as figurative categories that interconnect actual spaces, their portrayals and imagined sites, different representational regimes and traditions, spectatorial perceptions and broader ideological, historical, cultural and social contexts. These chapters have been written at the junction of cinema studies and multifaceted research in various spatial practices, in terms of both manmade and natural environments, social and ideological structures etc. My methodology is best described as a 'spatialized' variant of textual analysis, 'open to diverse influences ..., to diverse grids..., to diverse "schemata"..., and to diverse principles of pertinence, both cinematic ... and extra-cinematic' (Stam 2000: 194); it is also 'pragmatic, seizing on whichever approaches will best shed light on the object at hand' (Kuhn 1990: 10–11). Nevertheless, even though 'theoretically cubist' to a certain extent, to borrow Robert Stam's apt phrase (Stam 2000: 1), its main theoretical impetus lies in Mikhail Bakhtin's heterogeneous, polyvalent and inspiring legacy. Often I make reference

to Bakhtin's concept of the chronotope, which he developed in his essay *Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel* (originally written in 1937–1938, and concluding remarks in 1973; see Bakhtin 1981), as a literary category designating 'the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature' where

spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. This intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope. (Bakhtin 1981: 84)

Additionally, Bakhtin suggests that

the chronotope, functioning as the primary means for materializing time in space, emerges as a center for concretizing representation, as a force giving body to the entire novel. All the novel's abstract elements—philosophical and social generalizations, ideas, analyses of cause and effect—gravitate toward the chronotope and through it take on flesh and blood, permitting the imaging power of art to do its work. Such is the representational significance of the chronotope. (Bakhtin 1981: 250)

The chronotope, then, 'mediates between two orders of experience and discourse: the historical and the artistic, providing fictional environments where historically specific constellations of power are made visible' (Stam 1989: 11). Stam draws particular attention to the fine line in Bakhtin's thinking between the particular fictional spatiotemporal constellations and the reality of the actual life-world: the former *mediates* the latter; they are 'correlatable', but not 'equatable' (ibid.). Still, although Bakhtin cautions against confusing 'the *represented* world with the world outside the text (naive realism)', he also regards it as

impermissible to take this categorical boundary line as something absolute and impermeable (which leads to an oversimplified, dogmatic splitting of hairs). However forcefully the real and the represented world resist fusion, however immutable the presence of that categorical boundary line between them, they are nevertheless indissolubly tied up with each other and find themselves in continual mutual interaction [...] The work and the world represented in it enter the real world and enrich it, and the real world enters the work and its world as part of the process of its creation, as well as part of its subsequent life, in a continual renewing of the work through the creative perception of its listeners and readers. (Bakhtin 1981: 254)

Even though Bakhtin himself made no reference to cinema, numerous commentators and researchers of film have found this category an extremely helpful and productive framework for analysis (see e.g. Mercer 1988, Turovskaya 1989, Willemsen 1989, Stam 1989, Montgomery 1994, Deltcheva and Vlasov 1997, Vice 1997, Sobchack 1998, Naficy 2001, Massood 2003b, Ganser *et al.* 2006, Alexander 2007 etc.). Robert Stam has even suggested that chronotope

seems in some ways even more appropriate to film than to literature, for whereas literature plays itself out within a virtual, lexical space, the cinematic chronotope is quite literal, splayed out concretely across a screen with specific dimensions and unfolding in literal time (usually 24 frames a second), quite apart from the fictive time/space specific films might construct. (Stam 1989: 11; see also Stam *et al.* 1992: 218, Stam 2000: 205)

On several occasions I will make use of the chronotopes described by Bakhtin himself, such as the idyll, the road or the threshold, in order to tackle the spatial narratives of particular films or describe the dominant trends in the spatial representation of certain periods of Soviet Estonian cinema. However, as suggested by Stam, the chronotopic analysis is even more productive when, instead of looking for filmic ‘translations’ of Bakhtin’s literary chronotopes, which, after all, are limited to those of the pre-cinematic era, specifically cinematic chronotopes are constructed (Stam 2000: 205–206). Indeed, the notions of ‘nation-scape’ and ‘Soviet-scape’, developed in some of the following essays, could be conceptualized as chronotopes in their own right (and are perhaps applicable even beyond the realm of cinema). Even more broadly, though, chronotopic analysis can also be seen as a general model for my approach,

operat[ing] on three [often interlinked – *E. N.*] levels: first, as the means by which a text represents history [i.e. the real-life world – *E. N.*]; second, as the relation between images of time and space in the novel [or film – *E. N.*] out of which any representation of history must be constructed; and third, as a way of discussing the formal properties of the text itself, its plot, narrator, and relation to other texts. (Vice 1997: 201–202)

This general conceptual armature accommodates, quite effectively, the main premises and strategies, objectives and means of my project. Moreover, as Bakhtin himself has emphasized the deeply dialogic nature of human existence and culture in general,¹² these three broad levels function as a wide-ranging and essentially heterogeneous platform for

¹² ‘To be means to communicate dialogically. When dialogue ends, everything ends’ (Bakhtin 1984: 252).

conversation between multiple theories, perspectives and references, a skeleton on which the flesh of analysis is built (to use an analogy Bakhtin himself would have liked). At the same time, instead of having straightforward and explicit boundaries, these levels overlap one another to a certain extent; rather than forming a hierarchy, they function as a superimposed image with several layers, merging ideas and implications. Thus compartmentalising the aspects of the following analyses into this multilevel system is a somewhat reductive and abstracting task, although a necessary one, in order to demonstrate the pertinence of the category of chronotope in my project. Ultimately, the concept of chronotope, along with other Bakhtinian notions, is understood not so much as a clear-cut formula or scheme, but as a guideline to be followed or a theoretical 'crutch' to be leaned on.

On the **first, most general, level**, I have sought to examine Soviet Estonian cinema as a locus for projections and (re)productions of historical, cultural and social processes, whatever the exact time-frame and spatiotemporal configuration of particular films (whether immediate, depicting contemporary space-time, or historical, portraying past times and places), a pursuit that has hopefully paved the way for admitting the need to reconsider the position of Soviet Estonian cinema in relation to the 'national imaginary' and to the wider sociocultural field, not only in the local context but also as part of regional cinematic networks. For example, the investigation of spatial (and temporal) representations in the films of the 1960s, a period commonly acknowledged as that of the '(re)emergence of national cinema' (e.g. Orav 2003: 20ff), perhaps manages to illuminate some of the reasons behind its rejection by local audiences and the majority of contemporary Estonian critics alike: even though the filmmakers succeeded in constructing cinematic 'nation-scapes' despite the absence of a nation-state ('writing' them, to some degree, in a rather dialogic spirit, in an Aesopian language 'between the lines'¹³), thus inaugurating the locally-rooted, national cinema 'proper', the spectators did not always recognize their efforts and outcomes because they saw the filmic 'narrative spaces' as corrupted by transnational, i.e. Soviet, influences (including, but not limited to, certain narrative and cinematic codes, as well as the general framework of the film industry and culture, imported after World War II (or implanted, as Lennart Meri, a filmmaker and writer suggested; see Meri 1968) from Russia and controlled centrally by Soviet authorities). Additionally, the comparative analysis of spatiotemporal patterns in late-socialist and early-capitalist cinema, as exemplified by case studies of Peeter Urbla's *I'm Not a Tourist, I Live Here* (*Ma pole turist, ma elan siin*, 1988) on the one hand and Ilkka Järvilaturi's *Tallinn in Darkness* (aka *City Unplugged / Tallinn pimeduses*, 1993) on the other hand, demonstrated some of the ways the political and historical change found its expression

¹³ Stam explains that '[d]ialogism refers to the relation between the text and its others not only in the relatively crude and obvious forms of argument – polemics and parody – but also in much more diffuse and subtle forms that have to do with overtones, pauses, implied attitude, what is left unsaid or is to be inferred' (Stam 1989: 14).

on the silver screen, emphasizing the contrasting viewpoints of local and foreign witnesses, theorized in the framework of Gilles Deleuze's notions of movement-image and time-image, which David Martin-Jones has interpreted, building upon Homi K. Bhabha's work, as different articulations of 'narrating the nation' (Martin-Jones 2006: 32).

On **the second level of chronotopic operation**, 'the relation between images of time and space out of which any representation of history must be constructed' is the main focus. On this level, diverse frames of reference meet, comprised of a multivalent configuration of problems and perspectives, which, nevertheless, are connected by certain common denominators, leading to (or stemming from, depending on the point of view) the first level of 'representations of history', i.e. the real-life world. This level accommodates discussions on representations of (urban) architecture, as in the essay on depictions of Tallinn's Old Town in Soviet Estonian audiovisual products of tourism marketing, i.e. in short films (but also in some feature length narrative pieces, see Näripea 2004, 2005a, 2005b) made to promote Tallinn as one of the most desirable tourist destinations in the 'Soviet West' to travellers beyond the Iron Curtain, thus participating in the process of generating an influx of hard currency so desperately needed to sustain the all-Union circuits of economy (and ideology); or in the article on transnational spaces of science fiction in Marek Piestrak's *The Test of Pilot Pirx*, where modern architecture functions as a signifier of transnationality, but where the analysis of narrative space also reveals that messages of narrative and narration might be discrepant at times (which is, according to Umberto Eco, characteristic of cult movies in general (Eco 1985), and which is something that Ewa Mazierska has diagnosed as characteristic of Eastern European cinema at large); or, finally, in the cinematic 'vicious villas' of the 1950s, where several temporal layers and ideological orders are intertwined.

This level also includes representations of landscapes, rural communities and more general spatial categories, such as nature and borders, as discussed in 'A View from the Periphery. Spatial Discourse of the Soviet Estonian Feature Film: The 1940s and 1950s', 'National Space, (Trans)National Cinema: Estonian Film in the 1960s', 'Nature, Movement, Liminality: Representing the Space of the Nation in the 1960s Estonian Cinema' and 'Aliens and Time Travellers: Recycling National Space in Estonian Science-Fiction Cinema'. As the last three titles suggest, the issue of national identity has risen time and again in my investigations, especially in connection with films with rural settings, but also in connection with urban representations. In film studies, this concept has been most commonly understood in the sense of the 'imagined community of the nation', a much-quoted notion formulated by Benedict Anderson (1983: 659). Most commentators,¹⁴ furthermore, agree that any national cinema is subject to inter- and transnational factors, in terms of both the film industry (including structures of production, distribution and

¹⁴ E.g. Crofts 1993, Higson 1989, 2000 and 2002, Walsh 1996 and Bergfelder 2005; see also the anthologies Hjort and MacKenzie 2000, Willimas 2002, Vitali and Willemen 2006, and Hjort and Petrie 2007.

exhibition, patterns and scope of consumption and spectatorship) and representations of national identity. The latter should be understood not so much as something given, but as ‘something to be gained’ (Heath 1978: 10); instead of speaking of identity

as a finished thing, we should speak of *identification*, and see it as an on-going process. Identity arises, not so much from the fullness of identity which is already inside us as individuals, but from a *lack* of wholeness which is “filled” from *outside us*, by the ways we imagine ourselves to be seen by *others*. (Hall 1992: 287–288)

Thus, national identity, as represented – and also (re)produced – in Soviet Estonian cinema, is not a constant; rather, it is in a constant state of change and negotiation, as indicated in several of the following essays. For example, the touristic representations of Tallinn’s Old Town demonstrate how the identity of a place and its inhabitants was constructed through a give-and-take between the ambitions of the natives and the aspirations of Soviet architects of ideology, which might have concurred with one another to a degree but bore quite different meanings for each side, leading to a complex play of ideological resistance and adaptation. While in the films of the late 1940s and 1950s the prevalent codes of socialist realism imposed a decidedly stereotypical model of identity-building, comprised of such antagonistic clichés as ‘bourgeois nationalists’ and ‘progressive communists’, suppressing differences and channelling diversity into pre-conceived socialist realist moulds (even though not always successfully in terms of audience response, thus retaining a degree of undesired multivalence), from the 1960s on, accompanied by a strong sense of spatial openness and expansion, identities on screens multiplied and crumbled into differentiated (e.g. gendered and sexualized) and relatively unsteady manifestations. Even though the notion of ‘nation-scape’ might seem to imply a single national identity (which in the 1970s and 1980s was challenged and disputed by authors as diverse as Raul Tammet and Jaan Tooming, the first concentrating on the popular genre of science fiction and the latter making radically experimental films), it was still subject to a fundamentally dialogic development, taking shape in an ideological exchange of national (local) and inter- or transnational (Soviet and Western) currents, whereby ‘[t]o be means to be for another, and through the other for oneself. [...] I cannot manage without another, I cannot become myself without another’ (Bakhtin 1984: 287). In a sense, the spaces of Soviet Estonian cinema were filled with contrasting implications and contradictory tenets; even when they appeared unified on the surface, the films were frequently interlaced with multiple spatiotemporal layers and intricate strategies of identification, with an elaborate set of manoeuvres involving inter- and transnational operators of both Soviet and Western origin, and agents of local/national ancestry.

These predominantly heterogeneous spatial representations, whether urban or rural, inherently suggest Foucault’s concept of heterotopias. Foucault designates heterotopias as ‘other spaces’ or

real places ... which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality. (Foucault 1986: 24)

He defines them in opposition to utopias, 'sites with no real place' (ibid.), and by way of six principles, of which the third, fourth and sixth are perhaps the most pertinent to this discussion. In the third principle, Foucault describes cinema, along with theatre and oriental gardens, as an example of heterotopia's essential ability to bring together 'several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible' (ibid.: 25), and also, as Giuliana Bruno has noted, 'segments of ... diverse temporal histories' (Bruno 2002: 147). Importantly, Bruno draws additional parallels with Foucault's second principle, under which he locates the heterotopias of the cemetery: according to Bruno (ibid.), both '[f]ilm and the cemetery ... are sites without a geography, or rather without a fixed, univocal, geometric notion of geography. They inhabit multiple points in time and collapse multiple places into a single place' (ibid.). Foucault's fourth principle posits that heterotopias 'open onto' heterochronies of two basic types: those linked to the accumulation of time, such as museums and libraries, and those entirely temporal and transient, such as fairgrounds and festivals (Foucault 1986: 26). Finally, Foucault suggests that heterotopias function in relation to the rest of space in manners unfolding on the scale between two contrasting points: on the one hand, as 'a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusionary', and on the other hand, a space of compensation, creating 'a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled' (ibid.: 27). In this framework, for example, the chronotopes of nation-scape and Soviet-scape can be understood as heterotopian by nature. In the case of the Soviet-scape, the mechanics of compensation are intertwined with the aesthetic and ideological premises of Stalinist socialist realism, which, according to Evgeny Dobrenko, processed the 'Soviet reality' into a neat, de-realized cinematic representation, a 'commodified reality' (Dobrenko 2004: 690), museumizing simultaneously, as an act of destruction, the 'living past' (Dobrenko 2008: 9) of both its sacralised centre (Moscow) and its peripheries, in the end of 'radial lines of influence' (Widdis 2003a: 221), and, finally, reducing formally 'active' nature to 'picturesque remnants' in the background (Widdis 2003b: 186), as analysed in my essay on Soviet Estonian cinema in the 1940s and 1950s. Meanwhile, the nation-scape, as manifested in the films of the 1960s, made every effort to eschew, in a somewhat similar compensatory move, the Soviet reality, conjuring up mnemonic space-times of interwar nationhood in adaptations of national literary classics and, at the same time, reminding audiences of the drab reality of their

immediate surroundings. Thus, both of them construct an imaginary geography of ‘other spaces’, drawing together several layers of time as, despite being fairly escapist by nature, these cinematic spaces still remain inevitably connected with the immediate realities of the time of their production (and perhaps even beyond it, when the spatiotemporal stratum of future readings, such as this one, is taken into account). At the same time, however, while the Stalinist films gravitated towards museumization of time-space, the productions of the 1960s frequently tended towards heterochronies of the transient variety, towards the ephemeral, dynamic and momentary.

Finally, while the first and second levels of Bakhtin’s chronotopic analysis – i.e. 1) references to broader social, cultural and political issues and standpoints in films (representations of history/real-life world) and 2) the particular spatiotemporal configurations used to convey these ideas – relate mainly to the content or subject matter, whether overt or covert, of the films, **the third level of chronotopic analysis** includes a consideration of ‘formal properties of the text itself’, which in film are comprised of cinematic techniques – mise-en-scène, cinematography, editing and sound – on the one hand, and narrative form, on the other hand. My understanding of these structures, as related to the construction of space in narrative (but also in documentary) cinema has been influenced by David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson’s work. Even if I hesitate to subscribe to their cognitivist and neoformalist (esp. Thompson 1988) project in its entirety, they have certainly informed my studies in drawing attention to the crucial role of formal choices and stylistics (of mise-en-scène, cinematography and editing) in sculpting the (narrative) meanings and messages of a film and its spatial representations. In addition to providing general guidelines for film analysis (e.g. Bordwell and Thompson 2004) and illuminating the ways narrative space is constructed (mostly in classical Hollywood cinema, e.g. Bordwell 1985a and 1985b), Bordwell’s work on the history of film style (e.g. Bordwell 1999) and ‘historical poetics’ (concentrating on ‘how, in determinate circumstances, films are put together, service specific functions, and achieve specific effects’ (Bordwell 1989b: 266–267)) has left detectable traces in my thinking about film. In terms of spatial representations, Bordwell and Thompson’s description of the codes of Hollywood’s ‘classical paradigm’, creating a “closed” space which is subordinate to the narrative’ has been especially instructive, both as a successful, applicable standard and a point of departure, which, when implemented in the analysis of Soviet Estonian cinema, on many occasions works as a ‘negative’ model:

In the classical paradigm, the system for constructing space (the ‘continuity style’) has as its aim the subordination of spatial (and temporal) structures to the logic of the narrative, especially to the cause/effect chain. Negatively, the space is presented so as not to distract attention from the dominant actions; positively, the space is ‘used up’ by presentation of narratively important settings, character traits (‘psychology’), or other causal agents. Space as *space* is rendered subordinate to space

as a *site for action* through several specific procedures. (Thompson and Bordwell 1976: 42)

Before going any further, however, it is important to point out that Thompson and Bordwell's approach is deeply rooted in the formalist tradition of film theory, which emphasizes the artificiality of film, its 'inability to perfectly imitate the normal visual experience of reality', offering film-makers 'the opportunity to manipulate and distort our everyday experience of reality' (Buckland 2008: 25), as opposed to the realist tradition that focuses on "ontological" realism, on 'film's ability to offer a ... view onto (non-mediated) reality' (Elsaesser and Hagen 2010: 3). As stated by Bordwell himself, their 'neoformalism' 'derives principally from Slavic poetics, in particular the Russian and Czech thinkers, but is also influenced by the more or less oblique "return to Slavic theory" one finds in Todorov, Genette, the 1966–1970 Barthes, and contemporary Israeli poetics like Meir Sternberg', and by 'writings of Bazin, the Soviet film-makers, and Burch, without being committed to a "phenomenological" or "materialist" or "serialist" theory of film' (Bordwell 1989a: 378). By 'Russian and Czech thinkers', Bordwell is referring to the pioneers of the formalist line of thinking: the Russian Formalists in the 1920s and 1930s, such as Juri Tynianov, Boris Kazansky and Boris Eikhenbaum, whose ideas were developed and disputed, among others, by Jan Mukařovský, a representative of the Prague Linguistic Circle (see Eagle 1981; Mukařovský 1978), and by the 'Bakhtin Circle'¹⁵. Essentially, the major goal of the Russian Formalists, a crucial 'root-movement' for film theory in general, was to establish the particular formal specificity of film as an aesthetic practice (and its position among and links with other creative realms¹⁶), test ideas previously developed in relation to literature on another artistic terrain, and explore the analogy between film and language, which led to an understanding that film was a 'system of signs and conventions rather than the registration of natural phenomena' (Stam 2000: 49). Noël Burch, another source of Bordwell and Thompson's thinking, was an American filmmaker and critic who moved to France in the 1950s and took up the formalist legacy, along with the Eisensteinian tradition of practitioner-theorists. In *Theory of Film Practice* (1973; originally published as *Praxis du cinema*, 1969), a book

¹⁵ Two of the perhaps best known members of this circle, which centred on Mikhail Bakhtin's work, were Pavel Medvedev and Valentin Voloshinov. Despite their 'provocative critique of the Formalist method', the two schools of thought shared certain common traits and concerns: both believed in 'art's self-purposeful specificity', neither acknowledged the 'romantic, expressive' or 'naively realist views of art', and both rejected 'the reduction of art to questions of class and economics'. Finally, the 'dialogism' of the Bakhtin Circle was a more comprehensive equivalent of the Formalist 'defamiliarisation' (based on thinking of 'literariness' as 'inhering in a differential relation between texts') (Stam 2000: 51).

¹⁶ Interestingly, Boris Kazansky argued in his essay *The Nature of Cinema* (initially published in 1927) that film is actually closest to architecture: 'Architecture shapes not surfaces and masses, as do painting and sculpture, but rather "space". More precisely, it organizes surfaces and masses (or their relationships) into space, and thus earns the right to be called a separate art' (Kazanskij 1981: 105).

he later disowned, Burch coined the famous concepts of ‘the zero point of cinematic style’ and ‘the institutional mode of representation’ as a definition of dominant, i.e. (classical) Hollywood cinema which he denounced for intentionally masking ‘the *ambiguous* nature of cinematic space’ (Burch 1973: 16).

Although useful on a certain instrumental level, I agree with the ‘Bakhtinian’ viewpoint of Robert Stam, who has criticized Bordwell for ‘ignor[ing] what Bakhtin would call the historicity of forms themselves, i.e. forms as historical events which both refract and shape a multi-faceted history at once artistic and transartistic’ and seeing, like Formalists, ‘art as an “aggregate of formal/linguistic possibilities” when it is more illuminating to see it as part of a larger field of social and discursive contradiction’ (Stam 2000: 197–198). I also share Stam’s view that ‘[s]tyle, ideology, history are inextricably linked’ (ibid.: 199) and have thus attempted to relate the analysis of film form to ideological implications and historical conditions of the particular representations. Although most of the essays consider formal aspects of the films in question, this side is especially central in two of them: ‘Film, Space and Narrative: *What Happened to Andres Lapeteus?* and *The Postage-Stamp of Vienna*’ and ‘New Waves, New Spaces: Estonian Experimental Cinema of the 1970s’. While the first concentrates on two films from the mainstream cinema of the 1960s, exploring their narrative spaces and stylistic implications in the context of innovative Soviet cinema¹⁷ in the socially, politically and culturally dynamic period of the ‘Thaw’, the latter deals with Jaan Tooming’s small yet radically experimental filmic legacy, which broke completely new ground in the Soviet Estonian cinema of the 1970s, running, unsurprisingly, into serious problems with authorities. In his films in general, but especially in the infamously banned *Endless Day* (*Lõppematu päev*, filmed in 1971, completed in 1990), the rebellious audiovisual form expresses the rejection of the ‘zero point of cinematic style’ and the Lefebvrian abstract space it produces; it undermines and questions the premises of both the Soviet- and nation-scape, proposing in their stead an uncompromisingly fragmented regime of space-time and identity, promoting openness and variety, although retreating later into the depths of metaphysics.

¹⁷ Even though termed ‘New Wave’ by Alexander Prokhorov (2001), I would suggest that the majority of Soviet, including Soviet Estonian, films of the 1960s were still part of the ‘mainstream’, as these productions were not programmatically in opposition to the mainstream film industry (as was the French *Nouvelle Vague*), but were produced within it; similarly, after the arid and austere years of Stalinist socialist realism, these productions were admittedly innovative in terms of both the use of cinematic techniques and narrative form, as well as in terms of the (although cautious and frequently covert) social and ideological criticism, yet they were also far from the radical stances of the Western ‘new waves’ or even from the more moderate ‘soft avant-gardes’ of the Eastern Bloc (see e.g. Mazierska 2010b on Polish cinema, or Owen 2011 on Czechoslovakian film). Indeed, even the earlier Soviet cinematic avant-garde of the 1920s was considerably more revolutionary in spirit, and as Prokhorov suggests, ‘Thaw directors usually employ sequences imitating the style of avant-garde montage or literal quotations from films of the 1920s’ in episodes of ‘melodramatic excess’, where ‘the narrative is suspended and yields to the visual spectacle of characters’ sufferings or extreme emotional stress’ (Prokhorov 2002: 63).

Previous research on representations of urban environments and landscapes in film

The following essays on spatial representations in Estonian cinema are interdisciplinary in their approach and thus rely on a variegated body of previous scholarship and criticism, including, for example, philosophical works, film and literary theories, theories of architecture and urbanism, studies by film scholars and critics from diverse fields of research, as well as accounts by art historians, geographers, researchers of urban studies and architecture.¹⁸ Besides the steadily expanding scholarship on Eastern European and Soviet cinema in general, which my readings of Estonian film inevitably relate to and draw from,¹⁹ the most important frame of reference for this kind of research is undoubtedly the multifaceted and still growing body of scholarship on representations of filmic spaces and places, both manmade and natural, urban and rural, whether shot on location or built in film studios and backlots. A clearly discernible and multinational wave of interest, first in representations of architecture, rose around the mid-1980s, marked by the appearance of three monographs: Juan Antonio Ramírez's *La arquitectura en el cine: Hollywood, la edad de oro* (1986, in English Ramírez 2004), Donald Albrecht's *Designing Dreams: Modern Architecture in the Movies* (1987) and Helmut Weihsmann's *Gebaute Illusionen: Architektur im Film* (1988). Prior to that, only rare studies and anthologies, occasional book chapters and journal articles had dealt with the matter,²⁰ but since then a plethora of book-length studies, collections of essays, book chapters, whole special issues²¹ and separate journal articles have been published. The fact that most accounts are fashioned as case studies and that no comprehensive 'theory' of filmic space or architecture of any significant influence has appeared since then reveals the almost unimaginable richness of the spatial angle, but also makes it very difficult to summarize the achievements in this field. Still, in a nutshell, the subject of spatial representations has been approached from various angles and perspectives (e.g. set design and production design,²² film genres,²³ authorial approaches²⁴ and por-

¹⁸ More details can be found in each of the chapters.

¹⁹ See individual chapters for references.

²⁰ For earlier bibliography see Gold 1984.

²¹ E.g. in *East-West Film Journal* (vol. 3 (1), 1988), *Iris* (no. 12, 1991), *Design Book Review* (no. 24, 1992), *Architectural Design* (vol. 64 (11/12), 1994 and vol. 70 (1), 2000), *Wide Angle* (vol. 19 (4), 1997), *Screen* (vol. 40 (3), 1999), *City* (vol. 7 (3), 2003), and *Environment and Planning D* (vol. 23 (1), 2005).

²² E.g. Barsaq 1976, Preston 1994, Sennett 1994, Affron and Affron 1995, Neumann 1997, Tashiro 1998, LoBrutto 2002, Heisner 2004, Ramírez 2004, and Bergfelder *et al.* 2007.

²³ E.g. Hake 1994, Natter 1994, Gaughan 2003 and Graf 2007 on city symphonies; Christopher 1997, Staiger 1999 and Dimendberg 2004 on *film noir*; Gold 1985, Sobchack 1999, Desser 1999 and Gold 2001 on science fiction.

²⁴ E.g. Bruno 1993 on Elvira Notari's films, Elliott and Purdy 1997 on Peter Greenaway's films, Jacobs 2007 on Alfred Hitchcock's films, Rhodes 2007 on Rome in Pasolini's films, and Pallasmaa 2007 on Alfred Hitchcock, Stanley Kubrick, Michelangelo Antonioni and Andrei Tarkovsky's films.

trays of major cities²⁵), in different temporal (from silent²⁶ to postmodern²⁷ cinema), geographic (Hollywood,²⁸ European cinema²⁹ and global cinema³⁰) and experiential³¹ frameworks. Clearly researchers have been most fascinated by filmic representations of urban space and modern architecture (and modernity in general),³² neither of which, unfortunately, has had a dominant presence in Estonian cinema (although there are some notable exceptions). In Soviet Estonian film, and typical of Eastern European cinema in general (e.g. Jordanova 2003: 92ff, see also Ostrowska 2004), rural and small-town settings prevail. The topic of cinematic landscapes and countryside has caught the attention of the 'interpretative community' only fairly recently, and the scholarship on the subject is still relatively scarce: the latest collections of essays include, for example, *Representing the Rural: Space, Place and Identity in Films about Land* (Fowler and Helfield 2006), *Landscape and Film* (Lefebvre 2006) and *Cinema and Landscape* (Harper and Rayner 2010).

Finally, the research on various theoretical concepts has been 'grounded' by means of archival studies of particular films under examination. Although the production records of Tallinnfilm and Eesti Telefilm preserved in the Estonian State Archives are somewhat fragmentary, and do not include any pictorial material of the production process, the documentation still offers invaluable insights into the filmmaking and censorship practices of the Soviet period. These records are especially telling when compared with contemporary film reviews. In tandem, these sources occasionally provide extremely valuable information in terms of spatial representation as well.

Structure and summaries

The following essays, written and/or published between 2006 and 2011, are presented according to the chronology of their objects of analysis, starting with films made in the

²⁵ E.g. Sanders 2001, Celant and Dennison 2006 and Pomerance 2007 on New York; Brunson 2007 on London; Rhodes 2007 on Rome; and Hake 1994 and Jacobsen 1998 on Berlin.

²⁶ E.g. Gunning 1995 and Neumann 1997.

²⁷ E.g. Dear 2000, Mazierska and Rascaroli 2003, and Krause and Petro 2003.

²⁸ E.g. Mandelbaum and Myers 1985, Mandelbaum and Myers 1989, Sennett 1994, Shaal 1996, Bronfen 2004 and Ramírez 2004.

²⁹ E.g. Sorlin 1991, Penz and Thomas 1997, Konstantarakos 2000, Mazierska and Rascaroli 2003, Everett and Goodbody 2005, and Bergfelder *et al.* 2007.

³⁰ E.g. Shiel and Fitzmaurice 2001.

³¹ E.g. Massood 2003a and 2003b on African American urban experiences in film.

³² E.g. Sutcliffe 1984, Albrecht 1987, Webb 1987, Caws 1991, Sorlin 1991, Hake 1994, Donald 1995, Gunning 1995, Clarke 1997, Donald 1997, Neumann 1997, Penz and Thomas 1997, Donald 1999, Balshaw and Kennedy 2000, Lamster 2000, Orr 2000, Shonfield 2000, Kaes 2001, Shiel and Fitzmaurice 2001, Barber 2002, Krause and Petro 2003, Mazierska and Rascaroli 2003, Shiel and Fitzmaurice 2003, AlSayyad 2006, Griffiths and Chudoba 2007, Marcus and Neumann 2007, Webber and Wilson 2008 and Oukaderova 2010.

immediate post-war period and proceeding through the years of ‘thaw’, ‘stagnation’ and the ‘Singing Revolution’, to the collapse of the Soviet system. As already mentioned, the main focus is on the 1960s and 1970s, which is partly an accidental result of the research process, partly reflects the rather objective fact that the former decade was a period of striking change and exciting developments, and partly reflects my own tastes (e.g. a concentration on the popular cinema of the 1970s, or the ‘low’ pseudo-advertising genre of ‘view films’, rather than on the much-celebrated achievements of the ‘true Estonian New Wave’ of the late 1970s and early 1980s).

The first article in the series, ‘A View from the Periphery. Spatial Discourse of the Soviet Estonian Feature Film: The 1940s and 1950s’, looks at the earliest period of Soviet Estonian narrative cinema, the post-World War II era, dominated by the ‘visiting filmmakers’ who had been appointed by the central authorities to institute ideologically correct cinemas in the formerly bourgeois Baltic periphery. The essay examines how the cinematic depictions of spaces and places, as well as the people inhabiting them, resonate with the ideological shifts and Soviet strategies of identity-building. The discussion of spatial representations stems from the notions of the ‘tourist gaze’ (Urry 1990), which designates a static, hierarchical, tamed and reified view of landscape, the conquest of territory – influencing not only the actual terrain but also penetrating the lives and minds of people inhabiting them (both the tourist gaze and the conquest of territory are theorized in the context of Soviet cinema by Emma Widdis; see Widdis 2000, 2003a, 2003b), the binary spatial patterns (above all, centre versus periphery), and the closed and static ‘sacralized’ space, as suggested by Katerina Clark (2003).

The next three essays investigate the narrative cinema of the 1960s. First, in ‘National Space, (Trans)National Cinema: Estonian Film in the 1960s’, I suggest that, during this decade, an important mode of spatial representation – in other words, a chronotope – was established, one that perhaps still defines the ‘character’ of Estonian cinema in a more general sense: the nation-scapes or nation-spaces imagined by younger filmmakers of local descent who took over the Estonian cinematic stage. During the 1960s, rural settings prevailed over urban environments, and the portrayals of the countryside were based on the models of Italian neorealism, replacing the exoticized representations of the nation and the national of the Stalinist period. At the same time, these filmic landscapes often reveal a relative indifference towards contemporary realities and are thus coloured by a certain inclination towards nostalgic escapism. This special concern with provincial and rural localities and territories seems to reflect a desire to investigate national identity (John Agnew has proposed that the image of landscape is one of the most important mechanisms of creating national identities, see Agnew 1998). However, as further argued in ‘Nature, Movement, Liminality: Representing the Space of the Nation in 1960’s Estonian Cinema’, these national spaces were also inflected with transnational currents of both Soviet and Western origin. Partly because of this interplay of inter- and

transnational elements with locally rooted aspects, Estonian cinema remained relatively alienated from the core of Estonian culture. The third article of this sub-section, 'Film, Space and Narrative: *What Happened to Andres Lapeteus?* and *The Postage-Stamp of Vienna*', complements the previous discussion of rural environments with a couple of counter-examples, focussing on two films with urban settings – rather rare occurrences in the Estonian film of the 1960s. The analysis of their narrative space and set design connects these films with the previous discussion by situating them in wider transnational networks – both regional (Soviet cinema) and global (European *auteur*-cinema and Hollywood's 'zero point of cinematic style' (Burch 1973: 17)), drawing attention, by way of close formal analysis, to the fact that Estonian cinema was a product of constant interlocution with various traditions and discourses.

The following four essays deal with various aspects of spatial representations in the Estonian cinema of the 1970s, considering some of the alternatives to the concepts of nation-scape and Soviet-scape. 'Tourist Gaze as a Strategic Device of Architectural Representation: Tallinn's Old Town and Soviet Tourism Marketing in the 1960s and 1970s' examines a set of short documentaries, the 'scenics', or literally 'view films', basically commercials made to advertise Tallinn's Old Town as a desirable tourism destination, particularly for Western travellers. The notion of the tourist gaze and its incarnations under the auspices of the socialist realist mode of representation, as described by Emma Widdis (2003a: 138–139), provide an illuminating frame of reference for scrutinizing not only tourism-related production but also Eastern European cinema in a more general sense (see Mazierska 2010a: 12). While these touristic shorts were related to 'official' stances of Soviet ideology, although at times ambiguously, 'New Waves, New Spaces: Estonian Experimental Cinema of the 1970s' concentrates on the films of Jaan Tooming, a rebellious *auteur* whose works were typically geared towards undermining the powers that be. His experimental films, especially the infamously banned *Endless Day*, favour Lefebvrian differential space over the abstract space of mainstream cinema and offering shifting registers of spatio-social portrayals and critiques of the Soviet ideological apparatus. In a somewhat comparable way, Raul Tammet, whose short science fiction films *Solo* (*Soolo*, 1979) and *Wedding Picture* (*Pulmapilt/A potom oglyanulsya*, 1980) are the focus of 'Aliens and Time Travellers: Recycling National Space in Estonian Science-Fiction Cinema', called into question and modified the previous discourses on national spaces, historical narratives and collective identities. Tammet's works remained, like Tooming's oeuvre, although admittedly under fairly different circumstances, on the periphery of Estonian film production. The opposite, however, is true in the case of the two Polish-Estonian co-productions, the science fiction film *The Test of Pilot Pirx* (*Test pilota Pirxa/Navigaator Pirx*, 1978) and the fantasy adventure *Curse of Snakes Valley* (*Kłątwa Doliny Węży / Madude oru needus*, 1988), analysed in 'Postcolonial Heterotopias in Marek

Piestrak's Estonian Co-productions: A Paracinematic Reading' Especially *Pirx* received wide circulation, favourable reviews and a substantial fan following. These two films constitute a fascinating diptych of Eastern European popular cinema, and a paracinematic reading 'concentrating on ... formal bizarreness and stylistic eccentricity' (Sconce 2004: 547) of their spatiotemporal discourse reveals them as productions articulating broader, transnational and cross-Soviet social, political and cultural mores and values, desires and dreads. The analysis of their heterotopian spatial representations also demonstrates once again the deeply dialogic nature of Soviet and Eastern European cinematic ecology. And, perhaps most importantly, a closer look at their particular spatial regimes and narrative patterns from the perspective of postcolonial thought invites one to consider them as politically and culturally significant utterances.

The final essay of the series, 'From Nation-Scape to Nation-State: Reconfiguring Filmic Space in Post-Soviet Estonian Cinema,' focuses on the shifting modalities of spatial representations in Estonian cinema in the transitional period between the late 1980s and early 1990s, as well as on the changing procedures of narrating the nation, negotiating its identities and histories. By taking a closer look at two films – Peeter Urbla's *I'm Not a Tourist, I Live Here* (1988) and Ilkka Järvilaturi's *Darkness in Tallinn* (1993) – the essay offers some insights into the dynamic process of reshaping the cinematic imaginary of urban environments – as well as the psyches, histories and experiences of their inhabitants, both individual and collective – in the course of a tumultuous period of political and social change.

Some conclusions and suggestions

Any project that sets out to tackle the (relatively) initial task of mapping previously uncharted territories runs the risk of presenting results that might appear somewhat pedestrian and unsophisticated. For instance, for me perhaps one of the most significant conclusions drawn from the explorations of the local cinematic terrain is a firm conviction that Estonian film – whether Soviet or post-Soviet – is indeed an intriguing subject matter, a rich repository of visual culture. Estonian cinema, and its Soviet era in particular, deserves to be studied even (and maybe especially) beyond the oft-quoted cinematic 'gems' and the 'official' '10 Best Estonian Films of All Time'³³. In fact, it might well be that its 'true nature' becomes accessible *only* when considered as a whole, a whole

³³ In 2002, Estonian film critics named the best Estonian feature films of all times as follows: 1) *Spring* (*Kevade*, 1969, director Arvo Kruusement); 2) *Madness* (*Hullumeelsus*, 1968, director Kaljo Kiisk); 3) *Ideal Landscape* (*Ideaalmaastik*, 1980, director Peeter Simm); 4) *The Last Relic* (*Viimne reliikvia*, 1969, director Grigori Kromanov); 5) *Georgica* (1998, director Sulev Keedus); 6) *Happy-Go-Lucky* (*Nipernaadi*, 1983, director Kaljo Kiisk); 7) *Dead Mountaineer Hotel* (*Hukkunud Alpinisti hotell*, 1979, director Grigori Kromanov); 8) *Please, Smile* (*Naerata ometi*, 1985, directors Leida Laius and Arvo Iho); 9) *Misadventures of the Old Satan* (*Põrgupõhja uus Vanapagan*, 1964, directors Grigori Kromanov and Jüri Müür); 10) *Nest of Winds* (*Tuulte pesa*, 1979, director Olav Neuland). See <http://tallinnfilm.ee/index.php?page=67&>.

that is not a self-sustained system, but is actually connected by numerous and complex ties to much larger circuits of regional, and even global, cinema and culture, politics and networks of power.

The tools of spatial analysis have facilitated what appears to be a rather successful escape from the evaluative category of national cinema, as defined by topics of greater or lesser 'worth' (e.g. literary classics versus screenplays by foreign authors), making it possible to arrive at a more nuanced account of Soviet Estonian cinema, which is far too often dismissed overall as an era and cultural field dominated by mediocrity. At the same time, my intention was not to abandon the framework of national cinema altogether. Rather, the opposite – these films clearly played a considerable part in articulating and maybe even shaping the national project at a time when the nation-state as a political reality was absent, providing filmmakers an arena for contesting questionable cultural policies and giving them a voice (although frequently muffled or eventually silenced) to express their own concerns, ideas and critiques. Importantly, I've attempted to show that these aspects were present not only in such celebrated films as *Madness* or *The Last Relic*, but that they can also be found in apparently more 'conformist' productions, such as Raul Tammet's science-fiction films, and in more 'modest' works, such as Jüri Müür's *Fellow-Villagers* (*Ühe küla mehed*, 1962), which have been largely 'wiped out' of the memory of local audiences. Finally, I've striven to demonstrate that the picture is incomplete without the more 'Soviet-minded' pieces, which offer a necessary centre of gravity for a well-balanced explanation of the era's filmic ecology, as well as of culture in general. Just as *auteur* cinema can be fully appreciated, understood and critiqued only in juxtaposition with popular genre cinema (and vice versa), the specific characters of nation-scapes can be properly carved out only in correlation with Soviet-scapes. Nation-scape and Soviet-scape are, of course, functional abstractions that, as explained above, evolve over time and are influenced by a constant interplay of their constituents.

Lastly, I would suggest that, since the 'grand narrative' of Estonian cinema apparently is missing altogether in the public perception, and thus does not need 'de-' or 'reconstruction' (beyond proving wrong the opinion that Estonian cinema is boring and insignificant), we are at a good starting point for a productive, dialogic account of the local film history, one that relates the domestic filmic material to regional and global manifestations and developments of filmmaking, on the one hand, and to broader intellectual currents, various understandings of social, historical and cultural matters, as well as theories of the cinematic image, on the other hand. I can only hope that the following series of essays will provide some general direction for these future inquiries.

References

- Affron, Charles and Affron, Mirella Jona 1995. *Sets in Motion: Art Direction and Film Narrative*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Agnew, John 1998. *European Landscape and Identity*. – *Modern Europe: Place, Culture and Identity*. Ed. Brian Graham. London: Arnold, pp. 213–235.
- Allbrecht, Donald 1987. *Designing Dreams: Modern Architecture in the Movies*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Alexander, Lily 2007. *Storytelling in Time and Space: Studies in the Chronotope and Narrative Logic on Screen*. – *Journal of Narrative Theory*, vol. 37 (1), pp. 27–64.
- AlSayyad, Nezar 2006. *Cinematic Urbanism: A History of the Modern from Reel to Real*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Anderson, Benedict 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 1981. *Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel. Notes toward a Historical Poetics*. – *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 84–258.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Balshaw, Maria and Kennedy, Liam (eds.) 2000. *Urban Space and Representation*. London, Sterling: Pluto Press.
- Barber, Stephen 2002. *Projected Cities: Cinema and Urban Space*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Barsacq, Léon 1976. *Caligari's Cabinet and Other Grand Illusions: A History of Film Design*. Boston: New York Graphic Society.
- Bergfelder, Tim 2005. *National, Transnational or Supranational Cinema? Rethinking European Film Studies*. – *Media, Culture & Society*, vol. 27 (3), pp. 315–331.
- Bergfelder, Tim *et al.* 2007. *Film Architecture and the Transnational Imagination: Set Design in 1930s European Cinema*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Bordwell, David 1985a. *Narration in the Fiction Film*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bordwell, David 1985b. *The Classical Hollywood Style, 1917–60*. – David Bordwell *et al.*, *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*. London, Melbourne, Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 1–84.
- Bordwell, David 1989a. *Historical Poetics of Cinema*. – *The Cinematic Text: Methods and Approaches*. Ed. R. Barton Palmer. New York: AMS Press, pp. 393–398.
- Bordwell, David 1989b. *Making Meaning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bordwell, David 1999. *On the History of Film Style*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Bordwell, David and Thompson, Kristin 2004. *Film Art: An Introduction*. Seventh edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Bronfen, Elisabeth 2004. *Home in Hollywood: The Imaginary Geography of Cinema*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bruno, Giuliana 1993. *Streetwalking on a Ruined Map: Cultural Theory and the City Films of Elvira Notari*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bruno, Giuliana 2002. *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*. New York: Verso.
- Brunsdon, Charlotte 2007. *London in Cinema: The Cinematic City since 1945*. London: BFI.
- Buckland, Warren 2008. *Film Studies*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Burch, Noël 1973. *Theory of Film Practice*. Trans. Helen R. Lane, intro. Annette Michelson. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Caws, Mary Ann (ed.) 1991. *City Images: Perspectives from Literature, Philosophy, and Film*. New York: Gordon and Breach.
- Celant, Germano and Dennison, Lisa 2006. *New York, New York: Fifty Years of Art, Architecture, Cinema, Performance, Photography and Video*. Milano: Skira.
- Christopher, Nicholas 1997. *Somewhere in the Night: Film Noir and the American City*. New York: The Free Press.
- Clark, Katerina 2003. Socialist Realism and the Sacralizing of Space. – *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*. Eds. Evgeny Dobrenko and Eric Naiman. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, pp. 3–18.
- Clarke, David B. (ed.) 1997. *The Cinematic City*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Crang, Mike and Nigel Thrift (eds.). *Thinking Space*. London, New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Crofts, Stephen 1993. Reconceptualizing National Cinema/s. – *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, vol. 14 (3), pp. 49–67.
- Dear, Michael J. 2000. Film, Architecture and Filmspace. – *The Postmodern Urban Condition*. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 176–198.
- Deltcheva, Roumiana and Vlasov, Eduard 1997. Back to the House II: On the Chronotopic and Ideological Reinterpretation of Lem's *Solaris* in Tarkovsky's Film. – *The Russian Review*, vol. 56 (4), pp. 532–549.
- Desser, David 1999. Race, Space and Class: The Politics of Cityscapes in Science-Fiction Films. – *Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science-Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Annette Kuhn. London, New York: Verso, pp. 80–96.
- Dimendberg, Edward 2004. *Film Noir and the Spaces of Modernity*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny 2004. Socialism as Will and Representation, or What Legacy Are We Rejecting? – *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, vol. 5 (4), pp. 675–708.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny 2008. *Stalinist Cinema and the Production of History: Museum of the Revolution*. Trans. Sarah Young. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Eagle, Herbert (ed.) 1981. *Russian Formalist Film Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures.

- Donald, James 1995. *The City, the Cinema: Modern Space*. – *Visual Culture*. Ed. Charles Jencks. London: Routledge, pp. 77–95.
- Donald, James 1997. *This, Here, Now: Imagining the Modern City*. – *Imagining Cities: Scripts, Signs, Memory*. Eds. Sallie Westwood and John Williams. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 181–201.
- Donald, James 1999. *Imagining the Modern City*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eco, Umberto 1985. *Casablanca: Cult Movies and Intertextual Collage*. – *SubStance*, vol. 14 (2), pp. 3–12.
- Elliott, Bridget and Purdy, Anthony 1997. *Peter Greenaway: Architecture and Allegory*. London: Academy.
- Elsaesser, Thomas and Hagener, Malte 2010. *Film Theory: An Introduction through the Senses*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Everett, Wendy and Goodbody, Axel (eds.) 2005. *Revisiting Space: Space and Place in European Cinema*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Forgacs, David 2000. *Antonioni: Space, Place, Sexuality*. – *Spaces in European Cinema*. Ed. Myrto Konstantarakos. Exeter, Portland: Intellect, pp. 101–111.
- Foucault, Michel 1986. *Of Other Spaces*. Translated by Jay Miskowic. – *Diacritics*, vol. 16 (1), pp. 22–27.
- Fowler, Catherine and Helfield, Gillian (eds.) 2006. *Representing the Rural: Space, Place, and Identity in Films about the Land*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Ganser, Alexandra *et al.* 2006. *Bakhtin's Chronotope on the Road: Space, Time, and Place in Road Movies Since the 1970s*. – *Facta Universitatis. Linguistic and Literature*, vol. 4 (1), pp. 1–17.
- Gaughan, Martin. 2003. *Ruttman's Berlin: Filming in a "Hollow Space"*. – *Screening the City*. Eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice. London, New York: Verso, pp. 42–57.
- Gold, John R. 1984. *The City in Films*. Architecture Series 1218. Monvicello: Vance Bibliographies.
- Gold, John R. 1985. *From 'Metropolis' to 'The City': Film Visions of the Future City, 1919–39*. – *Geography, the Media & Popular Culture*. Eds. Jacquelin Burgess and John R. Gold. New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 123–143.
- Gold, John R. 2001. *Under Darkened Skies: The City in Science-Fiction Film*. – *Geography*, vol. 86 (4), pp. 337–345.
- Graf, Alexander 2007. *Berlin–Moscow: On the Montage Aesthetic in the City Symphony Films of the 1920s*. – *Avant-Garde Film*. Eds. Alexander Graf and Dietrich Scheunemann. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, pp. 77–91.
- Griffiths, Gareth and Chudoba, Minna 2007. *City + Cinema: Essays on the Specificity of Location in Film*. Tampere: Tampere University of Technology.
- Gunning, Tom 1995. *Urban Spaces in Early Silent Film*. København: Center for Urbanitet og Æstetik, University of Copenhagen.

- Hake, Sabine 1994. Urban Spectacle in Walter Ruttmann's *Berlin: Symphony of the Big City*. – Dancing on the Volcano: Essays on the Culture of the Weimar Republic. Eds. Thomas W. Kniesche and Stephen Brockmann. Columbia: Camden House, pp. 127–142.
- Hall, Stuart 1992. The Question of Cultural Identity. – Modernity and Its Futures. Eds. Stuart Hall, David Held and Tony McGrew. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 273–326.
- Harper, Graeme and Rayner, Jonathan (eds.) 2010. Cinema and Landscape. Bristol, Chicago: Intellect.
- Heath, Stephen 1978. Questions of Property: Film and Nationhood. – Cine-tracts, vol. 1 (4), pp. 2–11.
- Heath, Stephen 1981. Questions of Cinema. London: Macmillan.
- Heisner, Beverly 2004. Production Design in the Contemporary American Film: A Critical Study of 23 Movies and Their Designers. Jefferson, London: McFarland.
- Higson, Andrew 1989. The Concept of National Cinema. – Screen, vol. 30 (4), pp. 36–47.
- Higson, Andrew 2000. National Cinema(s), International Markets and Cross-cultural Identities. – Moving Images, Culture and the Mind. Ed. Ib Bondebjerg. Luton: University of Luton Press, pp. 205–214.
- Higson, Andrew 2002. The Limiting Imagination of National Cinema. – Cinema and Nation. Eds. Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 63–74.
- Higson, Andrew 2010. Transnational Developments in European Cinema in the 1920s. – Transnational Cinemas, vol. 1 (1), pp. 69–82.
- Hjort, Mette and MacKenzie (eds.) 2000. Cinema and Nation. London, New York: Routledge.
- Hjort, Mette and Petrie, Duncan (eds.) 2007. The Cinemas of Small Nations. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric 2007. Globalisation, Democracy and Terrorism. London: Abacus.
- Hubbard, Phil *et al.* (eds.) 2004. Key Thinkers on Space and Place. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Jameson, Fredric 2003. The End of Temporality. – Critical Inquiry, vol. 29 (4), pp. 695–718.
- Iordanova, Dina 2003. Cinema of the Other Europe: The Industry and Artistry of East Central European Film. London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Jacobs, Steven 2007. The Wrong House: The Architecture of Alfred Hitchcock. Rotterdam: 010.
- Jacobsen, Wolfgang (ed.) 1998. Berlin im Film: Die Stadt – die Menchen. Berlin: Argon.
- Kaes, Anton 2001. Metropolis: City, Cinema, Modernity. – Expressionist Utopias: Paradise. Metropolis. Architectural Fantasy. Ed. Timothy O. Benson. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 146–165.
- Kangur, Paavo 2011. Viimne reliikvia. Pilk legendi taha. Tallinn: Ajakirjade Kirjastus.
- Kazanskij, Boris 1981. The Nature of Cinema. – Russian Formalist Film Theory. Ed. Herbert Eagle. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, pp. 101–129.
- Konstantarakos, Myrto (ed.) 2000. Spaces in European Cinema. Exeter, Portland: Intellect.
- Koppel, Annika 2010. Kevade. Suvi. Sügis. Arvo Kruusemendi filmid. S.L.: Kadmiirell.
- Krause, Linda and Petro, Patrice (eds.) 2003. Global Cities: Cinema, Architecture, and Urbanism in a Digital Age. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

- Kuhn, Annette 1990. Introduction: Cultural Theory and Science Fiction Cinema. – *Alien Zone: Cultural Theory and Contemporary Science Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Annette Kuhn. London, New York: Verso, pp. 1–12.
- Kärk, Lauri 2000. Pildi sisse minek. Filmikirjutisi Tšehhovist *virtual reality*'ni 1977–1999. Tallinn: Kirjastuskeskus.
- Lamster, Mark (ed.) 2000. *Architecture and Film*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Lapsley, Robert and Westlake, Michael 1988. *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- LoBrutto, Vincent 2002. *The Filmmakers Guide to Production Design*. New York: Allworth Press.
- Lokk, Tiina 2003. Vastab Tiina Lokk. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 11, pp. 3–16, http://www.temuki.ee/arhiiv/2003/11/03nov_k01.htm.
- Lefebvre, Martin (ed.) 2006. *Landscape and Film*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Liotard, Jean-François 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi, foreword by Fredric Jameson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Maimets, Kaire 2003. Visuaalse ja muusikalise tasandi suhtest Leida Laiuse filmis “Ukuaru”. MA thesis. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Music.
- Maimets-Volt, Kaire 2009. Mediating the ‘Idea of One’: Arvo Pärt’s Pre-existing Music in Film. *Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre Dissertations*, no. 4. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre.
- Mandelbaum, Howard and Myers, Eric 1985. *Screen Deco*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Mandelbaum, Howard and Myers, Eric 1989. *Forties Screen Style: A Celebration of High Pastiche in Hollywood*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Marcus, Alan and Neumann, Dietrich (eds.) 2007. *Visualizing the City*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Martin-Jones, David 2006. *Deleuze, Cinema and National Identity: Narrative Time in National Contexts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Massood, Paula J. 2003a. *Black City Cinema: African American Urban Experiences in Film*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Massood, Paula J. 2003b. *City Spaces and City Times: Bakhtin’s Chronotope and Recent African-American Cinema*. – *Screening the City*. Eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice. London, New York: Verso, pp. 200–215.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2010a. *Eastern European Cinema: Old and New Approaches*. – *Studies in Eastern European Cinema*, vol. 1 (1), pp. 5–16.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2010b. Rewizje historii polski a “miękką awangarda” filmowa lat sześćdziesiątych. – *Kwartalnik filmowy*, no. 70, pp. 106–120.
- Mazierska, Ewa and Rascaroli, Laura 2003. *From Moscow to Madrid: Postmodern Cities, European Cinema*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Mercer, Kobena 1988. *Diaspora Culture and the Dialogic Imagination*. – *Black Frames*. Eds. Mbye Cham and Claire Andrade-Watkins. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Meri, Lennart 1968. Suur üksiklane. – Sirp ja Vasar, 9 February.
- Montgomery, Michael V. 1994. *Carnivals and Commonplaces: Bakhtin's Chronotope, Cultural Studies, and Film*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Mukařovský, Jan 1978. A Note on the Aesthetics of Film. – *Structure, Sign, and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Trans. and eds. John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, pp. 178–190.
- Naficy, Hamid 2001. *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Natter, Wolfgang. 1994. The City as Cinematic Space: Modernism and Place in *Berlin, Symphony of a City*. – *Place, Power, Situation, and Spectacle: A Geography of Film*. Eds. Stuart C. Aitken and Leo E. Zonn. Lanham, London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp. 203–227.
- Neumann, Dietrich (ed.) 1997. *Film Architecture: Set Designs from Metropolis to Blade Runner*. Munich, New York: Prestel.
- Näripea, Eva 2004. Medieval Socialist Realism: Representations of Tallinn Old Town in Soviet Estonian Feature Films, 1969–1972. – *Place and Location. Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics*, no. 4. Ed. Virve Sarapik. Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum, pp. 121–143.
- Näripea, Eva 2005a. Dissonant Heritage and the Tourist Gaze: Concerning the Restoration of Tallinn's Old Town and Its (Cinematographic) Representations. – *Ehituskunst. Estonian Architectural Review*, no. 43/44, pp. 56–70.
- Näripea, Eva 2005b. Soviet Camp: Cultural Conformation and Resistance in Don Juan in Tallinn. – *Kunst.ee: Estonian Quarterly of Visual Culture*, no. 4, pp. 37–40.
- Näripea, Eva and Trossek, Andreas (eds.) 2008. *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Special issue of *Koht ja paik / Place and Location. Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics*, no. 7. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts; Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum.
- Näripea, Eva *et al.* (eds.) 2010. *Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema*. <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/estonian.shtml>.
- Orav, Õie 2003. *Tallinnfilm I. Mängufilmid 1947–1976*. Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus.
- Orr, John 2000. *The Revival of the Cinematic City*. – J. Orr, *The Art and Politics of Film*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 136–154.
- Ostrowska, Elżbieta 2004. Landscape and the Lost Time: Ethnoscape in the Work of Andrzej Wajda. – *Kinoeye*, vol. 4 (5), <http://www.kinoeye.org/04/05/ostrowska05.php>.
- Oukaderova, Lida 2010. The Sense of Movement in Georgii Daneliia's *Walking the Streets of Moscow*. – *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, vol. 4 (1), pp. 5–21.
- Owen, Jonathan L. 2011. *Avant-Garde to New Wave: Czechoslovak Cinema, Surrealism and the Sixties*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Pallasmaa, Juhani 2007. *The Architecture of Image: Existential Space in Cinema*. Helsinki, Rakenustieto.

- Penz, François and Thomas, Maureen (eds.) 1997. *Cinema & Architecture: Méliès, Mallet-Stevens, Multimedia*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Pomerance, Murray (ed.) 2007. *City that Never Sleeps: New York and the Filmic Imagination*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Preston, Ward 1994. *What an Art Director Does: Introduction to Motion Picture Production Design*. Los Angeles: Silman-James Press.
- Prokhorov, Alexander 2001. *The Unknown New Wave: Soviet Cinema of the 1960s*. – *Springtime for Soviet Cinema: Re/Viewing the 1960s*. Ed. Alexander Prokhorov. Pittsburgh, pp. 7–28, <http://www.rusfilm.pitt.edu/booklets/Thaw.pdf>.
- Prokhorov, Alexander 2002. *Inherited Discourse: Stalinist Tropes in Thaw Culture*. PhD thesis. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, <http://etd.library.pitt.edu/ETD/available/etd-07242002-135513/>.
- Ramírez, Juan Antonio 2004. *Architecture for the Screen: A Critical Study of Set Design in Hollywood's Golden Age*. Jefferson, London: McFarland.
- Rhodes, John David 2007. *Stupendous, Miserable City: Pasolini's Rome*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Robinson, Chris J. 2010. *Geniaalsuse ja täieliku kirjaoskamatus vahel: eesti animatsiooni lugu*. Translated by Kristjan-Jaak Kangur. Tallinn: Varrak.
- Sanders, James 2001. *Celluloid Skyline: New York and the Movies*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sennett, Robert S. 1994. *Setting the Scene: The Great Hollywood Art Directors*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Shaal, Hans Dieter 1996. *Learning from Hollywood: Architecture and Film*. Stuttgart, London: Axel Menges.
- Shiel, Mark 2001. *Cinema and the City in History and Theory*. – *Cinema and the City: Film and Urban Societies in a Global Context*. Eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell, pp. 1–18.
- Shiel, Mark and Fitzmaurice, Tony (eds.) 2001. *Cinema and the City: Film and Urban Societies in a Global Context*. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell.
- Shiel, Mark and Fitzmaurice, Tony (eds.) 2003. *Screening the City*. London, New York: Verso.
- Shonfield, Katherine 2000. *Walls Have Feelings: Architecture, Film and the City*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Sobchack, Vivian 1998. 'Lounge Time': Post-War Crises and the Chronotope of Film Noir. – *Refiguring American Film Genres: History and Theory*. Ed. Nick Browne. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 129–170.
- Sobchack, Vivian 1999. *Cities on the Edge of Time: The Urban Science-Fiction Film*. – *Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science-Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Annette Kuhn. London, New York: Verso, pp. 123–143.
- Sorlin, Pierre 1991. *The Blurred Image of Cities*. – P. Sorlin, *European Cinemas, European Societies 1939–1990*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 111–137.

- Staiger, Janet 1999. *Future Noir: Contemporary Representations of Visionary Cities. – Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science-Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Annette Kuhn. London, New York: Verso, pp. 97–122.
- Stam, Robert 1989. *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film*. Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stam, Robert *et al.* 1992. *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics: Structuralism, Post-Structuralism and Beyond*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Stam, Robert 2000. *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sutcliffe, Anthony 1984. *The Metropolis in the Cinema. – Metropolis 1890–1940*. Ed. Anthony Sutcliffe. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 147–171.
- Tashiro, C. S. 1998. *Pretty Pictures: Production Design and the History of Film*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Thompson, Kristin 1988. *Breaking the Glass Armor: Neoformalist Film Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Thompson, Kristin and Bordwell, David 1976. *Space and Narrative in the Films of Ozu. – Screen*, vol. 17 (2), pp. 41–73.
- Turovskaya, Maya 1989. *Cinema as Poetry*. London: Faber.
- Urry, John 1990. *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Vice, Sue 1997. *The Chronotope: Fleshing out Time. – S. Vice, Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, pp. 200–228.
- Vitali, Valentina and Willemsen, Paul (eds.) 2006. *Theorising National Cinema*. London: British Film Institute.
- Walsh, Michael 1996. *National Cinema, National Imaginary. – Film History*, vol. 8 (1), pp. 5–17.
- Webb, Michael 1987. *The City in Film. – Design Quarterly*, no. 136, pp. 3–33.
- Webber, Andrew and Wilson, Emma (eds.) 2008. *Cities in Transition: The Moving Image and the Modern Metropolis*. London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Widdis, Emma 2000. *Borders: The Aesthetic of Conquest in Soviet Cinema of the 1930s. – Journal of European Studies: Literature and Ideas from the Renaissance to the Present*, vol. 30 (4), pp. 401–411.
- Widdis, Emma 2003a. *To Explore or Conquer? Mobile Perspectives on the Soviet Cultural Revolution. – The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*. Eds. Evgeny Dobrenko and Eric Naiman. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, pp. 219–240.
- Widdis, Emma 2003b. *Visions of a New Land: Soviet Film from the Revolution to the Second World War*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
- Willemsen, Paul 1989. *The Third Cinema Question: Notes and Reflections. – Questions of Third Cinema*. Eds. Jim Pines and Paul Willemsen. London: BFI, pp. 1–29.
- Williams, Alan (ed.) 2002. *Film and Nationalism*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

A View
from the Periphery.
Spatial Discourse
of the Soviet Estonian
Feature Film:
The 1940s and 1950s

A facsimile of an article published in

Via Transversa:
Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc.
Special issue of Place and Location.
Studies in Environmental
Aesthetics and Semiotics, no. 7.
Eds. Eva Näripea and Andreas Trossek.
Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts;
Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum,
2008, pp. 193–210

Eva Näripea

**A View from
the Periphery
Spatial Discourse of
the Soviet Estonian
Feature Film:
The 1940s and 1950s** ★

★ The article is written under target-financed research topic
no. SF0030054s08.

The first post-war decade and a half has more or less faded from the story of (Soviet) Estonian film-making; it forms a 'black hole' in the collective consciousness of the country's cinematic heritage, a little-known and alien gap between two 'owns': the thin, yet still our own, film culture of the pre-war Estonian Republic, and the much-celebrated rise of the 'national school of film' at the beginning of the 1960s. The late 1940s and the 1950s have rarely earned attention from today's critics and scholars, who tend to discard those years as a somewhat shameful period of blatant socialist realism (see, e.g., Orav 2003: 16–20). This paper, however, seeks to re-investigate the era's feature films from the perspective of spatial representations, considering how the cinematic depictions of spaces, places and people inhabiting them resonate with ideological shifts and Soviet strategies of identity-building. This essay begins with a short overview of the situation the local film industry faced in the second half of the 1940s, then moves on to argue that the spatial discourse of the Soviet Estonian films of the post-war decade and a half was, to a large extent, governed by the categories characteristic of the Stalinist/socialist realist culture and imported by Russian film-makers. The spatial representations were mainly based on the notions of the 'tourist gaze', the conquest of territory, binary spatial patterns (above all, centre versus periphery), and closed and static 'sacralised' space.

THE (NEW) BEGINNING

The beginning of Soviet Estonian feature films occurred in 1947, when *Life in the Citadel* (*Elu tsitadellis*), an adaptation of a play by the Estonian writer August Jakobson, was produced. By that time, the war and the Soviet cultural policy had effectively annihilated the better part of the local pre-war film world, both technically and creatively. The equipment, still intact and fully meeting the standards of modern film-making in the summer of 1940, had been destroyed (Pärnapuu 1989: 38), and a fair share of the film-makers, producers and industry officials of the Estonian Republic had emigrated, had been deported, or just discarded from the

industry.¹ According to Decree no. 281, issued by the Council of Peoples Commissars of the Estonian SSR, the Tallinn Studio of Newsreels (Kinokroonika Tallinna Stuudio)²—initially barely smouldering in the ashes of Estonian Culture Film (Eesti Kultuurifilm)—was officially established on March 19, 1945 (Paas 2002: 70). Although certain threads still inevitably connected the new era with the old Republic, the purification of the system, both intentional and ancillary (i.e. war-related), was destined to serve a particular goal: to turn a completely new page in the cinema of the now-occupied Soviet Estonia. The new cinematic culture was established 'as a transplant', which, arguably, for decades to come had very little to do with the organism of the local cultural life, as Lenart Meri noted in his ground-breaking article 'The great loner' ('Suur üksiklane') in 1968. It was a battle on multiple fronts: together with new cameras and editing tables, first borrowed and then bought, as well as with the new aesthetics of socialist realism, a knowledge was imported and propagated, which spread fairly aggressively the idea that film-making was born here only due to the favourable conditions brought by the Soviet regime, and anyone declaring the opposite was a 'bourgeois slanderer'. 'Cinematic troops', initially consisting of relatively well-established directors, cinematographers and scriptwriters, were sent to the new republics, which had to plant the seed of the ideologically correct and technically

1 In a very similar vein to, for example, Polish post-war film culture (see Haltó 2002: 47ff), where many film professionals also had lost their lives at the hands of the Nazis (Hendrykowska 1996: 389). In Estonia, the most famous case is probably that of Konstantin Märskä, a celebrated cinematographer who shot several feature films in the 1920s and became the main newsreel-maker of the state-owned Estonian Culture Film studio in the 1930s. He was undoubtedly one of the best film-makers of the pre-war period and, although he served as an assistant cinematographer in the crew of *Life in the Citadel*, Soviet officials made sure that his talents but also, even more importantly, his undesirable past would have minimal influence on the new Soviet Estonian cinematography. Märskä died in 1951.

2 The studio carried different names during the Soviet period: from 1944 to 1954 it was called Kinokroonika Tallinna Stuudio (Tallinn Studio of Newsreels), and in 1954 it was re-named Tallinna Kunstiliste ja Kroonikaalimide Kinostuudio (Tallinn Studio of Feature Films and Newsreels), or, in short Tallinna Kinostuudio (Tallinn Film Studio). Finally, in 1961 it became Tallinnifilm.

impeccable Soviet film.³ On the surface, the establishment of small and clearly not cost-effective national studios was perhaps meaningless, but they were an important part of the 'great Stalinist national politics'. Thus, Yuli Raizman went to Latvia (*Rainis*, 1949), Vera Stroyeva directed *Marite* in Lithuania, and, among others, Leonid Trauberg and Herbert Rappaport came to Estonia. Rappaport, who had studied law in Vienna in the 1920s, made films in Germany, France and the US in the 1920s and 1930s and finally, in 1936, had settled in Leningrad, directed a total of four films in Estonia: *Life in the Citadel*, *Light in Koordi* (*Valgus Koordis*, 1951), *Andrus Finds Happiness* (*Andruse õnn*, 1955) and *In Rain and Sunshine* (*Vihmas ja päikeses*, 1960). The first three actually bore Lenfilm's 'trademark', a fact which later caused quite a controversy over whether they belonged to the Estonian cultural sphere at all. However, in my opinion, these films, presented in the Estonian language, with Estonian actors, set in local surroundings and based, at least partially, on Estonian literary works, although directed by Soviet film-makers who, in fact, were supported by second directors from Estonian theatres (e.g. Andres Särev and Epp Kaidu, and later Kaljo Kiisk), should be considered at least as Soviet Estonian works. If not for any other reason, then maybe only because nobody else claims them.

One has to admit that Rappaport and Lenfilm, indeed, introduced an entirely new level of professionalism to the Estonian film industry, which for various (economic) reasons⁴ had produced only a few feature films during the pre-war years of the Estonian Republic (see, e.g., Paas 1980). This positive influence, however, was almost completely annulled by the fact that, for an extended period of time, the local creative potential was almost entirely ignored (see, e.g., Kaidu 1956: 194–195) and thus, from the mid-1950s, when feature film production in Tallinn was launched, until the early 1960s, the look and artistic level of the local production was mainly shaped by 'the infamous unemployed of the *malokartinie*'⁵—mediocre Russian film-makers with 'low creative potential' (Elmanoviš 1987) who raided the new national studios because they could

not find work in larger central studios. The personal reasons for relocating to the western rim of the Soviet Union, sometimes referred to as the 'West of the East', certainly varied (from finding a better place to live and/or seeking more favourable career conditions to escaping the misfortunes of one's private life), but the main programmatic, prudent and practical objective of engaging them in the process of establishing these new national studios was 'to indoctrinate a specific stereotyped outlook on life, to link the new national cinematography in making with the network of the all-Union cinematic legislation, and—undeniably—to block the much-feared influence of the so-called bourgeois nationalists.' (Elmanoviš 1987.) In the late 1950s, however, a number of young Estonian film-makers graduated, one by one, from the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography (Всесоюзный государственный институт кинематографии, VGIK) in Moscow,⁶ and started their highly promising careers in Tallinn. Also, several local writers joined the staff of the studio, both as scriptwriters and as members of the studio's Artistic Council. Thus, a more experienced and better-trained body of film-makers was established step by step. In addition, the Stalinist era, which had threatened people with physical repression, was gradually replaced by the Khrushchev 'Thaw', creating more encouraging conditions for self-expression. The sum of these circumstances was the emergence of a clearly discernible struggle between two generations and ideologies (Stalinism versus the Thaw), which inevitably resulted in an increasingly acute conflict between the (older) 'visiting film-makers', who propagated an unsolicited and inapt style of film-making, and the (young) Estonian film-makers, who now dared to stand for local cultural and moral values. The transcripts of the studio's Artistic Council, inaccessible outside of the relatively small circle of insiders, and—more importantly—some articles published in the public media (e.g. Kaidu 1956: 198–199), attest to rather open attacks and accusations against the inadequate creative potential of these 'touring' Russian film-makers, and also, perhaps even more significantly, against their ignorance of the local language, art and literature. This shift,

however, cannot be observed in the actual production until about 1962, when an apparent break occurred, marked by a film with an eloquent title—*Ice-Drift* (*Jääminek*). The thaw in filmic affairs was also marked by a completely new agent in the arena of film production: in 1960, Estonian Television produced its very first feature film, *Joller the Actor* (*Näitleja Joller*)—the first recognisably Estonian feature film of the post-war years, as Lennart Meri has argued (Meri 1968).

FILM FORM

As argued above, until the early 1960s the Soviet Estonian feature film was dominated by the cinematic language and patterns of narration imported from the large Russian central studios. This line of ‘realism’, based mainly on the principles of continuity editing (Bordwell 2001: 20) and other cinematic devices aimed at narrative clarity and the ‘effect of realism’, was derived from the classical Hollywood studio style and was simultaneously shaped to a considerable extent to suit Stalin’s personal tastes. Peter Kenez has maintained that, although he thoroughly enjoyed watching films, Stalin could never understand the essence of this medium. He far preferred the spoken word to the visual dimension of film-making. In terms of films, his taste was extremely unadventurous: experimental cinematography, odd and/or sharp camera angles, and tilted frames had to be discarded, and the camera had to shoot from eye-level (Kenez 2001: 131). Instead of close-ups, medium and long shots were favoured, ‘encompassing the entire environment, as if camera could, simply by avoiding selection, offer images saturated with reality’ (Woll 2000: 27). Theatrical aesthetics were mainly based on ‘in-depth staging and long takes – “Wellsian” depth became a hallmark of Stalinist cinema through the 1940s and 1950s.’ (Bordwell 2005: 111.) André Bazin has argued that in-depth staging and depth of focus ‘brings the spectator into a relation with the image closer to that which he enjoys with reality. Therefore it is correct to say that, independently of the contents of the image, its structure is more realistic’ (Bazin 1967: 35). Thus, it is not difficult to understand

why this device was so crucial to socialist realist aesthetics, which sought to present blatantly illusionist films as true reflections of reality. In Soviet Estonian films, in-depth staging (sometimes combined with depth-of-focus cinematography) is a frequent feature occurring in both indoor and outdoor settings.

However, after Stalin’s death in 1953, the rigour of this manner of representation was broken down, to a degree, and a few cautious steps

3 In the same way, Soviet (Russian) film-makers were sent as ‘ideological watchdogs’ to more distant countries of the Soviet bloc (e.g. Vsevolod Pudovkin acted as the ‘Soviet film ‘policeman’’ (Cunningham 2004: 70–71) in Hungary, visiting the country twice in 1950–1951; in 1947–1948 Ilya Trauberg served on the board of directors of the East German film company DEFA (Deutsche Film-Aktiengesellschaft; see Allan 1999: 4, 6)) and the missions of film-makers such as Abram Room and Sergei Yutkevitch to Albania and Yugoslavia, respectively, resulted in Soviet-Albanian/Yugoslavian co-productions (many thanks to Dina Iordanova for pointing out this fact). In East Germany, on the other hand, the Soviets worked with German intellectuals on a more equal and co-operative basis, above all with people—usually German émigrés in the USSR—who had already been involved in such partnerships for quite some time (see, e.g., Mückenberger 1999: 60). The practice of co-productions remained an important aspect of film-making in the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc throughout the socialist period, serving the significant ideological task of bringing the socialist nations together into a common ‘big family’.

4 In the pre-war Estonian Republic, the local market was minuscule and state agencies did not support (feature) film-making substantially; at the same time, in other small European countries this was an essential part of the development of their respective national film cultures and of their success both in local and international markets. True, from 1931 the state film studio Estonian Culture Film was established and in 1936 it became an organ of state propaganda, producing ‘compulsory newsreels that propagated values established by the state, and benevolent educational films.’ (Ruus s.a.) Film-related legislation was absent until 1935. There was no film school and professional training was lacking altogether. One of the most productive feature film directors, Theodor Luts, left Estonia in the 1930s, heading first to Finland, then to Sweden and later, after the end of World War II, to Brazil.

5 In the late 1940s and early 1950s, the number of (feature) films made in the Soviet Union decreased radically, mainly due to repressive cultural politics but also owing to Stalin’s policy of allowing the making of only a very limited number of films, all of which had to be masterpieces (see, e.g., Elmanovits 1987). Between 1945 and 1953, the production of all the studios of the Union came to 185 films and the absolute low-point was hit in 1951, with only nine films made in total (Woll 2000: 4). Furthermore, many of them were only ‘unfilmic’ recordings of theatrical performances (Kenez 2001: 188; Liehm, Liehm 1977: 68).

6 For the admission of students from the smaller republics, a quota of places had been created in order to ensure their training by the highest standards possible and to guarantee a high level of professionalism throughout the Soviet film industry—undeniably yet another way of firmly integrating the new republican cinemas into the bloodstream of pan-Soviet culture.

were taken towards moderate formal innovation. These are characterised mainly by the use of sharper angles and more expressive viewpoints, by a larger number of close-ups and even by some (rather restrained) attempts to break up the narrative linearity. For instance, the poetic shots of yachts at sea in *Yachts at Sea (Jahid merel, 1955)* are clearly influenced by Eisensteinian visual rhythms (cf. the visual patterns created by sails at the beginning of the Odessa staircase sequence from his *Battleship Potemkin (Броненосец Потёмкин, 1925)*), which in this case, unsurprisingly, were not invested with a similar level of thought and remained mainly ornamental. The low-angle shots of a coastal lighthouse in the same film, on a couple of occasions composed as almost abstract silhouette-pictures, were eye-catching but merely decorative. On the visual side, additionally, in the last sequence of the *Underwater Reefs (Veelalused karid, 1959)*, the subjective camera-work simulating the drunken gait of the protagonist also exemplifies the amplification of the scale of cinematic devices. These pictorial shifts were complemented by innovations on the temporal axis: the film *The Turning Point (Pöördel, 1957)* is presented in the form of frame narration; the narrative fabric of *June Days (Juunikuu päevad, 1957)* is interwoven with numerous flashbacks (both as brief dissolves and lengthy passages); and *Underwater Reefs* includes both visual and sound flashbacks.

The modest creative edge, however, did not allow too much of a rise above the minimal professional standards, and even these few innovations were not appreciated by the public, whose main attention was caught by the trite and stereotyped socialist realist stories and unrealistic plots.

TOURIST GAZE I: THE LANDSCAPE

Emma Widdis has, in her study *Visions of a New Land: Soviet Film from the Revolution to the Second World War* (2003), described the shift of paradigm in the Soviet cinema which took place at the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s. She argues that cinema based on the dogmas of socialist

realism brought along a new approach to the representation of landscape: the avant-garde, decentralised, fragmented, adventurous spatial experience, quintessentially represented in the film made in 1929 by Dziga Vertov—*The Man with the Movie Camera (Человек с киноаппаратом)*—was replaced by a static, hierarchical, tamed and reified view of the landscape. This, she says, refers to the emergence of the ‘tourist gaze’.⁷ The exploration of the land characteristic of the early Soviet spatial discourse was replaced by the conquest (*освоение* in Russian⁸) of territories, travel as exploration was gradually substituted for travel as leisure, or tourism, and the periphery was transformed ‘from a space of experience into a decorative space, implicitly viewed from the centre’ (Widdis 2003b: 139–140).

Epp Kaidu, the second director of Rappaport’s *Light in Koordi* and *Andrus Finds Happiness*, wrote in 1956:

If we ... experience the life of our nation only as tourists, we shall end up either with cheap artificial exoticism or museum-like archaism that distorts today’s realities. It is impossible to comprehend and value a nation’s soul if one is not aware of the treasures held in its museums. However, it is also impossible to choose from the museum what is necessary in one case or another if one does not know thoroughly and many-sidedly the life of this nation. (Kaidu 1956: 198.)

Ten years later, in 1966, the Estonian film critic Ivar Kosenkranius responded to the question ‘How has Estonian cinema developed?’ as follows:

These films [of the 1950s] represented the contemporary times, but the modern era was depicted on the screen as a thematic field trip to a fishing kolkhoz, to a construction site of an electric power plant or to the world of athletes. The film-makers showed contemporary Soviet Estonia in the manner of a fashion show, according to the subject of the particular film. (Kosenkranius 1974: 85.)

These quotations reveal, if one leaves aside the inescapable ‘compulsory self-criticism’ distinctive to the progress-driven rhetoric of the time, the rather truthful realisation that the spatial configurations of the Soviet Estonian films of the 1950s were indeed characterised by a sense of touristic distance, a perception of space detached from real, experiential circumstances of existence, which, of course, was, by the authors of these critiques—at least to an extent—motivated by the fact that the films were made by ‘directors and cinematographers who were [not] familiar with local life and conditions’ (Kaidu 1956: 198). Would things have been different if, in the same institutional and ideological framework, the cameras and cutting scissors were held by local talent? A parallel example from the Soviet Estonian literature of the same period seems to indicate that this might not have been the case (see, e.g., Märka 1998). This suggests that the socialist realist paradigm was, to an extent, ‘touristic’ in its essence and, even if put into practice by native inhabitants who presumably had a more profound and closer relationship with their (cultural) surroundings, its fundamental alienation would still have been insurmountable.

Close analysis of the actual films of the era shows that Widdis’s observation on the tamed, frozen and reified spatial matrix of socialist realist art finds a solid basis in the feature films of 1950s Soviet Estonia. This is perhaps most evident in regard to rural spaces, where nature, living and active, was often ‘turned into landscape’, into a passive horizon, a mere background for action (Widdis 2003b: 185–186; Bakhtin 2004: 217, 144). The genuinely Stalinist *Light in Koordi* and practically all the later films of the decade systematically repeat radiant and picturesque views of landscape: the hilly southern Estonian countryside (*Light in Koordi*), the stretches of seaside settings of the western coast and the islands (*Underwater Reefs* and *Yachts at Sea*) and carefully guarded border waters (*Yachts at Sea*), or even the golden expanses of fertile Ukrainian grain fields (again *Light in Koordi*). This operation of taming nature, ever changing, versatile and full of interruptions, into predictable, picture-postcard-pretty and almost always bright and

sun-drenched views is only one of the milder forms of socialist realist spatial transformations. Occasionally, nature—or, to be more precise, landscape—even becomes an object of a more or less repressive, reifying subjugation. This subjugation is exemplified, for instance, by scenes of ploughing fields in *Light in Koordi*, where machines penetrate the grain-growing soil or reclaim the bogs. Similarly, the yachtsmen in *Yachts at Sea* master the stormy sea with playful ease. The tempest in *Underwater Reefs* seems more threatening, but is still overcome without too much effort by the experienced fishermen, and its true, elemental severity is further undermined by the fact that its primary function in the film is to signify the inner struggles of the protagonist going astray. These pictures of (Soviet) people triumphing over or taming the (Estonian) wilderness could not be more eloquent in suggesting the newly established cultural hierarchies and power relations.

Another aspect of the tourist gaze and the decisive rupture it creates between everyday practices and the representations of space is the process of so-called ‘museumisation’ (Relph 1976: 80): the detachment of various objects from their actual and/or traditional daily functions, turning them into a lifeless, exotic exhibition. In the films of the 1950s, this becomes most obvious in the case of (pseudo-)ethnographic paraphernalia, such as old knitting

7 The term ‘tourist gaze’, coined by the British sociologist John Urry, is not only connected to sight-seers’ curious glance but has—largely due to phenomenological theories—come to signify a kind of universal mode of perception, which, according to many commentators, has since the mid-20th century started to dominate the ways people relate themselves to their surroundings (Urry 1990: 82). For instance, the Canadian geographer Edward Relph argues that the touristic perception of place is characterised by an inauthentic and false relationship between human and environment, based on uncritical adoption of predetermined conceptions; the opposite is a relationship that is deep, immediate and genuine (Relph 1976: 80–87).

8 More precisely, ‘conquest’ is only one of several possible translations (e.g. *освоение космоса*, ‘conquest of outer space’); more commonly, *освоение* is translated as ‘reclamation’, ‘mastering’ or ‘assimilation’, but also ‘development’, ‘pioneering’ or ‘settling’. I am grateful to Irina Novikova for directing my attention to this. However, all these words still convey Widdis’s basic idea of substituting the dynamic process of exploration with spatial practices aimed at domesticating the unknown and/or cancelling the unwanted.

patterns, folk costumes and traditional beer mugs. These items were torn out of their genuine and local cultural and social background and invested with the purposefully international, yet entirely hollow, concept of 'national form, socialist content'. They were turned into 'interesting aesthetic objects', without any true 'political or social connotations' (Tunbridge, Ashworth 1995: 48)—or, to be more precise, their previous political and social connotations were left aside and replaced by those corresponding to Soviet national politics and controlled by Soviet authorities. Thus, the production of meaning became the monopoly of the Soviet invaders and, by their will, these exotic ethnographic items started to signify the 'successes' of the small Estonian nation in the 'great family of Soviet peoples', which, from a Soviet perspective, would have, ultimately, meant the total annihilation⁹ of Estonian culture and society.

TOURIST GAZE II: THE CITYSCAPE

In films set in urban environments, the tourist gaze finds expression mainly through the construction of an illusionist, escapist and selective wishful reality, distanced from everyday practices on both environmental and social levels. Coherent urban space is fragmented into detached views, into slices of space which often concentrate around various monuments established by the state, based on approved ideological tenets and conveying officially accepted collective identities. For instance, in *Andrus Finds Happiness*, the first post-war Soviet Estonian feature film displaying the centre of Tallinn, the Russalka monument functions as an important marker of the city's identity as a Soviet coastal town.¹⁰ Furthermore, the lively urban tissue is mapped as a monumental space of frozen picture-postcard-like views. Tallinn's medieval Old Town, and the surrounding modern centre, mainly built during the times of the pre-war Republic, are appropriated smoothly and integrated into the presentable socialist realist spatial matrix. In a number of films of the second half of the 1950s, the Old Town and the modern centre are depicted as 'progressive' examples of the 'Soviet West'. The tourist gaze is suggested

either through representation of certain views and/or buildings (such as the city's silhouette or the medieval Town Hall), which later became a staple in the visual marketing of Tallinn as a desirable tourist destination, or through formal devices, such as establishing shots with a camera panning over the picturesque landscape of the roofs of the Tallinn Old Town, implying a 'master gaze', controlling and mapping the environment, suggesting order, and reifying the depicted surroundings (e.g. *June Days or Uninvited Guests (Kutsumata külalised, 1959)*). Although the heyday of the cinematic 'Tallinn for tourists' was still to come in the late 1960s and early 1970s,¹¹ when the Soviet administration, struggling with increasing hard-currency debt, discovered tourism (and, in this respect, Tallinn, among many other cities) as a good source of foreign currency (Hall 1991: 81), the film *Mischievous Curves (Vallatud kurvid, 1959)*, a light comedy about motor-cyclists and, above all, about the confusion created by a pair of charming twins, can be seen as the first example of this 'genre'. In this film, Old Thomas—the soldier-shaped weathervane of the old Town Hall—also makes his first appearance. Later he became the ultimate symbol of Tallinn as a tourism destination and, somewhat paradoxically, even a sort of agent of resistance in the popular mind of Estonians. Notably, Tallinnfilm produced the feature-length musical *Old Thomas Was Stolen (Varastati Vana Toomas)* in 1971.

The slums and dilapidated corners—if shown at all—demonstrate, without exception, the hardships of bourgeois history; they only appear in films about the destitution, misery and humiliation of the working class life during the pre-war years of 'predatory capitalism'. For example, a 'film-play'¹² from 1957, *In the Back Yard (Tagahoovis, 1957)*, based on a story by the much-celebrated Estonian writer Oskar Luts, is set almost entirely in a back area of a ramshackle slum; it depicts the life of the working class during the Great Depression of the early 1930s. Or *The Männards (Perekond Männard, 1960)*, a film about the life of a poor working class family in the years between 1918, the establishment of the first Republic, and 1924, the year of the infamous (although

unsuccessful) communist coup in Tallinn; the family resides in a cramped apartment in a shabby wooden rental house situated on a narrow, cobblestone street. Later, in the 1960s and 1970s, showing the old wooden districts was completely prohibited in films.¹³

TOURIST GAZE III: HYGIENE

A further trait of the touristic spatial protocol is cleanliness. Not only was nature turned into a 'view' and everyday items into a museumised exhibit, people's everyday activities, especially those of all kinds of manual labourers (above all, farmers and fishermen, blue-collar factory employees etc.) also became a gleaming spectacle. David Caute explains in his study *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy during the Cold War*:

Everyone in a [Stalin era] Soviet film — strikers, peasants, railway workers — is sheathed in what might be described a Mosfilm-set cleanliness; even the buildings of a post-war European city show no trace of destruction, debris, dust, destitution. No patched clothes here, no ration cards, no queues. Soviet designers and costume departments were in desperate denial of reality — the drabness of life in the Soviet Union ... had to be suppressed. This 'spring-clean' colouration set Soviet cinematography closer to Disney than to Italian neo-realism. (Caute 2003: 149.)

In Soviet Estonian films, this is perhaps most evident in two films: *Light in Koordi* and *Andrus Finds Happiness*, both shot on colour film stock and characterised by an exceptionally vivid pictorial language. Farmsteads in *Light in Koordi* are well-groomed and tidy, bearing no signs of war-time hardships (although the film starts in September 1944, as the title at the beginning states); even the quarters of the poor are neat, not to mention the bluish-whitish clinical spotlessness of the hospital. The rosy and well-nourished farmers, although dressed 'rurally', are clothed in clean and unpatched outfits, and the soldiers returning home from

the war wear brand new uniforms. Even the old and outdated modes of farming, although clearly time-consuming and laborious (which, of course, had to be replaced by the collective work and machine-power of a kolkhoz), do not seem much more difficult than a healthy and refreshing workout in fresh air. Still, the Estonian

9 Evgeny Dobrenko indeed argues that 'museumification' 'acts as one form of destruction' (Dobrenko 2008: 9) of the 'living past'. True, he refers to the real museums of Stalinist Russia in the framework of the production of history or, more precisely, of 'images of the past', yet his discussion applies just as well to the analysis at hand, for the intended ultimate result of this 'museumisation' was precisely another 'form of destruction', the destruction of Estonia's national past and identity.

10 The monument was erected in 1902 in memory of a Russian armoured ship which sank on its way from Tallinn to Helsinki in 1893. Although established under the tsarist regime, it still referred to the Russian and, by association, Soviet identity. (In fact, an important feature of the self-image of the post-war Stalinist regime was the realisation that the Soviet Union was the 'worthy heir' of 'Russian imperial grandeur'; see Dobrenko 2008: 136.) Significantly, up until now it has been customary for Russian newly-weds to visit the monument as part of their wedding ceremony. Naturally, it is entirely likely that in the film the monument also expressed the failure of the protagonist's dream of going to a naval school. Nevertheless, it is important that this particular monument was chosen amongst all other possible sites to convey this idea (virtually any seaside spot would have served the goal just as well). The selection of this particular monument also signifies the fact that in the Soviet spatial-political imagination the Baltic states had always been an integral part of Russian/Soviet territory and their annexation during World War II was an act of reclaiming that territory, of '(re)domesticating' the border-area, as suggested by Irina Novikova (personal communication with Irina Novikova, January 30, 2008).

11 About the representations of the Tallinn Old Town in Soviet Estonian films see Närpea 2004 and Närpea 2005.

12 'Film-plays' offered an effective opportunity to fulfil pre-set production plans in the early 1950s, during the period of *malokartintie*, and often they were nothing more than recordings of theatrical plays, shot with a static camera placed in front of the stage. (*In the Back Yard* is a more sophisticated case, however, as it was shot partly on location in an old residential area in Tallinn and elsewhere, and partly on a studio set. Nevertheless, the overall feeling is somewhat cramped and the sense of theatricality is reinforced by 'staged' dialogue and acting.) At the same time, in Russia, film-plays supported the programmatic campaign of 'cultivation' (or, literally, the pursuit of 'culture') of the Soviet society, launched in the post-war period and mainly targeted at Russian illiterate peasants (see, e.g., Clark 2000: 195ff) — these film-plays were supposed to make high-quality theatre available to masses inhabiting the provinces. A somewhat legend-like statement proposes that film-plays were made because of Stalin, who was a keen theatre-lover but dreaded visiting public places (Liehm, Liehm 1977: 68).

13 The wooden residential districts made their first appearance as a contemporary everyday setting only in 1978, in Arvo Kruusement's drama *Woman Heats the Sauna* (*Naine kütab sauna*).

countryside is depicted as lagging far behind the Russian kolkhozes: while the farmers of the former inhabit greyish log cabins, the latter's stone houses are covered with white plaster; more importantly, the film argues blatantly that Estonian villages lacked electricity, clubhouses and radios—an arrogant lie, of course, which, on the other hand, together with other elements of the film's *mise-en-scène*, indicate the general process of 'embourgeoisement' of the post-war Soviet society and ideology, as observed by Vera Dunham (1976: 42), or the 'veneration for "culture" [which] superseded the [previous] cult of heroic', as argued by Katerina Clark (2000: 195).

Although the overtly spectacular *mise-en-scène* of *Lights in Koordi* is unrivalled by later films, the embellishment of (working) environments remained a staple of socialist realist representations. This is apparent, for example, in *Yachts at Sea* and *Underwater Reefs*, where the representation of fishermen and their coastal villages stands in flagrant contradiction to actual coastal life. This becomes especially obvious when one compares these films with the pre-war short documentary *Fishermen* (*Kalurid*). Although in 1936, when the documentary was shot, the political-ideological circumstances already favoured propagandistic representations, it is clearly more true to life. Furthermore, even a member of the studio's Artistic Council, the Estonian writer Aadu Hint, lamented the air-brushed reality in *Underwater Reefs*, remarking that 'We looked for a village for location shooting. What did we see? The coastal villages were in decay... The fishermen drank a lot.'¹⁴

On the one hand, the concept of hygiene was an integral part of the modernist cognition, surrounded by the progressive aura of sailing towards a better, easier and healthier life; on the other hand, in the context of one of the most gloomy chapters of Soviet and Estonian history—the mass purges, an ultimate act of purification—the notions of purity and purification gain a sinister flavour, casting a grave shadow on the Disney-Technicolor-like cinematic representations of the Stalinist age. The poverty of the post-war years, cities bombed to ruins, villages barely surviving after the campaigns of forced collectivisation—all of this, strangely, is

somehow perversely reflected, in these utterly out-of-this-world films, as a sort of external, yet inescapably integral contextual knowledge, turning the offensively naïve optimism characteristic of these films against them—into a grotesque dance of death on the graves. The final episode from *Light in Koordi* offers a vivid example: the demonstration of great agricultural accomplishments brought on by the establishment of a kolkhoz is followed by a feast at the new centre of the village. The people, dressed in colourful national costumes, sing and dance around a newly-built fountain—an audaciously excessive crowning of socialist progress. Simultaneously, the accompanying song informs the viewers of the 'future' of all the central characters: the farm-hands become the masters, the blind gain their sight, and the exploited poor develop into rosy-cheeked collective farmers. Over the joyous scene towers an enormous picture of Stalin, suggesting, of course, his profound and immediate involvement in the creation of this new society.¹⁵

THE CONQUEST OF TERRITORIES

The concept of conquest analysed by Emma Widdis (e.g. 2003a and 2003b), as well as the notions of purity and purification, resonate not only with the tactics of the tourist gaze, controlling, reifying and thus sanitising the landscapes, but also with the gigantic Stalinist projects of rearranging nature and rural territories: re-designing Russian villages, inverting the course of rivers in Central Asia and Siberia, drying out the Aral Sea and irrigating deserts. In Soviet Estonian feature films, these ideas, shrunk to a smaller scale in order to fit the local circumstances, take the shape of draining marshes (Elmanoviš 1988: 59). First of all, this can be seen as another act of purification, of getting rid of dirty and barren wastelands in order to increase the amount of fertile soil. But, crucially, it comes to signify the act of transforming the unknown, turning 'the wild into the safe', of domesticating the alien and potentially dangerous terrain (Widdis 2000: 410). For instance, in *Life in the Citadel*, the protagonist, the Einstein look-a-like Prof. Miilas, who, by the way, was—

equally tellingly—a linguist researching ‘dead languages’ in Jakobson’s very successful play, became a lichenologist on the silver screen. The goal of his life-long work and ultimate focus of his professional dreams—draining the marshes—is, in fact, a reincarnation on a smaller scale of the colossal Stalinist plans of aggressively penetrating not only the natural habitats of the newly conquered territories, but also the lives and minds of people inhabiting them. In the final episode, the solitary professor, who heretofore has eagerly protected the privacy of his estate, family and—perhaps most importantly—his intellectual activities from the invasion of any social or political agenda, opens up his citadel—and his mind—to the ‘obvious advantages’ of the Communist regime. He opens the curtains and the window of his stuffy office, looks at the boggy landscape and turns to his son, who has just joined the Red Army, saying: ‘That is, I will fight, too. And in the future we will step to this window again and see fields and gardens and blooming roses and golden grain. And for all my fellow-countrymen who want to work, enough land can be found—living, warm, generous.’ With these final spirited words, a heroic image of flourishing golden fields illuminated by bright sunshine appears on screen instead of the ailing vegetation of marshes. The next film, *Light in Koordi*, preaching the ‘urgent need’ of collectivisation, seems like a sequel to this ending, especially the triumphant closing scene, where hundreds of people and mighty machines drain the marshes near the fictional Koordi village. It is the ‘Snake Swamp’. In the film’s semantic framework, this significant metaphor of reclaiming fertile soil from the bog refers not only to the ‘great achievements’ of socialist agriculture (in reality, the situation was rather the opposite—the forced collectivisation nearly annihilated Estonian rural ecosystems), but also indicates that Estonia—the ailing periphery—has to be conquered by the Soviet powers, and Estonians—stubbornly following the futureless road of the capitalist system—have to be directed onto a more ‘prolific’, i.e. socialist, track.¹⁶ Koordi’s Snake Swamp, as well as the name of the railway station appearing in the film—Swamp Village—has a clearly negative connotation in the film, connected to

the old, bourgeois Republic. Likewise, ‘swamp birds’ is the term the party organiser of the village uses to refer to the Estonian partisans—the Forest Brethren—hiding in the woods. The conclusion is simple and straightforward: once the marshes and the swamp birds are gone, the new regime will have won. The snakes will disappear with the swamp. Cleansing the landscape of bogs, then, signifies purging it of any unwanted people, mentalities and (cultural) phenomena, and consequently conquering it in its entirety. These imperialistic ambitions resemble the struggle of the English in their conquest of Ireland during the era of Enlightenment when, according to Katie Trumpener,¹⁷ the Irish bogs were ‘an actual barrier to’ the English invaders and the reclamation of marshes became an important part of the subjugation of the Irish to English rule (see Trumpener 1997: 37–66).

CENTRE AND PERIPHERY

The notion of conquest is tightly connected with the relationship between centre and periphery characteristic of the Stalinist culture: after all, the Stalinist spatial program was, as maintained by Emma Widdis, organised around the dominant centre in Moscow, which extended radial lines of influence and can as such be interpreted as a ‘version of Foucault’s panoptic model of the organisation of power, in which a radial structure creates conditions of visibility that secure control from the center.’ (Widdis 2003a: 221.) According to Katerina Clark, the hierarchical relationship, the opposition between the centre and the periphery, translated to the vertical axis, defines the deep structure of socialist realist

14 Estonian State Archives (Eesti Riigiarhiiv), f. R-1707, n. 1, s. 123, l. 151.

15 The fact that the film, but especially this scene, was utterly abominable to the Estonian public even expressed itself in public media, where a brave critic had the courage to reprove it, to some extent, by condemning the scene as ‘relatively theatrical’ (Tigane 1951).

16 One of the contemporary reviewers triumphantly remarked that ‘the rusty waters of the Snake Swamp, once a hopeless adversary of the poor peasantry of Koordi, is now forced to yield to the storm of collective work and the mighty Soviet technology.’ ([Anonymous] 1950.)

17 I thank Katie Trumpener for pointing out this parallel.

literature. She states that the centre and the periphery constitute two totally different space-times that are ‘maximally cut off from each other’: the centre is a completely sacred space, while the periphery gradually becomes more profane towards the edges. The centre, the seat of power, is an exclusive shrine for the state leader; the periphery belongs to the masses. This is the reason, according to Katerina Clark, why socialist realist novels are predominantly set in the provinces (Clark 2003: 10–14). Apparently, cinema followed largely the same, or at least similar, principles. In Soviet Estonian feature films of the 1950s, the stories often take place in (peripheral) small towns, suburbs or in some other small or spatially confined settings. It seems a programmatic decision that the films produced while Stalin was still alive marginalised or avoided Tallinn altogether. Although some sequences of *Life in the Citadel* were indeed shot in the centre of Tallinn, the dominant reference is still the anonymous ‘small Estonian town’ (as the subtitles declare in the opening sequence); the shots of Tallinn also avoid the clearly recognisable, ‘iconic objects’ of the city. Perhaps this reflects the way the new regime sought to abolish the old system and establish its own (spatial) hierarchies. In fact, this is exactly what happens in *Life in the Citadel*: Tallinn is referred to as a clearly German or at least German-oriented town, especially in the scene where the old streets lined with high gabled façades are juxtaposed with the procession of Soviet troops—tanks and cavalry—penetrating these streets triumphantly after their victory over the German army and the ‘liberation’ of Tallinn.

The preference for rural settings during the Stalinist age could, perhaps, also have been motivated by the fact that Soviet ideologists undoubtedly understood that the stronghold of the national sentiment was the countryside, where the ‘blood ties’ connected the farmers with the land, stimulating their bourgeois-patriotic mentality, and not the cities, where the war and the waves of emigration had already weakened the former elite. Cinema—a means of mass communication with a high propaganda index—was used as one of the strategic devices in the conquest of new territories and in breaking

traditional ways of life. In Estonia, the urbanisation process had started at the turn of the century and was well under way in the 1920s and 1930s, but it reached entirely new dimensions (both in terms of physical amplitude and ideological significance) in the Soviet period. Over time, the national mythology associated industrialised urban areas more and more with Soviet immigration (and thus with a serious threat to the sustaining of national traditions and culture). Thus, while during the Stalinist period the cinematic villages and small-towns marked the integration of the ‘small and quiet Estonia’ into the bloodstream of the great Soviet empire, later, after the emergence of the Estonian national cinema in the early 1960s, small towns and rural areas turned into hubs of subversion and came to signify the sovereignty and vitality of the local culture.¹⁸

SACRED LIGHTS

Although the Estonian feature films of the period lack one of the characteristic devices of Russian productions—the sudden ‘leap’ of the hero and his mentors from the total periphery to the absolute centre, i.e. Moscow (see Clark 2003: 14), they still always present a segment of its sacral space—as an icon. The relationship between the sacred centre and the profane periphery is manifested on a reduced scale: the ideologically most important episodes and actions always include Stalin’s (and later, after his denouncement Lenin’s) portrait, which often literally towers in the frame above all that is profane. The office of a party organiser, a central committee officer or some other important official becomes a ritual chapel, adorned with the sacral representation of the highest power. Again, *Life in the Citadel* and *Light in Koordi* provide the most obvious and probably also the most extreme examples. Whereas, in the former, Stalin’s bust oversees only the scene set in the Town Soviet, where questions of land amelioration are being discussed, testifying to the subject’s utmost ideological relevance, in the latter Stalin’s portraits and statues are scattered all over the mise-en-scène, accompanying almost every episode where the establishment of a collective farm is considered; finally, his

name appears even on a combine harvester. In films made after the mid-1950s, however, the decreased number of Lenin's portraits bears witness to the disapprobation of the leader cult.

Before that happened, though, the heroes of films were the priests of this religion, and Stalin's collected works its Holy Bible. The sacred obligation of these protagonists was to study his Word and preach it to mortals: in the *Light in Koordi*, we see Paul Runge, the main character, a former officer of the Red Army, sitting at a desk far past midnight and reading Stalin's collected works in the flickering light of an oil lamp. Light is indeed one of the most common references to the sacred space:¹⁹ the fictional village of Koordi is literally filled—as the title suggests—with the light of the Soviet Paradise. In this film, another option for suggesting this matrix of sacred space can be found: namely that all roads lead to Moscow. In the very beginning of the film, we see a road sign to Koordi and the name of the village is written both in Latin and in Cyrillic letters. The Estonian historian Evald Laasi has described this as one of the many shameful historical errors of this film: he argues that it was impossible to have such a signpost with Cyrillic letters, since the action of this particular scene occurs in the autumn of 1944—at the time when the Soviet troops had just entered the Estonian territory, which had previously been occupied by the Germans. Here, I believe, it is useful to turn to Evgeny Dobrenko, who in his recent study *Stalinist Cinema and the Production of History* contends, using a quotation by Pierre Sorlin, that 'History is not pre-existent to the film, it is produced by it... it is not a reality used by the film; it has to be rebuilt and the result of the reconstruction is never reliable.' (Sorlin 1980: 170; cited in Dobrenko 2008: 2.) Dobrenko goes on to argue convincingly that 'true 'historical reality' lies not in the subject (representations of the past) but precisely in the time of production; that is, the historical film does in fact construct history, but also 'reflects' above all the time of its production.' (Dobrenko 2008: 4.) Thus, the road sign in *Light in Koordi* has to be observed in the (ideological) context of the making of the film—1951 and the Stalinist regime—and not in the context of 1944 and the German occupation. Then it becomes clear

that it refers to the system where Moscow is the centre and Koordi one of the many peripheral points.

IDYLL AND BORDERS

Although Mikhail Bakhtin's ideas regarding the idyllic chronotope only reverberate with Soviet Estonian films of the 1950s to a certain extent, their application still provides valuable insight. According to Bakhtin, the core of the idyllic chronotope

finds expression predominantly in the special relationship that time has to space...: an organic fastening-down, a grafting of life and its events to a place, to a familiar territory with all its nooks, crannies, its familiar mountains, valleys, fields, rivers and forests, and one's own home. Idyllic life and its events are inseparable from this concrete, spatial corner of the world, where the fathers and grandfathers lived... This little spatial world is limited and sufficient unto itself, not linked in any intrinsic way with other places, with the rest of the world. (Bakhtin 2004: 225.)

18 The juxtaposition of urban and rural settlements, as well as the constant tension between the respective lifestyles, has also been a persistent metaphor in East Central European cinemas (see, e.g., Iordanova 2003: 102ff). While in the countries of the Soviet bloc film-makers' continuing interest in the subject resulted in a diverse array of portrayals, from representations of 'the village as an idyllic sphere where community life is sweetly preserved' to 'films that offered serious critique of the stubborn residues of a paternalistic system', from 'films dealing with the difficult years of ... forced collectivisation' to those scrutinising 'the incompetent administration ... that led to the destruction of many positive features of traditional life' (Iordanova 2003: 102–103), the Soviet Estonian cinema of the 1950s offers more unilateral depictions of villages as overcoming the struggles under the previous capitalist system and thriving under the new socialist regime. Only later, starting in the early 1960s, did the spectre of representational modes expand.

19 A comparable example of the epic battle between brightness and darkness can be found, for instance, in Polish Stalinist cinema: *Bright Fields (Jasne łąki, 1947)* 'is set in a village symbolically called Dark Fields. Its story line and its schematic propagandist content are formulated by the film's positive hero, a village teacher, whose message is that "Dark Fields must change to Bright Fields."' (Haltof 2002: 59.) According to Tadeusz Lubelski (cited in Haltof 2002: 59), audiences rejected the film (the same thing happened in Estonia with *Light in Koordi*) and it was deemed anti-propagandistic by the authorities (while the makers of *Light in Koordi* received another set of State Stalin Prizes).

Many films of the 1950s, especially those of the early part of the decade, indeed evoke a strong sense of 'familiar territory' and attachment of people to their homes, supported by numerous visual features of what is considered to be a 'typical idyll', even if it is presented in a shell of socialist realist lustre. At the same time, Bakhtin's remark about 'an organic fastening-down ... of life and its events to a place' seems to contradict the aforementioned socialist realist/tourist spatial strategy of detaching action from its immediate environment/nature. Bakhtin also talks about 'a sequence of generations' (Bakhtin 2004: 225) as a crucial part of idyllic life, but in the films, on the contrary, the plots strive towards a decisive rupture of this nexus if we understand this 'sequence' in terms of, say, class or social status. Bakhtin's idyllic chronotope indeed seems to suggest that the chain of generations shares not only blood ties but also a certain stability in the overall social matrix. Thus, the fact that, for example, in *Light in Koordi* the final episode stresses how farmhands have become masters, indicates an important digression from the idyll as understood by Bakhtin. Moreover, while Bakhtin characterises the idyll in temporal terms as 'a cyclical progression' as opposed to 'a vector following historical progress' (Deltcheva, Vlasov 1997: 537), the films of the 1950s evidently support the latter (although, theoretically, upon arrival in the ultimate age of communism the former was likely to gain ground). Similarly, although initially the villages, suburbs and small towns are depicted in the films as relatively closed spatial entities, the story-lines clearly advance towards a specific openness beyond the borders of those entities, towards new ideological horizons; the connection with other places/new conceptions is, thus, absolutely essential in these films, even though these 'other places' are limited to the quite particular geographical and political area of 'one sixth of the world'.

The dynamics between different spatio-temporal frameworks finds eloquent expression in the recurring theme of borders and border-crossing which is an intrinsic, yet perhaps latent, part of the idyllic chronotope. The topic of borders comes especially to the fore in the mid-1950s, indicating a shift towards Khrushchev's

'Thaw', which is characterised by a slightly more diverse, although no less skewed spatial model. The borders don't seem to hold that tightly any longer; the seductive ooze of subversive Western influences is particularly strong on the Baltic rim of the USSR: spies, consumer goods and dissident ideologies penetrate the Iron Curtain (admittedly not very successfully) in films such as *Uninvited Guests*, *Underwater Reefs*, *Yachts at Sea* etc.

VICIOUS VILLAS

Paradoxically, this relative openness brings forth an even stronger sense of seclusion, repeatedly suggested by distrust of the West—both in the form of the geographical and historical outside. Most evidently, as proposed above, the West beyond the Iron Curtain seeped through the Baltic borders in the shape of malicious, yet not-so-cunning secret agents; but it also appeared as an ideologically biased representation of Western locations and certain historical events or places. The actual West (Sweden in this case) is, in the 1950s, only represented in the *Uninvited Guests*: the dark rain-wet asphalt streets are lit up by dozens of bright and alluring neon signs,²⁰ bourgeois youth grooves to intoxicating jazz-beats, and the headquarters of Swedish-Estonian spies are equipped with Bauhausian metal-tube furniture and decorated with abstract paintings—all this adds up to a description of the ultimate depravity of the West. Similarly, the historical (ly West-ern) environment is shown as despicable and corrupt in actual representations of the pre-war Republic (the slums of *In the Back Yard* and *The Männards*; the rich industrialists in *June Days*), but even more importantly, also in cases where remnants of the old days appear in the Soviet present. Notably, this happens most often in one quite central and dominant architectural metaphor: that of the private villa. It is significant that the very first post-war Soviet Estonian feature film, *Life in the Citadel*, presents a single-family house as one of its characters: Prof. Miilas's villa, surrounded by a two-and-a-half metre high fence, actually symbolises the professor himself; they merge into an integrated life form. Although, as already suggested

above, Katerina Clark and Vera Dunham have argued that in the post-war period the pre-war militarist-flavoured cultural field was, after the victorious end of the war, penetrated by certain 'softer' values and even some petit-bourgeois features, the villas did not, by any means, have any positive connotations in the post-war Soviet Estonian cinema. Rather the opposite was true: Miilas's citadel and later several other cinematic villas clearly became the symbols of 'bourgeois nationalism', consistently connected with wickedness, falsehood and debauchery, with reactionary mentality, straightforwardly or indirectly attached to attacks against the Soviet regime or at least to dangerous and illicit attempts at subverting it. These villas have a certain vicious and corrupt flavour, which resonates perfectly with the undesirable characteristics of their inhabitants. For instance, in the *Life in the Citadel*, the much-condemned introverted-ness is suggested on several levels of the narrative. First, of course, the design of the villa and its surrounding yard together with the protective barrier (significantly, the original white picket fence is still intact inside the bigger enclosure) provide the most vivid symbol, exhibited on several occasions in shots prominently foregrounding the height of the fence. Inside, the professor's study forms the core of the citadel: from floor to ceiling, the walls are stuffed with bookshelves, and the windows tightly covered with thick curtains to keep the noises (and the (socialist) light) of the external world firmly outside; the detachment of the professor's academic realm from everyday banalities is further suggested by several plaster statues of ancient scientists and philosophers. Secondly, the dialogues repeatedly stress the enclosure of the professor's household ('Nobody invades Prof. Miilas's citadel'; 'After eight o'clock nobody can enter our house or leave it'; 'Wait until morning, maybe then you'll be allowed into this castle' etc.). Finally, the professor not only hides in his study but also prefers to research plants because 'they are quiet'; he does not allow 'any other truth but his' into his dwelling—even his children are prohibited from being exposed to any unwanted ideologies (going to the university is forbidden, not to mention joining the army). To reinforce this negative

image even further, the 'Professor's home is turned into a genuine pirate's pit', as argued by Tatjana Elmanoviš (1988: 59): his older son Ralf, from his first marriage, who turns out to be the warden of a Nazi concentration camp, appears on his father's doorstep after the Red Army has defeated the German troops and secretly hides in his quarters 'guns, ammunition, golden dentures of concentration camp victims, forged documents, foreign currency, poison and some sort of fantastic explosive coal [sic!]' (Elmanoviš 1988: 59.)

Later, in *Underwater Reefs*, an old captain's villa acquires similarly vicious connotations. The *film noir*-like cinematography—low-key lighting and angular shots—adapted to its representation, carries sinister overtones even in the first encounter, an impression even further enforced by the obvious decay of the building. The villa once belonged to a captain whose daughter fell in love with a young lad—the later chairman of the fishing kolkhoz—and who forbade the young couple to marry because of the boy's low social status and poverty. After the war, the villa is inhabited by the morally corrupt chief accountant of the fishing kolkhoz, who moves to the seaside village from 'the city' together with his sister—single and idle. The sister seduces the chairman shamelessly, despite his recent and apparently happy marriage to a local girl. The villa's—and its inhabitants'—viciousness becomes especially perceptible in repeated scenes of dissipation: the accountant and his sister throw several parties, where small circles enjoy smuggled liquor and goods from the West (the border, again). Similarly, a self-indulgent celebration of the rich industrialist's daughter's birthday on the eve of the Soviet invasion, in *June Days*, on the family's luxurious estate, signifies an ultimately un-Soviet mentality—and the fact that the party ends with a fatal quarrel, during which the industrialist's son is lethally shot by his abandoned mistress signifies the definitive deadlock of the previous, bourgeois regime. Incidentally, the design of the villa was a real work of art by the production designer Peeter Linzbach, who had in the

20 This *noir*-style opening sequence was actually shot on location in Riga, Latvia.

1930s made films in Berlin and Paris, working, for example, with Lazare Meerson on the crew of René Clair's *Under the Roofs of Paris* (*Sous les toits de Paris*, 1930). Strangely enough, the West-influenced mise-en-scène, as well as some recognisable genre traits (*film noir* in *Underwater Reefs*, melodrama in *June Days*) and other cinematic devices—not to mention numerous other physical and mental signs of life beyond the borders of the Soviet Union—open up this enclosed space a bit in the end, even if the insiders of the Soviet sphere are left with only a growing sense of seclusion.

Although contemporary Estonian film studies have rarely dealt with this period of local film history, often on the grounds that it is just not worth the effort, this investigation of spatial representations hopefully has revealed them as an extremely interesting subject of research, not just in terms of depictions of space, but also as intriguing examples of specific audiovisual utterances. These films should not be judged as artistically mediocre works, but rather as complicated and fascinating examples of cultural production. The cinematic heritage of the late 1940s and the 1950s is an integral part of the Estonian and, perhaps even more importantly, East European complex visual culture, which is waiting to be rediscovered.

FILMS

- Andrus Finds Happiness* (*Andruse õnn*), dir. Herbert Rappaport. Estonia, 1955
- Battleship Potemkin* (*Броненосец Потёмкин*), dir. Sergei Eisenstein. Russia, 1925
- Bright Fields* (*Jasne lany*), dir. Eugeniusz Cekalski. Poland, 1947
- Fishermen* (*Kalurid*), cinematographer Konstantin Märsk. Estonia, 1936
- Ice-Drift* (*Jääminek*), dir. Kaljo Kiisk. Estonia, 1962
- In Rain and Sunshine* (*Vihmas ja päikeses*), dir. Herbert Rappaport. Estonia, 1960
- In the Back Yard* (*Tagahoovis*), dir. Viktor Nevezhin. Estonia, 1957
- Joller the Actor* (*Näitleja Joller*), dir. Virve Aruoja. Estonia, 1960
- June Days* (*Juunikuu päevad*), dir. Viktor Nevezhin, Kaljo Kiisk. Estonia, 1957
- Life in the Citadel* (*Elu tsitadellis*), dir. Herbert Rappaport. Russia (Estonia), 1947
- Light in Koori* (*Valgus Koordis*), dir. Herbert Rappaport. Russia (Estonia), 1951
- The Männards* (*Perekond Männard*), dir. Aleksandr Mandrykin. Estonia, 1960
- The Man with the Movie Camera* (*Человек с киноаппаратом*), dir. Dziga Vertov. Ukraine, 1929
- Marite*, dir. Vera Stroyeva. Russia (Lithuania), 1947
- Mischievous Curves* (*Vallatud kurvid*), dir. Juli Kun, Kaljo Kiisk. Estonia, 1959
- Old Thomas Was Stolen* (*Varastati Vana Toomas*), dir. Semyon Shkolnikov. Estonia, 1971
- Rainis*, dir. Yuli Raizman. Latvia, 1949
- The Turning Point* (*Pöördel*), dir. Aleksandr Mandrykin, Kaljo Kiisk. Estonia, 1957
- Under the Roofs of Paris* (*Sous les toits de Paris*), dir. René Clair. France, 1930
- Underwater Reefs* (*Veealused karid*), dir. Viktor Nevezhin. Estonia, 1959
- Uninvited Guests* (*Kutsumata külalised*), dir. Igor Yeltsov. Estonia, 1959

Woman Heats the Sauna (Naine kütab sauna), dir. Arvo Kruusement. Estonia, 1978

Yachts at Sea (Jahid merel), dir. Mikhail Yegorov. Estonia, 1955

REFERENCES

- Allan, Seán 1999. DEFA: An historical overview. — *DEFA: East German Cinema, 1946–1992*. Eds. Seán Allan, John Sandford. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–21
- [Anonymous] 1950. Uue elu valgus. Uus väriline kunstiline film “Valgus Koordis” jõudis Tallinna. — *Rahva Hääl*, December 31
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 2004. Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel. — M. Bakhtin. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson, Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 84–258
- Bazin, André 1967. The evolution of the language of cinema. — A. Bazin. *What is Cinema. Vol. 1*. Trans. Hugh Gray. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 23–40
- Bordwell, David 2001. Eisenstein, socialist realism, and the charms of *mizanstsen*. — *Eisenstein at 100: A Reconsideration*. Eds. Al. LaValley, Barry P. Sherr. New Brunswick, London: Rutgers University Press, pp. 13–37
- Bordwell, David 2005. *Figures Traced in Light: On Cinematic Staging*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press
- Caute, David 2003. *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy during the Cold War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Clark, Katerina 2000. *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*. 3rd ed. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press
- Clark, Katerina 2003. Socialist realism and the sacralizing of space. — *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*. Eds. Evgeny Dobrenko, Eric Naiman. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, pp. 3–18
- Cunningham, John 2004. *Hungarian Cinema from Coffee House to Multiplex*. London, New York: Wallflower Press
- Deltcheva, Roumiana; Vlasov, Eduard 1997. Back to the house II: On the chronotopic and ideological reinterpretation of Lem’s *Solaris* in Tarkovsky’s film. — *Russian Review*, Vol. 56 (4), pp. 532–549
- Dobrenko, Evgeny 2008. *Stalinist Cinema and the Production of History: Museum of the Revolution*. Trans. Sarah Young. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Dunham, Vera 1976. *In Stalin’s Time: Middle-Class Values in Soviet Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Elmanovič, Tatjana 1987. Väljamurd üksildusest. Kaotused ja võidud. — *Sirp ja Vasar*, November 6
- Elmanovič, Tatjana 1988. “Elu tsitadellis” täna. — *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 8, pp. 56–61
- Hall, Derek R. 1991. *Tourism and Economic Development in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. London: Belhaven Press; New York, Toronto: Halsted Press
- Haltó, Marek 2002. *Polish National Cinema*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books
- Hendrykowska, Małgorzata 1996. East Central Europe before the Second World War. — *The Oxford History of World Cinema*. Ed. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 383–389
- Jordanova, Dina 2003. *Cinema of the Other Europe: The Industry and Artistry of East Central European Film*. London, New York: Wallflower Press
- Kaidu, Epp 1956. Eesti kunstilisest filmist. — *Eesti Nõukogude teater. Almanahh*. II. Tallinn, pp. 188–199
- Kenez, Peter 2001. *Cinema and Soviet Society from the Revolution to the Death of Stalin*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris
- Kosenkranius, Ivar 1974. Kuidas on arenendnud Eesti filmikunst? [1966]—I. Kosenkranius. *Film ja aeg. Esseid, etüüde, portreevisandeid*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, pp. 84–91
- Laasi, Evald 1988. Ajaloolase pilguga filmist “Valgus Koordis”. — *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 8, pp. 62–65
- Liehm, Mira; Liehm, Antonin J. 1977. *The Most Important Art: Eastern European Film After 1945*. Trans. Kača Poláčková-Henley. Berkeley, London: University of California Press
- Meri, Lennart 1968. Suur üksiklane. — *Sirp ja Vasar*, February 9
- Märka, Veiko 1998. Kala hakkas mädanema südamest (Sotsialistlikust realismist ENSV kirjanduses 1945–53). — *Vikerkaar*, no. 10–11, vpp. 81–111
- Mückenberger, Christiane 1999. The anti-fascist past in DEFA films. — *DEFA: East German Cinema, 1946–1992*. Eds. Seán Allan, John Sandford. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 58–76
- Näripea, Eva 2004. Medieval socialist realism: Representations of Tallinn Old Town in Soviet Estonian feature films, 1969–1972. — *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics IV*. Eds. Virve Sarapik, Kadri Tüür, Eva Näripea. Tartu: Eesti Kirjandusmuuseum, pp. 121–144
- Näripea, Eva 2005. Turistlik eskapism ja sümfoonilised variatsioonid: Tallinna vanalinn vaatefilmides 1960.–1970. aastail / Tourist escapism and symphonic variations: The Old Town of Tallinn in the scenics of the 1960s and 1970s. — *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi*, Vol. 14 (2–3), pp. 69–91
- Orav, Öie 2003. *Tallinnfilm. I. Mängufilmid 1947–1976*. Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus
- Paas, Veste 1980. *Olnud ajad. Kinematograafia Eestis 1895–1932*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat
- Paas, Veste 2002. Oli kunagi Tallinna kinostudio I. — *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 6, pp. 70–75
- Pärnapuu, Georg 1989. Film propaganda teenistuses. — *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 6, pp. 34–39
- Relph, Edward 1976. *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion
- Ruus, Jaan s.a. “Tallinnfilm” kui monument (<http://www.tallinnfilm.ee/index.php?page=67>)
- Sorlin, Pierre 1980. *The Film in History: Restaging the Past*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Tigane, L. 1951. Film kolhoosikorra võidust eesti külas. — *Sirp ja Vasar*, September 1

Trumpener, Katie 1997. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Tunbridge, E. J.; Ashworth, G. J. 1995. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons

Urry, John 1990. *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications

Widdis, Emma 2000. Borders: The aesthetic of conquest in Soviet cinema of the 1930s.—*Journal of European Studies: Literature and Ideas from the Renaissance to the Present*, Vol. 30 (4), pp. 401–411

Widdis, Emma 2003a. To explore or conquer? Mobile perspectives on the Soviet cultural revolution.—*The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*. Eds. Evgeny Dobrenko, Eric Naiman. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, 2003, pp. 219–240

Widdis, Emma 2003b. *Visions of a New Land: Soviet Film from the Revolution to the Second World War*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press

Woll, Josephine 2000. *Real Images: Soviet Cinema and the Thaw*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris

National Space,
(Trans)National Cinema:
Estonian Film
in the 1960s

Forthcoming in

A Companion to Eastern European Cinema.

Ed. Anikó Imre. Malden, Oxford: Blackwell

The recent upsurge of Estonian cinema, characterized by an increased number of productions as well as by the remarkable success of these productions both at international film festivals and at the domestic box-office, has left broader audiences with a strong conviction that Estonian cinema as a national cinema was not born until after Estonian state was re-established in 1991. The title of this paper, however, as well as the rather scarce historical accounts of Estonian cinema (e.g. Orav 2003: 20ff), proposes that something called “Estonian national cinema” emerged as early as the 1960s, despite the absence of nation-state.¹ Yet for a long time this advent was not seen as a process related to the “national culture” proper, and to this date the lion’s share of Soviet Estonian cinema (i.e. films (co)produced by local film studios and/or set in Estonia between 1940/1944 and 1991) is often not recognized as a self-evident part of Estonian culture. The main causes of such a rejection are rooted in the specific conditions of the Soviet film system that functioned as a transnational enterprise: multinational republican talent was trained solely in the metropolitan center of Moscow; the work of republican studios was centrally coordinated in terms of ideological instruction and control, as well as allocation of finances; and the finished products, made frequently by multinational crews and cast, were distributed in the Union-wide network. However, typically to Soviet period, these centrally imposed regulations and policies, which are now often considered in the framework of a transnational discourse of complex interrelations rather than from a victimizing perspective of colonialism and Russification (see e.g. Brüggemann 2009), left a number of loopholes for Estonian filmmakers to tackle locally bounded issues and to engage in national themes and narratives, (re)producing a “national imaginary.” The results of these “cross-cultural transactions” (Bergfelder 2005: 322) are shaped by a complex set of negotiations between national/local and transnational/Soviet currents, and thus it has been often difficult for the local audiences to embrace these films as manifestations of “true” national culture, equal to literature or theatre. In the following discussion I will first sketch some general outlines of the emergence of Estonian “national school” and delineate the interplay between national and transnational factors in this process. The second part of this chapter investigates spatial representations in Estonian fiction films of the 1960s, with an intention to demonstrate that in a number of films a specific chronotope in the

¹ In the period of interwar independence (1918–40) the young nation-state did not succeed in establishing local film culture comparable to budding national cinemas that appeared with the support of governmentally promoted cultural policies and subsidies elsewhere in Europe. In the pre-war Estonian Republic, the state agencies did not support (feature) filmmaking substantially, and the miniscule domestic market was too weak for initiating and sustaining regular film production locally. True, from 1931 the state film studio Estonian Culture Film was established and in 1936 it became an organ of state propaganda, producing “compulsory newsreels that propagated values established by the state, and benevolent educational films” (Ruus s.a.), but its development was cut short by World War II. Film-related legislation was absent until 1935 and there was no film school.

Bakhtinian sense (Bakhtin 1981) becomes apparent. According to Bakhtin, in an artistic chronotope “space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history” (Bakhtin 1981: 84). It is precisely the chronotope of “nation-scape,” described in more detail below, that reveals the essential character of these films as “national,” and sets them apart from the products of the homogenizing/transnational Soviet culture.

(Trans)National Cinema

In February 1962 a new Estonian feature film, *Fellow Villagers* (*Ühe küla mehed*) premiered in Tallinn. It told the story of a group of fishermen from a northern Estonian coastal village whose boat lost its course in a violent storm and drifted to Finnish shores. The men found shelter with their Finnish peers, while also encountering a former fellow villager, Feliks Kandel, an émigré spy of an undefined “capitalist agency,” who tried to persuade his countrymen to stay in the West. Finally, despite this and several other enticements all the men return home safely. Set against the background of earlier formulaic socialist realist films, the critics were positively stunned by the newcomer’s subtlety and relative lack of explicit ideological instruction. After a whole array of typical master plots (Clark 2000) based on the codes of the *Bildungsroman*², historical epics of ideological struggles³, and didactic lightweight comedies and (kolkhoz) musicals⁴, *Fellow Villagers* stood out for delicate representations of the characters’ inner psychological conflict and a nuanced take on the topic of emigration, and, in direct relation to the latter, for a sensitive contemplation of the deep scars left by the turmoil and in the aftermath of World War II. For the local audiences the film rang with much more truth than earlier cookie-cutter portrayals of the country’s presumable progress under the Soviet rule. The film’s crew attracted attention as well: it was a diploma film at the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography (VGIK) in Moscow for the director Jüri Müür, the cinematographers Jüri Garšnek and Harri Rehe, and the production designer Linda Vernik. These young Estonian filmmakers represented a new generation of filmmakers consisting to a great extent of ethnic Estonians and local talent – as opposed to the so-called visiting filmmakers, such as Aleksandr Mandrykin, Viktor Nevezhin, Mikhail Yegorov and, most famously, Herbert Rappaport, who had dominated the sphere of Soviet Estonian film in the immediate post-war era. These directors had been appointed to the newly founded Estonian studio, Tallinnfilm, in the late 1940s and early 1950s by the central authorities in Moscow, who struggled with the drought of *malokartinie* (“film famine”) and

² E.g. *Vihmas ja päikeses* (*In Rain and Sunshine*), directed by Herbert Rappaport, 1960.

³ E.g. *The Männards* (*Perekond Männard*), directed by Aleksandr Mandrykin, 1960.

⁴ E.g. *A Chance Encounter* (*Jubuslik kohtumine*), directed by Viktor Nevezhin, 1961; *Friend of Music* (*Laulu sõber*), directed by Ilya Fogelman and Reet Kasesalu, 1961.

channeled the leftover manpower to gear the cinematic apparatuses of the recently (re) conquered territories. More often than not these cineastes, sent to the freshly established studios with the mission of disseminating the fertile seed of Soviet cinematography, proved to be less than talented and equally little interested in the local traditions, culture and language.⁵ Compared to the films they had made, young Jüri Müür's *Fellow Villagers*, scripted by local writers Aimée and Vladimir Beekman (Aimée was also a VGIK graduate), attracted attention as an early agent of the emerging local cinema. Tatjana Elmanovič later emphasised that the “film carried a special mission – at last our own cinema was made, scripted by our own writers, directed and cinematographed by our own film-makers” (Elmanovič 1995: 517-518; cf. First 2008: 73).

Although the film contains several emblematic codes of the socialist realist canon, most importantly the typically unsuccessful attempt of a Western spy to harm the Soviet system and people, the filmmakers' approach to the story reveals a marked break from the previous discourse. Above all, typical of post-Stalinist narratives in general (Prokhorov 2002: 193ff), even though the fishermen constitute a collective, working class protagonist, the Stalinist myth of the Great Family (see e.g. Clark 1997) is decisively atomized into a set of smaller families and individual relationships. The group of fishermen consists of men whose ideals and problems, pasts and goals are distinctly diverse. Furthermore, while Niglas's religiosity, reinforced by his sparing and rigid character, is clearly disapproved as an anachronism, and he is the only one seriously contemplating the betrayal of his homeland, his relative negativity is just as downplayed as Juhan's Party membership is fairly deemphasized. The filmmakers avoid clear-cut, black-and-white characterizations and judgments; most notably it this manifested in the portrayal of Kandel, the emigrant spy: while he is identified as an enemy, his potential dangerousness is neutralized by his mousy appearance and helplessly propagandistic utterances – the latter becomes especially obvious in the absence of straightforward Soviet propaganda from the dialogue.⁶ Compared to the spies in, for example, Igor Yeltsov's *Uninvited Guests*

⁵ In order to communicate a fair overview of the general picture, however, one has to admit that not all of them were mediocre, chronically untalented artists: for example, Yuli Kun, who co-directed a comedy *Mischievous Curves* (*Vallatud kurvid*, 1959) with a local Kaljo Kiisk, belonged to the ranks of the best filmmakers of the time and was sincerely admired by Kiisk (see Kiisk 2005: 127); Herbert Rappaport, who directed altogether four feature films in Estonia between 1947 and 1960, including the very first Soviet Estonian production *Life in the Citadell* (*Elu tsitadellis*, 1947), was also a well-established director who in the late 1920s and early 1930s had served as an assistant director to G. W. Pabst (including, for example, on *Pandora's Box* (*Die Büchse der Pandora*) in 1929) and worked in Germany, Austria, France and the U.S. where he met Boris Shumyatsky, the reorganizer of the Soviet film industry, who subsequently invited him to work at Lenfilm. Kaljo Kiisk has also testified that through personal relations Iosif Heifits and Mikhail Romm made a relatively significant impact on the Estonian film of the 1960s (Kiisk 2005).

⁶ Admittedly, this, on the other hand, also serves the “normalization” of the Soviet regime, and the near absence of overt ideological statements does not remove the film from the sphere of politicized mode of articulation. As Dina Iordanova has pointedly indicated, “[w]ell aware of the excesses and the dangers of totalitarianism,

(*Kutsumata külalised*), made only three years earlier, Kandel seems less demonic – in a grotesquely caricature-like manner – and more humanized⁷: he is represented as an individual entrapped by greater historical circumstances. As such, this portrayal can be regarded an early and, admittedly, modest manifestation in Estonian cinema of a more general characteristic of Soviet cinema during the Khrushchev Thaw, which concentrated on the “shock of war in the consciousness of innocent civilians,” although, as pertinently asserted by Tatjana Elmanovitš, due to the historical conditions of the Baltic countries, in the early 1960s, “[t]he time was not yet ripe for giving sense to the particularities of the conflict (brothers fighting on the opposite sides, the war of large countries in the home yard of a small nation).” (Elmanovitš 1995: 518).⁸ The true traumas of war still remained unacceptable in the realm of Estonian cinematic portrayals, but the issues of emigration provided a chance to challenge the limits of this prohibition.

On the one hand, then, *Fellow Villagers* demonstrates a significant change towards greater “localness,” towards distinct national concerns (cf. Woll 2000: xiv), brought about by the new generation of native filmmakers. On the other hand, the film also bears witness of conditions and processes that originated outside the borders of the national community. As indicated above, by the late 1950s and early 1960s the changing political and

film-makers saw the making of ‘apolitical’ films as a matter of priority. The films that they opted for would often be about disturbances of intimate relationships rather than heroic confrontations and class struggles; they would focus on ordinary everyday life and thus, in the context of imposed excessive politicization of the personal domain, deliver a covert political statement. Their ‘apolitical’ cinema was, in fact, profoundly political.” (Jordanova 2003: 95). Furthermore, Müür’s decision to downplay the role of unconcealed ideological indoctrination can also be seen as a sign of social adaptation, which characterized the broader mentality of Estonians in the 1960s, when “many Estonians came to think that they have to settle with and adjust to the Soviet regime imposed on them” (Kuuli 2002: 98) and that “the inner structure of the system might change slightly, but its existence is permanent and unchangeable” (Olesk 1999: 391).

⁷ The film’s script editor, Valter Kruustee, even admitted during a discussion of the script at the studio’s Artistic Council that “last summer I had several contacts with members of the émigré elite in Sweden and saw their newspapers and magazines, and I have to say that I would like to see them portrayed as they are in reality. They do not represent a force we must fight against.” (Estonian State Archive (ESA), f. R-1707, n. 1, s. 566, l. 56).

⁸ However, Jüri Müür did return to this issue on a much more profound level in his *People in Soldier’s Uniforms* (*Inimesed sõdurisinelis*, 1968), which was one of very few Soviet Estonian fiction films attempting to tackle more or less honestly the true tragedies of Estonian soldiers, forced by the historical circumstances to fight on opposite sides of the front in World War II. It remained one of the rare occasions during the Soviet period on which Estonian soldiers in foreign uniforms were depicted in films and, even more importantly, one of the very few sympathetic portrayals of Estonians in German army. This problematic focus of attention caused considerable aggravation to the central authorities of cinema in Moscow. Due to the sensitive nature of the subject matter, the studio received several rigorous instructions from the Committee for Cinema in Moscow, demanding extensive revisions and pointing out in a condescending manner that the war-time conditions were not adequately presented and that the story of Estonian soldiers “converting” to good communists was not entirely convincing. When finally completed, the film was denied a screening license outside the Baltic republics and Karelo-Finnish SSR (according to Enn Säde’s biographical documentary *Jüri – see mulk. Ehk mis tuul müürile* about Jüri Müür).

cultural situation of Khrushchev Thaw led to a new mode of filmic thinking in Soviet Union, to a modification of the socialist realist canon, which affected first the productions of central and, after a short delay, republican studios. In addition, the structures of Soviet film system promoted crossing the internal, republican borders of the Union by encouraging and sometimes imposing co-operation between the Socialist Republics, as well as with other members of the Eastern Bloc, and by centralizing the professional training to the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography (cf. Higson 2002b: 67-68; Ezra and Rowden 2006: 4). The school functioned as a true cupola, melting together not only Soviet policies and multiple national identities, but also adding elements of Western origin to the mixture. While the centrally implemented Soviet policies were certainly intended to function as devices of subjugation, it is more productive to consider them and their ramifications in a dialogic framework of intercultural encounters. Moreover, a number of historians of Baltic history have by now come to a conclusion that the victimizing discourse of Russification is too limited for describing the complicated relationships between the Baltic periphery and the Soviet center. In what follows I will try to shed some light onto some aspects of these transnational developments, mechanisms and engagements, in terms of industrial and artistic, narrative and formal exchanges inside the Soviet Union and beyond its borders.

Although the filmmakers involved in the production of *Fellow Villagers* were almost invariably ethnic Estonians, it is also important to keep in mind that even if the first wave of centrally appointed filmmakers soon disappeared without much of a trace from the arena of Estonian cinema, and their work was effectively removed from the national discourse of cinematic history⁹, the structure of filmmaking teams on many occasions still remained decisively multinational (not to mention the fact that the overall Soviet system of film production remained basically unchanged). This is already apparent in the case of the fairly uniform ethnic structure of the group working on *Fellow Villagers*: the second director, Grigori Kromanov, hired in order to compensate for Müür's lack of experience in working with actors – whose theatrical background added to the difficulties directing them in film – was Russian by descent, although born and raised in Tallinn. The local culture and language was an integral part of his personal universe, just as the Russian roots inherited from his ancestors, making him a transnational figure *par excellence* (he later married a Jewish-Lithuanian theatre critic and shared his time between Vilnius and Tallinn). Together with Müür they went on to direct the first and much-celebrated adaptation of Estonian classical literature – *The Misadventures of the New Satan* (*Põrgupõhja uus Vanapagan*) in 1964; moreover, a romantic historical adventure, *The Last Relic* (*Viimne reliikvia*), produced in 1969, (and also,

⁹ See, for more detail, Närpea 2008.

notably, based on another Estonian literary classic), made Kromanov the author of the most popular Soviet Estonian (genre) film, which arguably reached the Union-wide spectatorship of 44.9 million viewers and was also widely distributed in both socialist and capitalist countries. In addition to local talent, filmmakers from other parts of the Soviet Union also continued to participate actively in Estonian film production. It is noteworthy, however, that these visiting (and, importantly, invited) artists – most often actors, cinematographers, and occasionally also scriptwriters – predominantly came from the republics situated in the Western part of the U.S.S.R., that is Latvia, Lithuania, the Ukraine and Byelorussia, while the script-consultants were, as a rule, appointed by the central authorities in Moscow. The latter practice can be doubtlessly considered another exercise of censorship and control, although now and then these revisions unquestionably also helped to advance the level of professionalism and improve the outcome, as was the case with *Fellow-Villagers*, the script of which was mercilessly critiqued and edited by Lev Kuleshov, Müür's teacher at VGIK. Notably, the crucial emphasis usually still remained on the local idiosyncrasy, as demonstrated so convincingly by Müür's debut.

As already indicated above, then, nearly all the filmmakers holding key positions in the creative unit of *Fellow Villagers* – the director, the cinematographers, the production designer – had been educated in VGIK, in Moscow, under the influence of a wholly different set of cultural factors. The institute of cinematography had put them into contact with both the history and newest trends in Western cinema, both directly – through films that were shown as part of their coursework but the screening of which was prohibited to the general public¹⁰ – and indirectly – through the works of their teachers who were among the best filmmakers of their times. For example, Müür, who against all odds – his past as a teenage *Luftwaffenhelfer* (child soldier, Luftwaffe support personnel) in German army during World War II, although a carefully kept secret, had made him an unlikely candidate – and despite the fact that the quotas of places set aside for students from the small republics were not yet established, so that all candidates had to compete for admittance on equal terms (see Remsu 1986: 22), had become Dovzhenko's student at this elitist institution in 1955, along with Leida Laius, another important Estonian director¹¹, Otar Iosseliani and Larisa Shepitko, among others. VGIK, whose professors

¹⁰ When the school was over, relatively close contacts with the latest developments of Western cinema were sustained through regular closed screenings organized by the Union of Soviet Filmmakers and its republican branches, and in Estonia also through access to Finnish television, which reached the northern part of Estonia and made a great impact on the awareness of the Estonian audiences and doubtlessly also on the work of the local film industry.

¹¹ Notably, Laius's biography is also crisscrossed by transnational patterns: her grandparents emigrated from Estonia in mid-19th century and she was born in 1923 near Leningrad, in Russia. In 1938, her father was arrested as a *kulak* and Leida, her brother and their mother, a native of the Estonian border-town Narva, were forced to move (back) to Estonia. During World War II she joined the Red Army, but failed,

and students had always been carefully monitored in terms of ideological correctness, had nevertheless managed to become a major incubator for open-minded, socially conscious young intelligentsia, where reportedly the first acts of student unrest against the authorities took place as early as 1956 (Fomin 1998: 203-208). The cultural atmosphere of Moscow was particularly fertile between 1955 and 1965, and events such as the 1957 World Festival of Youth and Students, which under the motto “For Peace and Friendship” brought to the city unprecedented 34,000 participants from all over the world, must have provided mind-broadening experiences to the young filmmakers. Thus, the liberating breeze of the Thaw, spreading the hope for change, was felt more rapidly and immediately after Stalin’s death, and especially after Khrushchev’s Secret Speech in 1956, in the metropolitan centre of Moscow than in the peripheral province of Estonia. The creative conditions of the second half of the 1950s, too, were undeniably more favorable in Moscow, and especially in a relatively well-protected artistic sanctuary such as VGIK, than in Estonia, where the cultural sphere was still headed by the Stalinist-minded and conservative Secretary of Ideology Leonid Lentsman (see e.g. Ehin 2001; Kuuli 2002: 55ff.), and where the energies of the creative elite were only beginning to regain impetus after the repressive and depressing period of the immediate post-war decade. Later, however, the tables turned and the Baltic periphery became an important hub of dissent, although considerably more so in other cultural spheres than in cinema.

But to return to the late 1950s when Müür, Garšnek, Rehe and Vernik studied in VGIK, the Western influences in terms of cinematic models more precisely meant Italian neorealism, which was undeniably the most important trend of the day.¹² In her review of the *Fellow Villagers*, Tatjana Elmanovič argued that the film’s “script betrays the formal aspirations of 1950s Italian neo-realist cinema”, it “lacks conventional plot structure” and “instead of suspenseful and thrilling adventures the filmmakers aimed towards observing the men who found themselves thrown away from their familiar surroundings into an alien territory, and towards studying their feelings, reactions, thoughts and conclusions.” (Elmanovič 1995: 518). Many other critics, too, had unanimously noticed and welcomed this change in the deep structure, the replacement of “false-classicist” and airbrushed socialist realism with “observation of life,” “genuine environments,” and “casual improvisations,” as described by Elmanovič. This tendency of deheroization had

contrary to her desire, to fight on the front, becoming instead a member of the art ensemble with the Estonian Rifle Corps.

¹² According to Josephine Woll, by 1956 “Italian neo-realist cinema had altered viewers’ expectations. Film professionals, film club members and urban residents generally had easy access to Rossellini’s *Rome – Open City*, De Sica’s *Umberto D.* and *Bicycle Thief*, and to all of De Santis’ films; the regime permitted liberal distribution because these movies dealt with social issues and depicted ‘simple’ working-class characters.” (Woll 2000: 35). In 1962, an article introducing the tenets of Italian neorealism also appeared in Estonian press: ‘Tracing Neorealism’ by Valdeko Tobro, a local film critic.

found its way to the Soviet cinema to a great extent precisely through the neorealist films and had laid basis to such works as Kalatozov's *The Cranes Are Flying* (*Летят журавли*, 1957) and Chukhrai's *Ballad of a Soldier* (*Баллада о солдате*, 1959), both of which were widely acclaimed by the Estonian press and audiences, and must have made quite an impression on the film students. At Tallinnfilm, numerous works demonstrating similar dramaturgical shifts followed the *Fellow Villagers*, most famous, and probably most prominent, of them being Kaljo Kiisk's *Ice Drift* (*Jääminek*) from 1962¹³. Later, some slight vibrations of the "new waves" of both the Eastern Bloc and Western countries found their way to the Estonian filmic field through the same channels, exemplified best by such films as Kromanov's *What Happened to Andres Lapeteus?* (*Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?*, 1966), and Kiisk's *Midday Ferry* (*Keskpäevane praam*, 1967) and *Madness* (*Hullumeelsus*, 1968); although the boldest experiments took place in the production of Estonian television film studio, Eesti Telefilm, in the 1970s (see Näripea 2010). Just as elsewhere in the Soviet Union, the range of devices for visual expression expanded considerably, and filmmakers, although not always entirely successful in their results, became profoundly interested in pictorial experiments. The work of perhaps the most influential Soviet cinematographer during the Thaw, Sergei Urusevsky, whose style combined "fast-paced montage, multiple superimpositions, complex panoramic shots, and subjective camera angles" (Prokhorov 2001: 13), revitalizing the practices of the 1920s Soviet cinematic avant-garde,¹⁴ was highly relevant to Estonian film. It made probably the greatest impact on a cinematographer of the Eesti Telefilm studio, Anton Mutt, another VGIK graduate, who in Tõnis Kask's tripartite TV-miniseries *Dark Windows* (*Pimedad aknad*, 1968) shot a whole sequence by running with a hand-held camera – the only one of its kind in Estonian (narrative) cinema of the 1960s. Algimantas Mockus, the Lithuanian cinematographer of *Ice Drift* and Laius's *Werewolf* (*Libahunt*,

¹³ *Ice-Drift*, Kiisk's solo directorial debut, also enjoyed considerable success on a regional level: at the annual film festival of the Baltic states and Byelorussia, it won the main prize, the Grand Amber, and earned additional awards for the best cinematography, the best screenplay and the best actress. Kiisk had consulted Iossif Heifits and Mikhail Romm (Kiisk 2005: 123-124, 127) during the production, thus introducing some reverberations of their talent to the Estonian filmic field.

¹⁴ As noticed by Prokhorov (2002: 63), during Thaw the "narrative is suspended" at its nodal points and "yields to the visual spectacle of characters' suffering or extreme emotional stress. In such episodes, Thaw directors usually employ sequences imitating the style of avant-garde montage or literal quotations from the films of the 1920s. The visual ambiguity of such sequences signals emotional tension, subjectivity of point of view, and concern with the emotional state of an individual." This pattern was already in place in *The Cranes Are Flying* where the scenes shot in a manner reminiscent of the Stalinist practices – "[b]odies fill the foreground, often from the waist up; a face may hang very close to the camera...; characters are arrayed in steep diagonals plunging into the distance" (Bordwell 2001: 19) – are punctuated by sequences which borrow their abstract aesthetics from the cinema of Eisenstein, Vertov, and other avant-garde filmmakers of the 1920s. This overall visual configuration also characterizes several Estonian films of the 1960s, including *Fellow Villagers*.

1968), also adopted elements of Urusevsky's stunningly inventive visual language to a powerful effect. In addition to the stylistic fireworks of Urusevskian play with angles, motion, light and shadow, the documentary-like aesthetics – “the basis of poetry in the cinematography of the 1960s” (Woll 2000: 197) – also penetrated the pictorial modes of communication, either by inclusion of documentary footage (as in *People in the Soldier's Uniforms*) or by adopting an “observational” approach to the narrative and/or visual structure (Müür's *Letters from Sõgedate Village* (*Kirjad Sõgedate külast*, 1966), *Mid-day Ferry*, etc.). Furthermore, the relative geographical closeness of the Baltic states to the Western capitalist countries, and especially to Finland, whose television broadcasts were accessible to the spectators on the northern coast of Estonia, opening to the Soviet audiences a literal “window to the West,”¹⁵ left significant traces on the cinematic culture, as witnessed, for example, by the Bergmanesque style of several Estonian films (such as *The Misadventures of the New Satan*,¹⁶ which has been compared to Bergman's *Seventh Seal* and *Winter Light* (see e.g. Elmanoviš 1995: 519); or *Madness*, which bears certain likeness to *Persona*). However, while the particular formal devices signaled a significant change, it is important to stress that the general so-called “politics of the author” was extremely highly esteemed and made a substantial impact on the consciousness and aspirations of the local filmmakers. An Estonian critic Ülo Matjus even wrote in 1968: “World cinema is *auteur* cinema. Estonian cinema needs *auteur* cinema.” Indeed, the achievements of Polish and Czechoslovakian *auteurs* became a source of national envy for their Estonian colleagues who attempted to make their “authorial voices” heard despite the “castration machine”¹⁷ of the Soviet filmmaking system.

¹⁵ Moreover, Urho Kaleva Kekkonen, the Finnish president, visited Estonia in 1964, bringing about a change of focus in Finnish policies: the Finnish state now officially concentrated on developing relations with Soviet Estonia, instead of Estonian communities in exile (see Lilja and Olesk 2005). In July 1965, regular ferry service between Tallinn and Helsinki was (re)established, creating a direct channel of communication. The cultural ties between the two neighboring countries were manifold and multi-disciplinary, and included also (unrealized) plans for cinematic co-production (see Lõhmus 2009).

¹⁶ During the film's first screening to Tallinnfilm's Artistic Council, one of its members, a writer (and the editor-in-chief of Tallinnfilm between 1961 and 1963) Ants Saar declared quite openly that “in the course of making this film we once again looked to the West and kept in mind the audiences outside the Soviet Union. And we have been obliged to do so in order to follow a recent order issued by the Central Committee about taking greater concern for exports. This is undoubtedly one of those productions targeted to foreign markets.” (ESA, f. R-1707, n. 1, s. 821, l. 57). Unfortunately, as it often happened with Müür's films, his trouble-seeking, arrogant and stubborn personality caught the unfavorable attention of ideological watchdogs and *The Misadventures of the New Satan* never crossed the borders of the U.S.S.R. The fact that overseas audiences were consciously targeted by the policies of the highest level, however, resonates well with Andrew Higson's claim that “the parameters of a national cinema should be drawn at the site of consumption as much as at the site of production of films” (Higson 2002a: 52) and thus emphasizes once again the profoundly transnational character of Soviet (Estonian) cinema.

¹⁷ An eloquent expression coined by an Estonian film critic Tiina Lokk in the 1980s (Lokk 1989: 57) and brought to my attention by Andreas Trossek (2008: 39).

National Space

It thus seems that what is commonly referred to as the emergence of Estonian national cinema was actually an essentially transnational process. The “national school” was conceived by filmmakers whose personal (hi)stories and professional connections often crossed the national borders, and who had been educated in the metropolitan center of Moscow – a fact that frequently made their compatriots doubt their “loyalty” to the nation robbed of its sovereignty – where they had been acquainted with the latest trends in Western cinemas. The institutional conditions supporting the cultivation of national cinema were also mainly beyond local control: the financial means and basic ideological instructions came from central authorities. At the same time, however, the picture is still incomplete without the local, national part of this *trans*-national development and the argument that the 1960s can be considered the moment of the appearance of Estonian national cinema still holds a good share of truth. While the shift from Stalinist, stereotyped mode of representation to a more variegated range of narrative and visual devices was typical to the cultural production of Khrushchev Thaw everywhere in the Soviet Union, it is also important to stress that Jüri Müür planned his first film as an openly and straightforwardly national enterprise. Defending his diploma project at Tallinnfilm, Müür boldly stated at a meeting of the studio’s Artistic Council: “I’m not afraid to earn the title of a bourgeois nationalist by saying that they [the characters of the *Fellow Villagers*] are Estonians. They do have national character. [...] The film is intended to become a national film, *a film with a particular environment and characters of the northern coast*.”¹⁸ (Emphasis added). He also argued that although the men are encouraged to stay in Finland for good, they clearly do not decide to return because of the so-called advantages of the Soviet society,¹⁹ but rather because “Estonia is the place where the fishermen’s wives, homes and co-workers are, and they cannot bear to live anywhere else.” Critics were quick to comprehend these intentions from the finished product, as testified, for example, by Ivar Kosenkranius’s review, which summarized the fundamental nature of the film as follows: “The fellow villagers implicitly connote homeland and nation.” (Kosenkranius 1962). In other words, the identity of the characters is defined less by social class or ideological inclinations, than by their sense of belonging to a particular place that is regarded an inalienable domain of their linguistic and cultural community; the land and the nation being one and the same.

¹⁸ ESA, f. R-1707, n. 1, s. 566, l. 80-81.

¹⁹ He also suggested that “we should not include great arguments with Feliks Kandel about whether the men should stay or not. Nor the great discussions about the fishermen getting paid more or the life being better [in the West].” These choices testify about the tactics Müür used to avoid the typical codes and patterns of socialist realist discourse, replacing it with a different, more subtle, and, most importantly, locally bound angle of representation.

Thus, it appears that the film's national frame of reference is first and foremost related to and discussed by means of categories of territory and space. Indeed, although many other aspects, too, set the previous filmmaking practices apart from the cinema of the 1960s, as demonstrated above, the essence of the shift – a crucial change in the perspective – becomes especially evident when one is to consider representations of space. Most importantly, in the films made by the centrally appointed visiting filmmakers in the 1950s urban environments had held a relatively high significance. In the 1960s, on the other hand, the majority of fiction films produced by Tallinnfilm presented rural or small-town settings. Furthermore, those few films from the 1960s that featured urban areas tended to represent the city as a place of (ideological and/or personal) corruption, as, for instance, in *What Happened to Andres Lapeteus?*, which was quite unabashedly critical towards the recent Stalinist past, and the social legacies and behavioral models it had left to the 1960s. Another example of demoralizing urban conditions is Veljo Käsper's *The Vienna Postage-Stamp* (*Viini postmark*, 1967), a comedy ridiculing the slow progress of industrial advancement, the low moral attitude of workers and the general roguish mentality. The countryside, in contrast, was frequently portrayed as a "site of cultural tradition and heritage" (Fowler, Helfeld 2006: 2). As suggested by Tiina Peil and Helen Sooväli (2005: 50), "rurality and the narrative of land ... maintain a central role in Estonia's imagination of its homeland" (see also Peil 2008: 147). In contrast to the Stalinist cinematic villages of the 1950s, the rural environments in the films of the 1960s usually managed to avoid the exoticized representations of the nation and the national, the varnished collages of ethnographic elements and falsely embellished depictions of people's everyday lives. Instead, as revealed by Kosenkranius's 1962 review of the *Fellow Villagers*, the atmosphere of these rural settings was "created by the people and the distinctive nature of the environment, which the authors have framed in the spectre of well-chosen details." The pseudo-ethnographic imagery, which lent an unmistakably artificial, misleading, and alienated look to the first products of "Soviet Estonian cinema," such as Rappaport's *Light in Koordi* (*Valgus Koordis*, 1951), had finally been replaced by a milieu more plausible to the local audiences. Or, from the point of view of phenomenological theories of environmental representations the gaze of an outsider, the "touristic" sense of place, inauthentic, distorted and stereotyped, was replaced by a "local" point of view and sense of place (Relph 1986: 80-87).

Nation-Space: Back to the Past

While the Estonian countryside had enjoyed considerable wealth and prosperity in the late 1930s, and the interwar Estonian Republic and its government had relied heavily on the political support and tax resources of the rural bourgeoisie, the wealthier and

middle-class farmers had been effectively abolished by the late 1940s – either deported and/or killed by the Soviets or driven to exile in order to escape the onslaught of the war and the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” The city, meanwhile, had appeared in the literature of the 1930s as a predominantly negative *topos*, exploiting the products of the farmers’ hard work in order to feed the useless army of bureaucrats; additionally, because of the lower birth rate, the urban inhabitants were accused of attempts of annihilating the Estonian nation (see Märka 2004: 67-68, 74). War-related losses in the countryside and the post-war campaigns of forced collectivization had left the rural areas impoverished and ailing, making to the local audiences so much more clear the flagrant lie of films like *Light in Koordi*, but also of productions completed as late as 1961, such as the kolkhoz musical *Friend of Singing (Laulu sõber)*, which portrayed the life of a collective farm called Kalev – a name tellingly borrowed from a hero of ancient Estonian mythology. In this film, following the typical socialist realist plotline, the collective farmers, having overcome the initial obstacles and struggles of establishing the kolkhoz, lead their untroubled lives in nice new apartment buildings and work in mechanized cow barns, wearing spotlessly white smocks – a revealing sign of the advent of the “scientific-technological revolution” in the Khrushchevite Soviet Union, and refine their cultural sophistication by means of various amateur-artistic practices. Later, in the 1970s, the programmatic industrialization of farming indeed helped to raise the living standards in rural areas above those in towns and cities, and agriculture became an object of true national pride as the most Estonian-minded branch of economy. In the beginning of the 1960s, however, the general picture of life in the countryside was “symbolized by muddy roads, poverty, pilfering, alcoholism and hopelessness” (Kalm 2008: 61). In this respect, it is especially significant to find that alcoholism triggered, in a way, the whole narrative of the *Fellow Villagers*: Raim, one of the fishermen and the mechanic of the boat, was too drunk to join his crew in the morning of the accident, and when the engine failed in the middle of the sea there was no one on board to fix it, so that the boat and the men were left helplessly in the mercy of the raging storm, drifting towards unfamiliar waters and shores. Equally notably, the character of the drunkard does not change by the end of the narrative; he keeps up his customary ways even after the upsetting incident, therefore escaping the usual socialist realist formula of personal, and thus political, reform.

According to the third program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, issued in 1961, the kolkhoz villages were supposed to be transformed into large, urban settlements with apartment buildings, proper infrastructure, network of shops, various service-providers, cultural and health institutions – a process pertinently defined as agro-urbanization (Maandi 2005: 180). The social, economical and cultural divisions between the country and the city were to be abolished (see Kalm 2008, Jänes 2004). Yet the actual

implementation of these goals progressed slowly. More often than not the establishment of entirely new centralized settlements was not realized and the kolkhoz centers were built as extensions to already existing villages and historical manor complexes. Nevertheless, as Hannes Palang and Ülo Mander have explained, the transformation of landscape and lifestyle was dramatically visible already in the mid-1960s. The land was nationalized and the rural households were forced to join the collective farms, kolkhozes. Small backcountry villages disappeared, farmsteads were abandoned, the arable land, formerly divided into smaller plots, now formed massive fields. New machinery favored the disappearance of individually maintained ploughlands and the abandonment of little hayfields, which, in turn, led to the expansion of forests (Palang and Mander 2000: 172).

On the whole, the progressive ideology endorsed by the Party program was clearly geared towards the future, towards neutralizing the previous, old-fashioned and ideologically outmoded ways and vistas, towards erasing memories of the past. In this respect, the above-mentioned musical, *Friend of Singing*, released in the same year as the new Party program, functions as a representation of a wishful reality, a glimpse into the bright communist future, executed as a perfect product of a socialist realist illusion-generating machine.

In this context it is somewhat surprising to find that the Soviet Estonian cinema of the 1960s demonstrates relative indifference towards the development of the kolkhozes. While in the 1950s the establishment and progress of collective farms provided a staple substance for cinematic stories, in the 1960s, with only a few exceptions from the earlier part of the decade,²⁰ the topic of dramatically changing landscapes and lifestyles is virtually absent. Instead of contemporary rural everyday, the filmmakers often found their inspiration in another era, another time and space. On many occasions, the space-time of the 1960s Estonian cinema appears to be decisively divorced from the contemporary, that is, Soviet realities, from the real *and* officially envisioned landscapes described briefly above. It is also important to bear in mind that it is not only cinema that fled the countryside but also real people: in 1940, only 34% of the population inhabited the urban areas, while in 1962 as much as 64% of the Soviet Estonian residents had become town- and

²⁰ In addition to the above-mentioned kolkhoz musical *Friend of Singing*, two films dealing explicitly with life on kolkhozes were produced: Yeltsov's *Under One Roof* (*Ühe katuse all*, 1962), and Kiisk's *Traces* (*Jäljed*, 1963). The latter is interesting in several respects. First, looking back to the immediate postwar era, it was the earliest Estonian film attempting to deal more or less openly with various problems faced by the rural communities under the Stalinist period of forced collectivization. It did so by showing the establishment of a kolkhoz as a relatively repressive and painful process, pointing out the corruption of the imposed system and ridiculing its ways of operation. So much so, in fact, that the film was banned from screening outside Estonia (Kiisk 2005: 123). Secondly, it was the first film made in the Baltic republics investigating the highly problematic subject matter of the so-called Forest Brothers – anti-Soviet partisans who waged guerrilla warfare against Soviet rule at the time of the Soviet invasion and occupation of the Baltic countries during and after World War II. For the broader audiences, however, the Lithuanian film *Nobody Wanted to Die*, by Vytautas Žalakevičius (1967), was to become the quintessential representation of this topic.

city-dwellers. The process of rapid urbanization, however, was also ignored by the Estonian cinema of the 1960s.²¹ Instead of the Soviet quotidian existence, whether rural or urban, the filmmakers frequently seemed to strive towards creating a world apart from the immediate reality, an escapist sphere of locally situated and nationally bound themes in the wide ocean of the “international” Soviet cinema. Furthermore, in hindsight it is almost ironic to observe how much the underlying principle resembled that of the Stalinist cinema: both the Stalinist film and the newly established “Estonian school” did their best to dissociate from the actually existing circumstances and conjure up a new world, which, although sometimes reminiscent of the immediate surroundings, was decisively different on a symbolic level. For Stalinist cinema it meant the processing of “Soviet reality” into derealized socialist realism, into a “commodified reality” – “something akin to enriched uranium” (Dobrenko 2004: 690). According to Evgeny Dobrenko,

Stalin introduced a new temporality: the concluded future (a kind of future pluperfect). In order to free the ground for this new future, the present was shifted into the past, the future-directed future was transformed into the present, as a result of which the present itself underwent complete de-realisation. The completed construction of the past turns out anew to be an ideal, a model for the future (either as a direct projection or ‘in reverse’). (Dobrenko 2008: 7).

The new generation of Estonian filmmakers, similarly, created screen spaces which implied, to an extent, another time and space. Yet contrarily to the Stalinist practices, they conjured up bygone eras and places, and resurfaced powerful memories of cancelled opportunities and void hopes. Perhaps the employment of this Aesopian language was their only opportunity to retain at least some level of integrity in the situation where the brutal honesty of the true state of life in the countryside was a representational taboo and the portrayal of the varnished version of it would have signaled the servile acceptance of socialist realist tenets, that is, the betrayal of local culture, its continuity, and viability.

According to John Agnew, the image of landscape is one of the most important mechanisms of creating national identities (Agnew 1998; cited in Sooväli 2008: 132). So, the extent to which Estonian filmmakers paid attention to the rural representa-

²¹ It is important to keep in mind, however, that although the 1950s saw an accelerated growth of the population of smaller towns and townships, “the bigger towns got new inhabitants via immigration, [while] smaller towns gathered mainly “refugees” from the countryside, escaping the awful living conditions in the early kolkhozes.” (Mander and Palang 1994: 48). This might well enough be one of the reasons behind the relative absence of bigger cities from the films of the 1960s (as well as the negative portrayal of the few that showed up in films), and explain the more favorable attitude towards smaller towns and townships in terms of cinematic representations.

tions can partly, perhaps, be explained by their efforts to investigate national identity,²² which was suppressed by the Soviet regime and faced a threat of complete annihilation in favor of the uniform *homo Sovieticus*. Jüri Müür's above-quoted statements laid the emphasis, quite openly, precisely on the distinctive character, maybe even uniqueness, of locality and nationality. Latently, thus, Müür, as well as other filmmakers of the time, sought contact with the past, both in terms of evoking certain life-styles and traditions and covertly commemorating the lost independence and statehood in order to sustain the sense of the Andersonian "imagined community." The rural realm became the basis for constructing, reconstructing and reestablishing local and national mythologies, winning a voice and space for identity in peril of fading away. As emphasized by Fowler and Helfield (2006: 3), "rural cinema frequently plays an important role as a conservator of the culture and a kind of archival entity." Instead of envisioning the communist future, then, the local artists and audiences were keen to plunge into the past, irretrievably lost in the socio-political reality, yet vividly alive in their minds, and, in part, in the rural landscapes of the immediate post-war years.²³

In this respect it is also important to stress that Estonian cinema of the 1960s is to a great degree seen as the cinema of adaptations of the local literary classics, written between the late 19th century and the 1930s, and often presenting stories set in this period and mostly in rural environments.²⁴ This policy of adapting the local literary classics was not looked upon favorably by the authorities in Moscow, who according to the decisions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the Communist Party endorsed representations and stories of contemporary times and revolutionary themes. The new, Estonian-minded editorial staff of Tallinnfilm had, to the relative aggravation of the studio's Russian-speaking and Moscow-orientated management, already started to draft lists of important works for

²² The fact that the national narrative, as established by the elite of the prewar nation-state, was closely connected with rural imagery is furthermore confirmed by the design of the interwar currency. According to Helen Sooväli, in the European context the dominance of village landscapes on the Estonian bills was only comparable to the Latvian currency (Sooväli 2008: 136).

²³ According to Peeter Maandi, "To the extent that we can speak of a "Soviet landscape" we cannot disregard the fact that to a certain degree, it coexisted with the old (pre-Soviet) landscape. Thus, many manor complexes became the centres of the new collective farms, and new Soviet-style buildings were simply appended to the old manor houses and parks. Many of the ancient field patterns could still be identified at the end of the Soviet period, partly because numerous fields were converted to grazing land, which did not necessarily imply that impediments had to be removed." (Maandi 2005: 202). In fact, his research shows that many people used the "material landscape as an aid to memory. To some extent, this memory-laden landscape served as a link to the pre-Soviet past." (Maandi 2005: 203).

²⁴ In this context it is also interesting to note that according to Jaan Kross (2008: 304-305) the relatively small Estonian community in New York had sometimes in the early 1970s also cherished the idea of establishing a diasporic film industry and the first project was supposed to be the adaptation of August Kitzberg's much celebrated tragedy *Werewolf* (*Libahunt*, 1912), which in 1968 had already been adapted for screen in Tallinnfilm under Leida Laius's direction.

screen adaptation sometime in the late 1950s, but those plans were realized only partially and only from the 1960s onwards, when the young, VGIK-educated Estonian filmmakers brought new and stimulating breeze of inspiration to the studio. Between 1961 and 1969 Tallinnfilm produced altogether twenty-three feature films, five of which were adaptations of Estonian literary classics, eight were adaptations of contemporary prose and plays (sometimes with subject-matter from the recent history, harking back to the 1940s), six were based on original scripts by local authors and four on works of scriptwriters from elsewhere: one from Latvia (*Madness* by Viktors Lorencs) and three from Russia (quite objectively three weakest films of the decade). Although the adaptations of literary classics were intended to consolidate and buttress the local national sentiments and indeed were somewhat subversive towards Moscow's policies, cinematic or otherwise, paradoxically they still also managed to play a part in ghettoizing the local cinematic achievements in the Estonian cultural sphere at large, mainly, and surprisingly enough, with the help of contemporary Estonian critics who had often been trained as literary scholars and tended to downplay the films in comparison with the original literary sources. According to Tiina Lokk, the gap created between cinema and the audiences by the productions of the so-called visiting filmmakers of the 1950s, which, in comparison with literature, told blatant lies, was unfortunately not overcome even when the new generation of Estonian directors introduced adaptations of classical literature to the Estonian cinematic arena. Even if they were seen as innovative and distinctive in the larger, Union-wide context, the local critics could only look upon them as inferior to their written precursors (Lokk 2003: 15), creating an unjustly negative image of Estonian cinema, which persisted for decades to come, and keeping it from entering the circulation of national culture.²⁵ A remarkable, although by no means singular, example of this conscious degradation is the story of adapting *The Misadventures of the New Satan*. This classic tale, written by the celebrated author Anton Hansen Tammsaare in 1939 as his last novel, was an allegorical story based on folkloristic motifs: the Devil himself comes to Earth as a human being in order to find out if it is indeed impossible to be redeemed, to lead a life as a human and still go to heaven after death. As a work concentrating on and criticizing the profound contradictions of the bourgeois society it was a fairly acceptable candidate for screen adaptation in terms of its ideological implications in the Soviet context. In fact, Müür had started working on the script as early as in 1957 and was planning to direct it as his diploma project at VGIK. In 1960, a board of professors discussed the proposal (which Müür presented to them as intentionally Estonian and national project) and found it

²⁵ Later, however, some critics have argued that these adaptations are the only Soviet Estonian films which deserve to be labeled "national" (e.g. Vaher 2009: 18). Still, similarly to the critics of the 1960s Vaher does not acknowledge them as proper cinema, because, arguably, the dominant voice in them belongs to the language of literature, not that of film.

“dramaturgically interesting, highly cinema-specific and significant for the contemporary context”²⁶. But when Müür approached the editors of Tallinnfilm, his intentions were nipped in the bud, as an “expert evaluation” commissioned from a local literary scholar Helene Siimisker deemed the screenplay entirely worthless, dismissing the philosophical core of Tammsaare’s work, deforming its ideas and characters.²⁷ Müür’s initial offer was shelved and he was assigned to direct the *Fellow Villagers* instead. Nevertheless, in 1962 he returned to *The Misadventures of the New Satan* and completed the film by 1964.

Conclusion

As I hopefully demonstrated above, the story of Estonian cinema, the paths of which have to this date been trodden far too rarely, is a captivating and complex phenomenon waiting to be (re)discovered in fuller detail, both by its native audiences, as part of their cinematic inheritance, and by international commentators, as a full and equal part of East European film history. Although the scope of this article prevented me from considering the whole range of cross-national links between Estonian cinema and the wider, regional network of Soviet and East European film culture, I attempted to offer at least some introductory insights into what has been considered the moment of Estonian cinema’s inception. On the one hand, this process, as well as its results, were subject to numerous transnational impulses. On the other hand, these films also betray traces of an unmistakably local sensibility, demonstrating clear intent to participate in the “national project.” While several contemporary critics remained suspicious of cinema as “nationally impure,” shaping the image of the local film industry as a marginal player on the domestic cultural field for decades to come, it is the responsibility of the subsequent generations to reconsider these evaluations critically, and to recognize that this “impurity” might, in fact, be a virtue and not a flaw. In other words, it is crucial for the domestic debates to catch up on developments in the international research and theorization of national cinemas, and to acknowledge that *any* national cinema is inevitably related to various networks and structures of transnational origin. Under the Soviet rule, the restraining measurements of control, imposed on the cinematic affairs by the central authorities in Moscow, prompted mistrust towards the budding “national school” amongst the local community, who often failed to notice the potential of the transnational system of Soviet film industry, as well as the generally sincere intentions of the filmmakers in advancing the “national project.” It is high time, firstly, to integrate the story of Soviet Estonian cinema into narratives of Estonian national culture, and, secondly, to consider local film production as subject to fascinatingly complex cross-cultural web of influences.

²⁶ ESA, f. R-1707, n. 1, s. 843, l. 47.

²⁷ ESA, f. R-1707, n. 1, s. 843, l. 2-3.

References

- Agnew, J. (1998) 'European landscape and identity', in B. Graham (ed) *Modern Europe: Place, Culture and Identity*. London: Arnold, pp. 213-235.
- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981) 'Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel: Notes toward a historical poetics', in M. Holquist (ed) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 84-258.
- Bergfelder, T. (2005) 'National, transnational or supranational cinema? Rethinking European film studies', *Media, Culture & Society*, 27(3): 315-331.
- Bordwell, D. (2001) 'Eisenstein, socialist realism, and the charms of mizanstsenä', in A. LaValley and B.P. Sherr (eds) *Eisenstein at 100: A Reconsideration*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, pp. 13-37.
- Brüggemann, K. (2009) 'Writing national history in a globalising world', *Tallinn University Newsletter*, November 30, accessed 13/01/2011, www.tlu.ee/?LangID=5&CatID=3918&ArtID=6643&action=article.
- Clark, K. (1997) 'Socialist realism with shores: The conventions for the positive hero', in T. Lahusen and E. Dobrenko (eds) *Socialist Realism without Shores*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 27-50.
- Clark, K. (2000) *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual, Third Edition*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Dobrenko, E. (2004) 'Socialism as will and representation, or What legacy are we rejecting?', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 5(4): 675-708.
- Dobrenko, E. (2008) *Stalinist Cinema and the Production of History: Museum of the Revolution*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Donald, J. (1997) 'This, here, now: Imagining the modern city', in S. Westwood and J. Williams (eds) *Imagining Cities: Scripts, Signs, Memory*. London: Routledge, pp. 181-201.
- Ehin, A. (2001) 'Nelükümmend aastat vabavärsivaidlusest', *Looming*, 9: 1398-1401.
- Elmanovitš, T. (1995) 'Grigori Kromanovi filmid', in I. Veisaitë-Kromanova (ed) *Lavastaja Grigori Kromanov. Mälestused. Artiklid. Kirjad. Päevikud*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, pp. 517-532.
- Ezra, E., and Rowden, T. (2006) 'General introduction: What is transnational cinema?', in E. Ezra and T. Rowden (eds) *Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1-12.
- First, J.J. (2008) *Scenes of Belonging: Cinema and the Nationality Question in Soviet Ukraine during the long 1960s*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Fomin, V., ed. (1998) *Kinematografottepeli. Dokumenty i svidetel'stva*. Moskva: Materik.

- Fowler, C., and Helfield, G., eds. (2006) *Representing the Rural: Space, Place, and Identity in Films about the Land*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Higson, A. (2002a) 'The concept of national cinema', in A. Williams (ed) *Film and Nationalism*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, pp. 52-67.
- Higson, A. (2002b) 'The limiting imagination of national cinema', in M. Hjort and S. Mackenzie (eds) *Cinema and Nation*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 63-74.
- Ingvoldstad, B. (2008) 'The paradox of Lithuanian national cinema', in E. Närke and A. Trossek (eds) *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts, pp. 137-154.
- Iordanova, D. (2003) *Cinema of the Other Europe: The Industry and Artistry of East Central European Film*. London and New York: Wallflower Press.
- Jänes, L. (2004) 'The Stalinist collective farm village: Attempts to establish town-type settlements in the Estonian landscape', in M. Kalm and I. Ruudi (eds) *Constructed Happiness – Domestic Environment in the Cold War Era*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts, pp. 184-199.
- Kalm, M. (2008) 'Ons linnaelu maal hea? Majandi keskasula Eesti NSV-s', *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi*, 17(4): 61-87.
- Kiisk, K. (2005) 'Kaljo Kiisa ebatavaline elu', *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 12: 121-128.
- Kosenkranius, I. (1962) "'Ühe küla mehed'", *Sirp ja Vasar*, February 23.
- Kross, J. (2008) *Kallid kaasteelised II* [Dear Fellow Travellers II]. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Kuuli, O. (2002) *Sula ja hallad Eesti NSV-s. Kultuuripoliitikast aastail 1953–1969* [Thaw and Freezes in Estonian S.S.R.: On Cultural Policies between 1953 and 1969]. Tallinn: O. Kuuli.
- Kärk, L. (1995) 'Mida oleks hea teada ajaloost? Eesti filmiloo lühikonspekt', *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 8-9: 114-123.
- Lilja, P., and Olesk, S. (2005) 'Urho Kaleva Kekkoneni kõne Soome estofiilidele', *Akadeemia*, 2: 243-254.
- Lokk, T. (1989) 'Eesti tõsielufilmi suundumustest', *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 6: 57-64.
- Lokk, T. (2003) 'Vastab Tiina Lokk', *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 11: 3-16.
- Lõhmus, J. (2009) "'Sarv soe, Samm sees, Säde silmis ja Meri põlvini!'", *Sirp*, March 27.
- Maandi, P. (2005) *Change and Persistence in a Reformed Landscape: A Geographical Analysis of Land Reforms and Landscape Change in Muhu and Rapla Municipalities, Estonia, c. 1840 to 2003*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Mander, Ü., and Palang, H. (1994) 'Changes of landscape structure in Estonia during the Soviet period', *GeoJournal*, 33(1): 45-54.
- Matjus, Ü. (1968) 'Ei üksi, siis hulganisti', *Edasi*, July 24.
- Märka, V. (2004) 'Töö kui eesti kirjanduse püha lehm. Rahvakasvatustliku kirjanduse aastasada 1870–1970', *Vikerkaar*, 6: 58-76.

- Näripea, E. (2008) 'A view from periphery. Spatial discourse of the Soviet Estonian feature film: The 1940s and 1950s', in E. Näripea and A. Trossek (eds) *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts, pp. 193-210.
- Näripea, E. (2010) 'New waves, new spaces: Estonian experimental cinema of the 1970s', *Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema*, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema, accessed 9/11/2010, www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/naripea.shtml.
- Olesk, S. (1999) 'Jää all ja peal. Eesti nõukogude luule kontekst aastatel 1956–1962', in M. Kalda, Õ. Kepp (eds) *Mis on see ise: tekst, tagapõhi, isikupära*. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia, Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus, pp. 390-402.
- Orav, Õ. (2003) *Tallinnfilm I. Mängufilmid 1947–1976* [Tallinnfilm I. Narrative Films 1947–1976]. Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus.
- Palang, H., and Mander, Ü. (2000) 'Maastiku muutused Eestis', in T. Frey (ed) *Kaasaegse ökoloogia probleemid. Loodusteaduslikud ülevaated Eesti Maa päeval*. Tartu: Eesti Põllumajandusülikool, Tartu Ülikool; Tallinn: EV Keskkonnaministeerium, pp. 169-179.
- Peil, T. (2008) 'Kodu maastikus', *Vikerkaar*, 7-8: 145-151.
- Peil, T., and Sooväli, H. (2005) 'Estonian national landscapes – the sum and its parts', in T. Peil and M. Jones (eds) *Landscape, Law and Justice. Proceedings of a conference organised by the Centre for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, Oslo, 15-19 June 2003*. Oslo: Novus, Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, pp. 49-60.
- Prokhorov, A. (2001) 'The unknown new wave: Soviet cinema of the 1960s', in A. Prokhorov (ed) *Springtime for Soviet Cinema: Re/Viewing the 1960s*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Russian Film Symposium, pp. 7-28.
- Prokhorov, A. (2002) *Inherited Discourse: Stalinist Tropes in Thaw Culture*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.
- Relph, E. (1986) *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion.
- Remsu, O. (1986) 'Aastad ja filmid. Essee Leida Laiusest', *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 11: 20-33.
- Ruus, J. (s.a.) "Tallinnfilm" kui monument, accessed 13/01/2011, www.tallinnfilm.ee/index.php?page=67.
- Sooväli, H. (2008) 'Maastiku kirurgia', *Vikerkaar*, 7-8: 130-137.
- Tobro, V. (1962) 'Neorealismi jälgedes', *Edasi*, August 7.
- Trossek, A. (2008) 'When did it get political? Soviet film bureaucracy and Estonian hand-drawn animation', in E. Näripea and A. Trossek (eds) *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts, pp. 31-45.
- Vaher, V. (2009) *Kino on saatan, kes imeb su rinda. Vene kino katekismus* [Cinema Is a Devil Who Sucks Your Brest: The Catechism of Russian Film]. Tallinn: Pegasus.
- Woll, J. (2000) *Real Images: Soviet Cinema and the Thaw*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris.

Nature,
Movement,
Liminality:
Representing
the Space
of the Nation
in the 1960s
Estonian Cinema

A facsimile of an article published in

Regioninēs studijos,
no. 5, 2010, pp. 89–107

NATURE, MOVEMENT, LIMINALITY: REPRESENTING THE SPACE OF THE NATION IN 1960'S ESTONIAN CINEMA

Eva Näripea
Estonian Academy of Arts (Estonia)

Keywords: Estonian cinema, representations of space, representations of history, national identities.
Pagrindinės sąvokos: Estijos kinas, erdvės vaizdavimas, istorijos vaizdavimas, tautiniai tapatumai.

Introduction

The first decade of the 2000s witnessed some remarkable developments in Estonian cinema. Most noticeably, during the years of recent economic boom, the number of local productions took a drastic swing upwards with considerable assistance from the remodelled system of state subsidies for film-making, peaking in 2007 when a total of nine domestic feature films premiered in Estonia (Baltic Films... 2008). More importantly, however, the numerous prizes awarded to Estonian films at distinguished international festivals have both created a growing interest towards Estonian cinema on the global level and increased its reputation among the native audiences. While some attempts have been made to generate awareness of the local “cinarcheology” on the academic arena of film studies – both abroad and at home – the broader audiences are still under a strong impression that Estonian cinema as an individual sector of national cultural production was not formed until after the Estonian state was re-established in the early 1990s. Indeed, this attitude is a clear signifier of the fact that a certain branch and period of the Estonian culture – Soviet Estonian cinema – described accurately as a “great loner” already in the 1960s (Meri 1968), has firmly main-

tained the marginal position and that Soviet Estonian cinema is still not recognised as a self-evident part of the local cultural domain, at least not in the wider, popular imaginary. Yet a closer look at the historical evidence suggests that it is entirely justifiable to trace the lineage of Estonian cinema as a “national” phenomenon back at least to the 1960s, when it (re)emerged in a situation where the Estonian nation-state had been abolished politically by the Soviet regime, which at the same time had also been responsible for establishing the fully functioning system of film-making. Thus, in a nutshell, Soviet Estonian cinema was an immanently liminal phenomenon: during the immediate post-war years it was initially found and equipped, in terms of ideology, technology and manpower, by central Soviet authorities, yet in the early 1960s local film-makers, newly graduated from the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography in Moscow, along with Estonian writers, managed to turn it into a vehicle for producing indigenous, locally rooted culture. This transposition, however, was not entirely successful, as proposed above: because of the several Eastern (or, more precisely, Soviet) born transnational factors and influences which affected heavily the development of Soviet Estonian cinema, it remained relatively alienated from the core of the Estonian cultural body. On the other hand, the republic’s geographical location on the Western rim of the Soviet Union also introduced transnational elements of Western origin: Finnish TV and other (media) channels offered rather profound impulses to the Estonian cinematic ecology. This paper examines Soviet Estonian feature films production of the 1960s and seeks to demonstrate that while it was inseparably tied to the Union-wide, i.e. transnational, cinematic circuits, both in terms of policies and practices, themes and topics, the Estonian production nevertheless sculpted a distinctive, i.e. national, sensibility. The prevailing cinelandscape and filmic spaces of the period offer strikingly effective manifestations of these dialogues between national and transnational currents. I propose that the dominant and distinctive spatial orders of the Soviet Estonian feature films of the 1960s could be gathered under a single umbrella concept – motion. A specific sense of mobility, whether in regard to the increasing intellectual freedom and exchange, to the broadening cultural vistas or to the relative relaxing of repressive politics, indeed permeated the whole Soviet society during the “thaw” of Khrushchev’s tenure. Yet in Soviet Estonian cinema it became most apparent via two recurring and interlinked spatial motives – those of landscape and border, which, additionally, functioned as bearers and signifiers of local, i.e. national, identities and (hi)stories.

Evgenii Margolit, reckoning the distinctive elements of spatial representations in Soviet cinema during the Stalinist high point of the socialist realist discourse, argues that:

Cinelandscape at this time is static; it exists disconnected from the character, as a separate, and in the best cases, picturesque background. Landscapes depicting winter and summer are preferable to those that represent transitional seasons, which lack complete clarity, and are, therefore, less common. Movement is not encouraged: the world is interpreted as having attained its full realization, not as “becoming” but “has already become” to use Mikhail Bakhtin’s terminology (Margolit 2001: 31–32).

As the visual imagery of landscape is a forceful device of propaganda, easily subordinated to the service of communicating the messages of the dominant ideology (Sooväli 2008: 134), it is not surprising to discover that the above-described strategies of representation prevailed in the cinematic production all over the Soviet Union, including the imported film culture of Estonian SSR of the 1950s (in detail, see Näripea 2008). Heroic, static and monumental images of landscapes, however, disappeared gradually, first, in the mid-1950s, from the groundbreaking productions of larger (central) studios, such as Marlen Khutsiev and Feliks Mironer’s *Spring on Zarechnaya Street* (*Vesna na Zarečnoj ulice* 1956), Mikhail Kalatozov’s award-winning *The Cranes Are Flying* (*Letjat žuravli* 1957) or Grigori Chukhrai’s much-celebrated *Ballad of a Soldier* (*Ballada o soldate* 1959), and then, in the first part of the 1960s, also from the more peripheral works of the new generation of Soviet Estonian filmmakers. People and their everyday lives, divorced from the picturesque landscapes in Stalinist films, were reconnected with their surroundings, the nature. In Estonian cinema, this becomes apparent, first and foremost, in pictures which demonstrate people’s close relationship with nature and the immediate reliance of their livelihood on the gifts of nature, on the productivity of their agricultural and piscatory activities (depending on the setting of particular films). Thus, films like *Fellow-Villagers* (*Ühe küla mehed*, directed by Jüri Müür 1962), *Ice Drift* (*Jääminek*, directed by Kaljo Kiisk 1962) or *Letters from Sõgedate Village* (*Kirjad Sõgedate külast*, directed by Jüri Müür 1966) show that regardless of changes in political circumstances and ideological regime the people inhabiting the seaboard maintain, at least in some scope, their customary sources of substance and patterns of existence, which rely to a great

extent upon the seasonal rhythms, as well as upon the profound respect for the elements. Notably, these representations also testify to the tendency to annul, or at least discard from the centre of attention, the immediate (Soviet) realities – a practice dominating the spatial regime of narrative cinema throughout the decade, which found its expression in a relative indifference towards depicting contemporary life of kolkhozes; instead, film-makers preferred to conjure up the semi-mythic “ideal landscapes” of the interwar countryside, creating thus imaginary spaces of existence for the nation without a nation-state – veritable nation-scapes. Ironically, however, in a sense this tactic of ignorance also served to “normalise” these Soviet realities. At the same time, the plots of these films reveal that nature and the relationship between people and environment are also heavily invested with symbolism and allusions, which on some occasions and to a certain extent might be read as subversive of the established order. In both *Fellow-Villagers* and *Ice Drift*, for instance, nature is not merely a passive horizon, a simple backdrop; rather, it functions as an important trigger of events, an active narrative agent.

Fellow-Villagers, a film regarded by many commentators as the first “truly” Estonian production of the Soviet years (e.g. Elmanovitš 1995: 517–518), tells the story of a group of fishermen from a northern Estonian coastal village whose boat deviates from its course in a violent storm and drifts to the Finnish shores. The men find shelter with their Finnish peers, while also encountering a former fellow-villager Feliks Kandel, an émigré spy of an undefined “capitalist agency” who tries to induce his countrymen to stay in the West. Finally, however, despite this and several other enticements all the men return home safely. In this film, the storm is one of the main narrative mechanisms (the other being the intoxicated boat mechanic, who presumably fell prey to the corruptive influence of alcohol due to his severe conflict with the surrounding (Soviet) reality, causing the accident on the sea and setting thus in motion the entire chain of action. Facing the tempest, the men are powerless; they cannot control the nature because of the failure of the (Soviet) technology and lack of knowhow caused by the contaminative effect of the (socio-political) environment (i.e. the drunkard mechanic).

Equally crucial role of the elemental forces becomes apparent in the *Ice Drift*, a powerful film directed by one of the most important *auteurs* of Estonian cinema, Kaljo Kiisk, which owes much of its powerfully poetic imagery to the work of a Lithuanian cinematographer Algimantas Mockus. The story is about the struggle for survival of two clans, the Lautrikivis and

the Jõgels, inhabiting a small and remote Estonian island, which is taken over by a Nazi military unit during World War II. Typically, again, little attention is paid to the change of the political regime in the summer of 1940 when Estonia became, unwillingly, part of the Soviet Union. The long epilogue (just over seven minutes) introducing the families and the life on the island only casually mentions that after long years of rivalry the two kin-folks finally united their forces “when the times changed”, formed a collective household and began sharing each others’ property and expertise. The idyllic harmony, notably portrayed in the sunny and summerlike setting, is abruptly brought to an end by the sudden attack of the German troops in the summer of 1941 (which, quite tellingly, is signalled as the “beginning of the war”). After the young and able men leave the island in order to join the Soviet army, the remaining people, mainly the elderly and the women, are only protected by the island’s natural conditions: it is too small for planes to land and its rocky coastal waters are too dangerously shallow for bigger vessels to come ashore. Winter frosts, however, cover the sea with a sturdy surface of ice, creating a natural path for the Nazis to invade this last point of resistance. Winter, then, becomes a sign of hardships, as in many other Soviet films of the Thaw. According to Margolit, “Russian poetry of the Thaw legitimized in the reader’s consciousness winter and the plains as images of the State where life had become frozen” (Margolit 2001: 34). In the *Ice Drift*, the cycle of seasons is firmly intertwined with the story’s nodal points: winter signifies suffering and pain under the oppressive German rule, while the “totalitarian freeze” is followed by “the onset of spring and natural revival” (see Monastireva-Ansdell 2006: 248), which brings new hope for a better future. In the film, this is expressed literally by Laas Lautrikivi’s (the patriarchal head of one of the families) words, “Soon the ice melts and everything will rise to the surface because this is the way it has been determined”, by which he means that the Nazis will ultimately pay for the misery caused to the islanders. Visually, the hope for greater freedom is further emphasised by the (open) ending of the film: shots of foamy waves rolling over rocks imply the possibility of the villagers winning once again the liberty to earn their living by fishing and to sail the sea without restraints. The Germans are portrayed in the film as predatory and brutal lechers and drunkards, grotesquely cruel and perverse masks, rather than real human beings (also exemplified later in a TV miniseries *Dark Windows* (*Pimedad aknad* 1968) by Tõnis Kask). Their stupidity and ignorance becomes especially apparent in an episode where the old fishermen, attempting to resist the vulturine

Nazis by not catching enough fish to fill the German quotas of army provisions, are forced to go far away from the shore, despite the watery and breaking ice. The melting surface crumbles under their feet and they manage to escape the dangerous situation only by a stroke of luck.

Once again, then, nature's elemental forces function as a crucial narrative engine, and unlike the Stalinist cinema, which subordinated the nature as a landscape to the willpower of the almighty socialist realist hero, the films of the 1960s tend to emphasise the supremacy of nature over human agency. In Estonian context, one cannot but wonder if this new emphasis was perhaps perceived by the local audiences as a symbol of the unjust break of the "natural existence" of the independent nation-state. Did the contemporary audiences interpret the viciousness of the Nazis in the *Ice Drift* as a covert parallel to the repressions and brutalities of the Soviet invaders? Was the desolate and gloomy late-feudal countryside of the 1890s in *The Dairyman of Mäeküla* (*Mäeküla piimamees*, directed by Leida Laius 1965) seen as a symbolic equivalent of the "muddy roads, poverty, pilfering, alcoholism and hopelessness" (Kalm 2008: 61) of the contemporary kolkhoz landscape? Finally, when Jüri Müür declared after the first screening of the *Ice Drift* that "the sea, the heaven and the rocks play almost as important part as the human protagonists", did he latently refer to these territorial vehicles as signifiers or tokens of national cinema / local identity?

As noted by Margolit, during the Thaw the cinelandscape "became necessary for conveying and expressing man's inner world, that is, the journey of the human soul (to return to the initial meaning of the trite expression)" (Margolit 2001: 34–35). Indeed, besides the more general connotations indicated above, nature often served as a device for describing the internal universe of the characters, for conveying their emotional states and psychological conditions. For instance, in *Ice Drift*, Laas Lautrikivi's daughter Linda, who makes a desperate, yet only partially successful, attempt to save her father's life by becoming a mistress of the Nazi commander, is shown as a lonely figure standing against the background of a gigantic rock of ice when she witnesses the execution of Tõnis Jögel, the head of the other family. The ice signifies Linda's inner congealment, her symbolic death, since saving her father's life by scarifying her chastity, she betrayed her neighbours, her family and, ultimately, herself. In fact, later on Laas deems her a "cripple" and finally disowns her altogether. In *Werewolf* (*Libahunt*, directed by Leida Laius 1968), furthermore, the character of the protagonist, Tiina, is both visually and metaphorically constructed almost

entirely on the basis of various allegories of nature: water and fire refer to her powerfully independent and allusive personality; her untamed and thus dangerous sexuality is imagined through the comparison with the wilderness of the forests.

Movement/liminality: from the centre to periphery and beyond

While (rural) spaces of Stalinist cinema were, as a rule, highly static and relatively enclosed, functioning partly as instances of the Bakhtinian idyllic chronotope, in a sense that the “little spatial world is limited and sufficient unto itself, not linked in any intrinsic way with other places, with the rest of the world” (Bakhtin 2004: 225), the burgeoning Thaw saw increasingly transformative and dynamic approach to both urban and rural locations. For example, Moscow, formerly the Stalinist sacred centre (Clark 2003: 14), was portrayed by Marlen Khutsiev in *Ilich's Gate* (*Zastava Il'iča* 1962/1988) and in *July Rain* (*Ijul'skij dožd'* 1966) as well as by Giorgi Danelia in *I Walk Around Moscow* (*Ja šagaju po Moskve* 1963) (see Coxe 2005, Coxe 2008, Woll 2000: 209–210) as a vibrant, “personal, intimate and lyrical” space “in flux” (Coxe 2008: 215). Estonian cinema, too, concentrating mainly on the depictions of the countryside and natural environments, surpassed the inertia of the 1950s and obtained a refreshing flow, a sense of movement on various levels. First, similarly to the Soviet cinema of the Thaw in general, the film-scapes “acquired a lost dynamic and liberated itself from the inner frame” (Margolit 2001: 35), meaning that the cinematographic techniques gained a boost of mobility. Secondly and maybe even more importantly, however, in Estonian cinema in particular this change from Stalinist stagnation to a newly found vibrancy in terms of spatial representations – “space was physically opening up” (Woll 2000: 210) – is perhaps best explained through two partially overlapping concepts: the Bakhtinian chronotope of the road and the notion of liminality.

In the context of the “new” Estonian cinema of the 1960s in general, and of the shifting spatial discourses in particular, the importance of *Mid-day Ferry*, a film directed by Kaljo Kiisk in 1967, is best revealed by adapting Bakhtin's concept of the road chronotope. This film, being often identified as the first and only “disaster movie” ever produced by the Soviet Estonian cinema, was certainly a good example of the new narrative form, which

bears certain traces of likeness to the narrative strategies of the so-called new wave cinemas in both Eastern and Western Europe (especially relevant parallels can be drawn with Roman Polański's *Knife in the Water* (*Nóż w wodzie* 1961), but any deeper analysis of these links remains regrettably beyond the scope of this paper). According to Valdeko Tobro, a contemporary Estonian film critic:

Instead of following the rules of traditional narrative form, the script [of the *Midday Ferry* – E. N.] testifies of the author's intention to observe actual, realistic characters in actual, realistic situations, that is, his desire to observe reality and give sense to its inner, latent processes. The position formerly held by carefully constructed plot is now taken over by flow of real events: the road brings people to the harbour, they embark the ferry, fire breaks out, people react to the situation according to their characters, the danger is eliminated, the ferry reaches its destination and everybody go their separate ways again. The characters have been constructed in a similar way. Although the stereotypical narrative patterns require gradual opening of characters or their changing caused by the central events, in *Midday Ferry* they enter the story as they are and remain the same throughout its course. The author is first and foremost interested in how they react to the situation; who they are is a question left for the audiences to answer. (Tobro 1967, original emphasis).

The opening tracking shot, creating a circular pan around a signpost on a rural crossroad, establishes road as the main chronotope of the film. As Alexandra Ganser, Julia Pühringer and Markus Rheindorf have observed, "In some chronotopes, mainly those of travel and uprooted modern life, time takes precedence over space; in the more idyllic, pastoral chronotopes, space dominates time" (Ganser et al. 2006: 2). Indeed, in *Midday Ferry*, time is in a way more important than space, since the apogeic event of the film – the fire on the ferry in the middle of the sea – is set by one of the nameless characters, the Boy who in the beginning of the film drops, by accident, a burning cigarette bud to a truck carrying a load of cotton. The truck embarks the ferry and the audience, who is, contrarily to the characters, aware of the smouldering danger, can almost hear the time ticking away, closer and closer to the unavoidable disaster. Moreover, in relation to the road Bakhtin also describes the chronotope of chance: "Should something happen a minute earlier or a minute later, that is, should there be no chance simultaneity or chance disjunctions in time, there would be no plot at all" (Bakhtin 2004: 92). This is exactly the case in *Midday Ferry* (although the plot is relatively loose here, as demonstrated above): the Boy comes across the truck completely by accident – he and the Girl find it standing at

the crossroad and spontaneously decide to continue their apparently quite random journey as stowaways in its trailer.

Additionally, Bakhtin proposes that the chronotope of the road (“the open road”) is closely connected with the “motif of meeting”, especially important being the accidental encounters of people who are otherwise “separated by social and spatial distance” (Ganser et al 2006: 3), or, in Bakhtin’s words, “any contrast may crop up, the most various fates may collide and interweave with one another” (Bakhtin 2004: 243). A local critic K. Riik has counted that *Midday Ferry* presents altogether 38 characters, “none of whom is the protagonist” (Riik 1967: 17), and, even more importantly, none of whom has a name. All of them are people from strikingly diverse backgrounds, they have different personalities and various, sometimes severely contrasting, world-views: e.g. a curvy blonde hairdresser, a divorcee and a single parent, who after working in a cheap railway salon has managed to seduce and marry a respectable, if somewhat spineless, professor; a disabled war veteran with a little girl whose mother is more interested in men than her offspring; a party of young “beatniks”; a group of female linguistics students; a couple of fishermen; a pair of pilots; the nameless couple – the Boy and the Girl – who sneak onboard as stowaways, etc. Their only common denominator is the fact that they are on their way from the mainland to an island, Muhu, to celebrate the summer solstice. According to the chronotopic classification of road movies proposed by Ganser, Pühringer and Rheindorf *Midday Ferry* belongs to the category of “road as setting”, which “charges the road with the function of a meeting place for characters who would otherwise perhaps never meet” (Ganser et al. 2006: 7). In the “course of travelling the roadies’ personalities, stories and backgrounds are revealed”, “their fates are intertwined, if only for a short while”. However, no “change of personal development ... triggered off by a fellow traveller” (Ganser et al. 2006: 7) occurs in the *Midday Ferry*; quite the opposite, as witnessed by Riik, “No-one transforms from Saul to Paul or vice versa, nobody changes or grows, by the end of the film everyone remains as they appeared on the screen in the beginning. Only we know them better now – the danger of fire has shed a revealing light on them, one by one” (Riik 1967: 17).

Midday Ferry is thus a good example of one successful strategy for setting the spatial inertia of the Stalinist socialist realism into motion again. However, its youthful buoyancy, accentuated by a jazzy musical score, remained a relatively exceptional case, and it was unquestionably the purest

manifestation of the road chronotope in the Soviet Estonian cinema of the 1960s. Still, many other films, too, contained journeys between different times and/or spaces, inviting the introduction of the concept of liminality into the discussion at hand. Estonian territory, forming alongside the other two Baltic countries on the westernmost rim of the Soviet Union, is due to its distinctive geographical properties – its area of 45,228 square kilometres is outlined by 23,794 kilometres of coastline and contains, in addition to the mainland, about 1,500 islands and islets – especially susceptible to interpretations relating to borders, frontiers, a particular kind of in-between-ness and transitions. Liminality, one could argue, is an intrinsic part of local Estonian identities, whether national, territorial or historical. Therefore, it is not surprising to find that the images – whether literal or symbolic – of borders and edges, perimeters and thresholds, margins and fringes hold a significant position in the Estonian cinema of the 1960s. Naturally, these images were directly and closely connected to the geographical, but also political realities, and in the 1960s they were not a novelty as a subject of cinematic representation. Yet while the films of the 1950s were eager to mask this liminality, to connect the periphery strongly with the umbilical cord of the central, Muscovite authorities, in the 1960s the liminality became to function as an existential attribute of a local territoriality and identity. In what follows I will attempt to consider some of the most apparent manifestations of this phenomenon.

In terms of spatial representations, borders were one of the most vivid symbols throughout the Soviet Estonian cinema: it could occur as the line of the impenetrable Iron Curtain, carefully guarded by military forces *Yachts at Sea* (*Jahid merel*, directed by Mikhail Egorov 1955), or as a porous division between two worlds through which the capitalist spies, Western consumer goods and alien ideologies infiltrate the Soviet Union (*Uninvited Guests* (*Kutsumata külalised*), directed by Igor Eltsov 1959; *Underwater Reefs* (*Veealusel karid*), directed by Viktor Nevežin 1959; *Fellow-Villagers*, etc.). The topic of borders came especially to the fore from the mid-1950s on, indicating a shift towards Khrushchev's "thaw" that was characterised by a slightly more diverse, although no less slanted spatial model, compared to the socialist realist discourse of space, which had been mainly based on the following notions: 1) "tourist gaze", designating a static, hierarchical, tamed and reified view of landscape; 2) conquest of territory – influencing not only the actual terrain but also penetrating the lives and minds of people inhabiting them (both the tourist gaze and the conquest of territory

are theorized in the context of Soviet cinema by Emma Widdis; see Widdis 2000, 2003a and 2003b); 3) binary spatial patterns (above all, center versus periphery), and closed and static “sacralised” space, as suggested by Katerina Clark (2003). While in the films of the late 1940s and early 1950s (and in Soviet Russia already during the 1930s) the border had become “an increasingly important symbol of might and security, a protective divide from the encroaching evils of the Capitalist West” (Widdis 2003: 402), since the mid-1950s it doesn’t seem to hold that tightly any more, and the seductive ooze of subversive Western influences is particularly strong on the Baltic hem of the USSR: spies, tantalising capitalist commodities and dissident ideologies penetrate the Iron Curtain (even though not yet very successfully) in films like *Uninvited Guests*, *Underwater Reefs* etc.

While the Soviet Russian cinema of the Thaw often abandoned the iconic and sacral centres (e.g. *Spring on Zarechnaya Street*; see, e.g. Margolit 2001: 35, Woll 2000: 45–50), and focused its attention to the periphery, which, unlike the centre, was not “corrupted by totalitarian culture” (Prokhorov 2007: 127), then the already peripheral cinema of Soviet Estonia – spatially or otherwise – went to further (spatial) extremes, and sometimes crossed the (state) borders altogether, as, for example, in the *Fellow-Villagers* where most of the story is set in Finland. The border, then, which had been “a protective divide” as proposed by Widdis in Stalinist years, became – as in the avant-garde and revolutionary Soviet Union of the 1920s – a “point of transition or contact with the world beyond”, “a metaphorically fluid and breachable frontier” (Widdis 2000: 403). But unlike in the Soviet Union of the 1920s, in the 1960s Estonia this was not an act of reaching out to the international proletariat, rather, from the Estonians’ point of view, it signalled re-emerging contacts with the Western world, which was seen as the genuine “home” of the local culture. In fact, it is highly likely that the slight opening of the Iron Curtain, via Finland to the rest of the West, had a considerably positive effect on the “rebirth” of the Estonian national culture on the brink of the 1960s.

As maintained by an Estonian artist Enn Põldroos, even the most trivial signs from the world outside the iron cage of the USSR, “some empty foreign cremetube washed ashore from the sea, became a mysterious envoy generating fantasies from another universe”:

One had a weird feeling that Russia and all what belonged to it remained outside the notion “world”, “humanity”, “world culture”. The world was all that “Other” that was outside, hidden by the present and a devotedly studied past. It was

a world that sometimes sent us messages, some plastic things floated in the sea, some interrupted piece of melody (Pöldroos 2001: 99).

The seaside, but even more so the islands, which manifested the ultimate Western frontier of the USSR, held a prominent position in the Estonian cinema of the 1960s, as already demonstrated in the discussion above. Several films, such as *Fellow-Villagers*, *Ice Drift*, *Letters from Sõgedate Village*, *Girl in Black* (*Tütarlaps mustas*, directed by Veljo Käsper 1966), *Mid-day Ferry*, *Gladiator* (*Gladiaator*, directed by Veljo Käsper 1969), are set in fishing villages either on the coast or on the islands. Repeated shots of waterfronts, rocky beaches caressed by splashing waves visually emphasise the motif of border. At the same time, though, these images mask and distort the actual situation of life in border zones, which were in fact carefully guarded by the Soviet army. In reality, the authorities imposed rigorous restrictions to both the native inhabitants of the coastal regions and visitors to seaside areas, while, as a complete contrast, the cinematic representations of the seaside function as illusionary “ideal landscapes”, the ultimate objective of which is to re-assure a certain continuity of the ideologically charged notion of homeland and the sustainability of the (local/national) identities connected to it. These filmic coastal images could be easily read as full of longing for opportunities lost in the turmoil of history, which, for instance, becomes especially apparent in the epilogue of the *Ice Drift*, the opening sequence of *Letters from Sõgedate Village* and in the extremely poetic cinematography of *Girl in Black* (see Unt 1967). Latently, then, the images of open, apparently freely accessible sea actually emphasise a sense of enclosure, the painful awareness of virtually overwhelming restrictions. Tiina Peil argues pointedly that:

The sea that had been open and wide was closed off and became the sea that separated as a result of the Second World War. <...> The contacts with other coasts were reduced to a minimum for several decades. The seashore turned into a place for dreaming, into a place where it was possible to let your thoughts fly in solitude, even if people were confined to never leaving for the other shores (Peil 1999: 445).

In addition to these depictions of divisions between land and water, manifesting the separation of East and West, history and present, the cinematic representations of liminality also appear on other levels and different frameworks, both in terms of general conceptual/symbolic structures and particular territorial configurations. For example, in *Werewolf*, the border runs between the forest and the village, between the freedom of the former

and the trammels of civilization of the latter, or, according to Mardi Valgemäe who draws pertinent parallels with ancient Greek mythology, between darkness and light, between the Dionysian ecstasism of the former and the Apollonian serenity and the equilibrium of the latter (Valgemäe 1995: 69). The story, set in the early 19th century, is about Tiina, a girl whose mother had been accused of witchcraft and burnt on the stake. Orphaned and lonely, she sought refuge with a family in the village, the Tammarus. They took her in and she grew up with their son, Margus, and another adopted daughter, Mari. Reaching adolescence, Margus fell deeply in love with Tiina's vibrant, passionate and attractive personality, and decided to marry her. His parents, however, taken aback by Tiina's untamed character, suspecting her of having inherited her mother's supernatural powers and being convinced that she is a werewolf, forced him, instead, to marry Mari, the blonde and gentle, yet somewhat insipid and cold stepsister. Tiina, overwhelmed by the betrayal, then ran away to the woods. Years later, wolves came to the farm and howled near the barn. Margus, attempting to scare them off by shooting at them, discovered to his horror that, instead of the wolves, the bullet had fatally wounded Tiina. Thus, the film is not only about the borders and oppositions between the wilderness of the woods, which stands for Tiina's unhindered and bold strive for personal freedom (and which, historically, was known to protect the last remaining point of resistance of the pre-war republic – the guerrilla forces of the so-called Forest Brothers), and the superstitious and ultra-conservative village, which symbolises the repressive and subjugative order of the "civilized society" (cf. Remsu 1986) – an opposition which so easily lends itself to interpretations such as individual versus collective, and thus, by extension, Estonian/local versus Soviet, Us versus Them; its importance to the discussion at hand lies also in Tiina's figure as a liminal character *par excellence* – the werewolf is a transitory, unstable creature, an outcast of the society whose danger in this particular instance is first and foremost associated with her sexuality. Since in the Soviet society the latter was carefully controlled by the mechanisms of approved codes of morality (but also legally, as homosexuality, for example, was considered a criminal offence), Tiina's character can also be seen as subversive towards the ruling political regime, even if at the moment of the film's premiere (January 1969) the system was still flexible enough to accommodate this digression. Moreover, Laius's *oeuvre* in general is important as marking the appearance of clearly gendered and sexualised identities in Estonian cinema, expanding thus the representational range of cinematic identities.

Similar contacts with otherworldly locations and characters, as well as leaky borders between different orders of existence can also be found in *The Misadventures of the New Satan* (*Põrgupõhja uus Vanapagan*, directed by Grigori Kromanov and Jüri Müür 1964), an adaptation of a novel from 1939 by an Estonian literary classic A. H. Tammsaare, which in its turn is based on figures and tales from Estonian mythology. It is a story about the Devil himself coming to Earth to investigate if a human being is capable of leading an honest life and earn his/her place in the Heaven. The greater portion of the film is set on a farm, hidden deep into the woods, where the Devil works hard and tries his best to be a good Christian. Being lamentably outsmarted by Kaval-Ants (Clever-Hans), he finally returns, beaten, to Hell. The doors to the metaphysical realms of Heaven, shown in the opening sequence, the earthly countryside with fields and woods, standing for the eternal cycle of life and death, the sacral space of the vicarage, the bureaucratic domain of the community office, the space of science represented by a doctor's office, and Kaval-Ants's ample household, signifying the power of money/capitalism, constitute a spatial universe decisively different from the Soviet realities and symbolising the local idiosyncrasies, identities and territorialities. *Madness* (*Hullumeelsus*), on the other hand, Kaljo Kiisk's much-celebrated "Dürrenmattian political model drama" (Kärk 1995: 115) from 1968, employs the liminal world of a madhouse in order to present a strikingly sharp criticism of totalitarian system. Conceived and presented to the institutions of censorship as an antifascist work, its subversive Aesopian language was not subtle enough to deceive the ideological wardens, and it was immediately denied a screening license outside the Estonian SSR.

Finally, liminality does not have to appear as only or particularly a spatial phenomenon; it can also manifest itself in temporal forms. In Estonian films of the 1960s, it might thus additionally be recognised as the in-between-ness of historical situations, whether real or imagined. First and foremost, it is exemplified by the numerous representations of war, mainly World War II, which must have been felt by the Estonian people as an unreal time of dramatic shifts and immense trauma, overshadowed by suspense and uncertainty for future. Secondly, the latently present past of the previous era of independent statehood, discernible in so many films of the decade as argued above, provides another case of temporal liminality, functioning as an example of imaginary border-crossing.

Conclusion

This initial and introductory investigation of spatial representations in Estonian narrative cinema of the 1960s indicate that the abolition of Stalinist and socialist realist modes of representations in the beginning of the decade resulted in a whole range of changes in both visual and narrative aspects of the local film production. The simplistic stories of socialist heroes, typically triumphing over the elements as well as the bygone ideologies, reducing both rural and urban settings into static, illustrative backgrounds, and often brought to the silver screen under the direction of centrally delegated filmmakers from Russia, were replaced by narratives and devices of representation displaying more dynamic, intimate and symbolically complex relationships between an extended gallery of characters and their environs, and drawing hitherto unthinkable parallels – weather overtly or covertly – between settings, historic events, past eras, and (national) identities, bringing thus the cinematic spaces into a state of flux. Subtly shifting emphasis from centre to peripheries, evoking borders and even the world beyond them, drawing attention to transitions and in-between spaces, margins and liminal spheres, the work of Estonian filmmakers in the 1960s conceived a universe which was in synch with wider social and cultural transformations of the region. Although the changes in visual and narrative form of Estonian films were probably not as dramatic as in other Eastern European cinemas or even in the production of major Soviet studios, they were still certainly discernible as evidences of a newborn cinematic culture, which was deeply influenced by contemporary filmmaking practices of its neighbouring countries in both socialist and capitalist domain, but which nevertheless developed a distinctive voice and look of its own, perhaps most noticeably by means of its characteristic spatial configurations.

As hopefully demonstrated above, the study of spatial representations reveals in relief that it is entirely possible and plausible to discuss Soviet Estonian cinema as a phenomenon pertaining to the field of national culture. The portrayals of Estonian territory, its characteristic land-, sea- and mnemoscapes as seen in the cinema of the 1960s provide a reasonably strong case for arguing that despite the lack of nation-state on the one hand and the rigorous regulations of Soviet cinema authorities on the other hand, the local cultural agencies managed to establish a specific representational order which bears clear traces of local idiosyncracies. Even though not always recognised by contemporary audiences and critics as such, and re-

ardless of its close ties with regional/Soviet/transnational ideologies and cinematic practices (links to which the essay at hand has managed to refer only briefly), Estonian cinema of the 1960s constitutes the beginnings of a distinctively local, although by no means isolated, tradition which continues, albeit in variations, throughout the rest of the Soviet period and even beyond it, and which deserves much more academic attention than has been paid to it thus far.

References

1. Bakhtin, M. 2004. Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel. In M. Bakhtin, M. Holquist (Ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press: 84–258.
2. *Baltic Films: Facts & Figures* (2008). Retrieved from <http://www.efsa.ee/public/files/Facts%26Figures%202008.pdf>.
3. Clark, K. 2003. Socialist Realism and the Sacralizing of Space. In E. Dobrenko, & E. Naiman (Eds.), *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*: 3–18.
4. Coxe, B. T. 2005. An imprint of the times: Marlen Khutsiev's *July Rain* and the end of the Thaw. *Ulbundus: The Slavic Review of Columbia University*: 30–47.
5. Coxe, B. T. 2008. Screening 1960s Moscow: Marlen Khutsiev's *Ilich's Gate*. *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc* (Eds. E. Näripea, & A. Trossek), special issue of *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics VII*: 213–227.
6. Elmanovitš, T. 1995. Grigori Kromanovi filmid. In I. Veisaitė-Kromanova (Ed.), *Lavastaja Grigori Kromanov. Mälestused. Artiklid. Kirjad. Päevikud*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat: 517–532.
7. Ganser, A., Pühriinger, J., & Rheindorf, M. 2006. Bakhtin's Chronotope on the Road: Space, Time, and Place in Road Movies since the 1970s. *Facta Universitatis. Series: Linguistics and Literature* 4(1): 1–17.
8. Kalm, M. 2008. Ons linnael maal hea? Majandi keskasula Eesti NSV-s / Is Urban Life in the Countryside Good? The Central Settlements of Collective Farms in the Estonian SSR. *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi / Studies in Art and Architecture / Studien für Kunstwissenschaft* 17(4): 61–87.
9. Kärk, L. 1995. Mida oleks hea teada ajaloost? Eesti filmiloo lühikonspekt. *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 8–9: 114–123.
10. Margolit, E. 2001. Landscape, with hero. In A. Prokhorov (Ed.), *Springtime for Soviet cinema: Re/viewing the 1960s*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Russian Film Symposium: 29–50.
11. Mazierska, E. 2008. *Masculinities in Polish, Czech and Slovak Cinema: Black Peters and Men of Marble*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
12. Meri, H.-P. 2008. *Tagasivaateid veerevast vagunist*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
13. Meri, L. 1968. Suur üksiklane. *Sirp ja Vasar*.
14. Monastireva-Ansdell, E. 2006. Redressing the commissar: Thaw Cinema Revises Soviet Structuring Myths. *The Russian Review* 65(2): 230–249.
15. Näripea, E. 2008. A View from Periphery. Spatial Discourse of the Soviet Estonian Feature Film: the 1940s and 1950s. *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc* (Eds. E. Näripea, & A. Trossek), special issue of *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics VII*: 193–210.

16. Peil, T. 1999. *Islescapes: Estonian Small Islands through Three Centuries*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
17. Põldroos, E. 2001. *Mees narrimütsiga*. Tallinn: Kunst.
18. Prokhorov, A. 2001. The Unknown New Wave: Soviet Cinema of the 1960s. In A. Prokhorov (Ed.), *Springtime for Soviet cinema: Re/viewing the 1960s*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Russian Film Symposium: 7–28.
19. Prokhorov, A. 2007. The Adolescent and the Child in the Cinema of the Thaw. *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema* 1(2): 115–130.
20. Remsu, O. 1986. Aastad ja filmid. Essee Leida Laiusest. *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 11: 20–33.
21. Riik, K. 1967. “Keskpäevane praam”. *Kultuur ja Elu* 5: 16–18.
22. Säde, E. 2008. Enn säde silmist ja meelest. *Sirp*, 6 June: 10.
23. Sooväli, H. 2008. Maastiku kirurgia. *Vikerkaar* 7–8: 130–137.
24. Tammer, E. (Ed.). 2008. *Nõukogude piir ja lukus elu. Meie mälestused*. Tallinn: Tammerraamat.
25. Tobro, V. 1967. “Keskpäevane praam”. *Õhtuleht*, 7 June: 4.
26. Tomberg, D. 2006. Tühirand ja maailma äär. Mati Undi “Tühirand” ja “Võlg” filmis. *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 3: 95–103.
27. Tüür, K. 2002. Those who Love (in) the Woods. *Koht ja paik / Place and Location* (Eds. V. Sarapik, K. Tüür, & M. Laanemets). *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Arts* 10: 488–498.
28. Unt, L. 2005. Meri ja mere pilt. In T. Maran, & K. Tüür (Eds.), *Eesti looduskultuur* (pp. 120–150). Tartu: Eesti Kultuuriloo ja Folkloristika Keskus, Eesti Kirjandusmuuseum.
29. Unt, M. 1967. “Tütarlaps mustas”. *Edasi*, 5 February: 5.
30. Valgemäe, M. 1995. Rituaalteatrist ja “Libahundist”. In M. Valgemäe, *Linn ja teater. Lavamärkmeid mitmelt maalt*. Tallinn: Vagabund: 59–72.
31. Viitung, R. 2007. “Võlg” (Eesti Telefilm, 1966). *Eesti filmid*. Retrieved from <http://eestifilmid.blogspot.com/2007/04/vlg-est-telefilm-1966.html>.
32. Widdis, E. 2000. Borders: The Aesthetic of Conquest in Soviet Cinema of the 1930s. *Journal of European Studies* xxx: 401–411.
33. Widdis, E. 2003a. To Explore or Conquer? Mobile Perspectives on the Soviet Cultural Revolution. In E. Dobrenko, & E. Naiman (Eds.) *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press: 219–240.
34. Widdis, E. 2003b. *Visions of a New Land: Soviet Film from the Revolution to the Second World War*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
35. Woll, J. 2000. *Real Images: Soviet Cinema and the Thaw*. London, New York: I. B. Tauris.

Motion pictures

1. Chukhrai, G. (Director). 1959. *Ballad of a Soldier (Ballada o soldate)* [Motion picture]. Soviet Russia: Mosfilm.
2. Danelia, G. (Director). 1963. *Ja šagaju po Moskve* [Motion picture]. Soviet Russia: Mosfilm.
3. Egorov, M. (Director). 1955. *Jahid merel* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinna Kinostudio.
4. Eltsov, I. (Director). 1959. *Kutumata külalised* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinna Kinostudio.
5. Eltsov, I. (Director). 1963. *Ühe katuse all* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
6. Himbek, V. (Director). 1966. *Võlg* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Eesti Telefilm.
7. Kalatozov M. (Director). 1957. *The Cranes Are Flying (Letjat žuravli)* [Motion picture]. Soviet Russia: Mosfilm.

8. Kask, T. (Director). 1968. *Pimedad aknad* [TV miniseries]. Soviet Estonia: Eesti Telefilm.
9. Käsper, V. (Director). 1966. *Tütarlaps mustas* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
10. Käsper, V. (Director). 1969. *Gladiatuur* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
11. Khutsiev, M., & Mironer, F. (Directors) 1956. *Vesna na Zarečnoj ulice* [Motion picture]. Soviet Ukraine: Odessa Film Studio.
12. Khutsiev, M. (Director). 1962/1988. *Zastava Il'iča* [Motion picture]. Soviet Russia: Gorky Film Studio.
13. Khutsiev, M. (Director). 1966. *Ijul'skij dožd'* [Motion picture]. Soviet Russia: Mosfilm.
14. Kiisk, K. (Director). 1962. *Jääminek* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
15. Kiisk, K. (Director). 1967. *Keskpäevane praam* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
16. Kiisk, K. (Director). 1968. *Hullumeelsus* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
17. Kromanov, G. & Müür, J. (Directors). 1964. *Põrgupõhja uus Vanapagan* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
18. Kruusement, A. (Director). 1969. *Kevade* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm
19. Laius, L. (Director). 1965. *Mäeküla piimamees* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
20. Laius, L. (Director). 1968. *Libahunt* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
21. Müür, J. (Director). 1962. *Ühe küla mehed* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
22. Müür, J. (Director). 1962. *Ühe küla mehed* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
23. Müür, J. (Director). 1966. *Kirjad Sõgedate külast* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinnfilm.
23. Nevežin, V. (Director). 1959. *Veealused karid* [Motion picture]. Soviet Estonia: Tallinna Kinostuudio.
24. Polański, R. (Director). 1961. *Nóż w wodzie* [Motion picture]. Poland: Zespół Filmowy Kamera.

Abstract

The recent upsurge of Estonian cinema, characterised by an increased number of productions as well as by the remarkable success of these productions both at international film festivals and in the domestic box-office, has left the broader audiences with a strong conviction that Estonian cinema as a national cinema was not born until after the Estonian state was re-established in the early 1990s. This reflects eloquently the fact that a whole branch and period of the Estonian culture – Soviet Estonian cinema – is to this date not recognised as a self-evident part of Estonian national culture, at least not in the wider, popular imaginary. This paper examines Soviet Estonian narrative cinema of the 1960s and seeks to demonstrate that while it was inseparably tied to the Union-wide, i.e. transnational, cinematic circuits, both in terms of policies and practices, themes and topics, Estonian cinema still succeeded in sculpting a distinctive, i.e. national, sensibility. This dynamic, in my opinion, is manifested in a strikingly clear manner through dominant spatial representations of the period's production. The portrayals of Estonian territory, its characteristic land-, sea- and mnescapes as seen in the cinema of the 1960s provides a reasonably strong case for arguing that despite the lack of a nation-state on the one hand and the rigorous regulations of Soviet cinema authorities on the other hand, the local cultural agencies managed to establish a specific representational order which bears clear traces of local idiosyncrasies.

Santrauka

Dabartinis Estijos kino pakilimas ir pasiekimai tarptautiniuose kino festivaliuose bei populiarumas Estijoje įtvirtino tam tikros visuomenės dalies nuostatą, kad Estijos kinas, kaip nacionalinis fenomenas, nebuvo susiformavęs iki 1990-ųjų, kai Estija vėl tapo nepriklausoma valstybe. Tai byloja, kad ištisa Estijos kultūros šaka ir laikotarpis – sovietinės Estijos kinas – iki šiol nėra pripažintas kaip integrali Estijos nacionalinės kultūros dalis, bent jau plačiuosiuose visuomenės sluoksniuose. Straipsnyje analizuojamas septintojo dešimtmečio sovietinės Estijos kinas siekiant parodyti, kad nors ši kultūros šaka buvo stipriai susaistytą tarybinių reikalavimų, ji vis dėlto sugebėjo reprezentuoti ir įkomponuoti nacionalinius bruožus. Autoriaus nuomone, ši dinamika pirmiausia atsiskleidžia per erdvės pristatymą to meto kinematografijoje. Estijos teritorijos vaizdavimas, jos bruožų, kraštovaizdžio, jūros pabrėžimas, kaip matyti septintojo dešimtmečio kine, suteikia tvirtą pagrindą argumentuoti, kad, nepaisant nepriklausomybės praradimo ir griežtų sovietinio kino cenzorių reikalavimų, šalyje sugebėta sukurti specifinę kinematografijos kalbą, aiškiai pabrėžiančią Estijos savitumą.

Film, ruum ja
narratiiv:
“Mis juhtus
Andres Lapeteusega?”
ning “Viini postmark”

Film, Space and
Narrative:
‘What Happened
to Andres Lapeteus?’
and ‘The Postage-Stamp
of Vienna’

A facsimile of an article published in

Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi /
Studies on Art and Architecture,
vol. 15 (4), 2006, pp. 55–75

Film, ruum ja narratiiv: “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?” ning “Viini postmark”

Eva Näripea

Artikkel vaatleb jutustuse esitusviise, täpsemalt iseloomulike aegruumide loomist mängufilmides, lähenedes sellele pea lõputuid variatsioone sisaldavale probleemataikale kahe juhtumi analüüsi kaudu: käsitletakse filme “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?” (1966) ja “Viini postmark” (1967). Tegevustiku geograafilisele ja ajalisele lähedusele vaatamata esindavad need filmid kaht võrdlemisi erinevat ruumi ja narratiivi sidumise võimalust, millest esimene tugineb põhiliselt kaameratööle ja montaažile, teine aga dekoratsioonide ehitatud keskkonnale.

Film loob oma tunnusliku kronotoobi Mihail Bahtini mõistes,¹ mis markeerib jutustatava loo ajalise-ruumilise karkassi (tegevuse aeg ja koht), määratleb tegevusi ja suhteid, vahendades mitmesuguseid üldisemaid sõnumeid ning väärtushinnanguid. Selle kõrval, mida kujutatakse, peab silmas pidama ka viisi, kuidas seda tehakse. Filmikunsti käsutuses on mitmekesine seadmestik, aparaat, millega luuakse kahemõõtmelisel ekraanil kolmemõõtmeline maailm, “tihendades ning laiendades ruumi ja aega”², ning mis manipuleerib nii filmi vormiliste kui ka si-

suliste aspektidega. See on kogum efektiivseid tehnikaid ja meetodeid³, mis mõjutavad olulisel määral filmiteksti kui terviku tähendusmustreid. Kõrvuti narratiiviga moodustavad kaameratöö, montaaž, misanstseeni erinevad elemendid ja heli vormisüsteemi, mis on vältimatult sõnumit loov tegur⁴,

1 Vt. nt. M. Bahtin, *Aja ning kronotoobi vormid* romaanis. Ajaloolise poeetika põhijooni. – M. Bahtin, *Valitud töid*. Koost. P. Torop. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 1987, lk. 44–184.

2 J. Hopkins, *A Mapping of Cinematic Places: Icons, Ideology, and the Power of (Mis)representation*. – Place, Power, Situation, and Spectacle: *A Geography of Film*. Eds. S. S. Aitken, L. E. Zonn. Lanham, London: Rowman & Littlefield, 1994, lk. 47. Vt. ka M. Bahtin, *Aja ning kronotoobi vormid* romaanis, lk. 44.

3 Üks 1970.–1980. aastate juhtivaid filmiteaduse viiteraamistikke oli “aparaadi teooria” (ingl. *apparatus theory*), mis võrsus semiootikast ja psühhoanalüüsist, põhinedes esmajoones Jacques Lacani ja Louis Althusseri ideedel. Aparadi teooria järgi hõlmab “seadmestik” lisaks kujutisi tekitavatele meetodeile ja tehnikale ka kõikvõimalikke sotsiaalseid tegureid, “reprodutseerimis- ja levirežiime, kohti, kus need on kättesaadavad, ning meediasid, mis neid eetrisse annavad ja levitavad” (J. Aumont, *The Image*. Trans. C. Pajackowska. London: British Film Institute, 1997, lk. 99). Teedrajavaid kirjutisi oli Jean-Louis Baudry essees “Effets idéologiques produits par l’appareil de base” 1970. aastast (ingl. J.-L. Baudry, *Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematic Apparatus*. – *Film Quarterly* 1974/75, Vol. 27, lk. 39–47); samuti Jean-Pierre Oudart’i 1969. aastal ilmunud “La suture” (ingl. J.-P. Oudart, *Cinema and Suture*. – *Screen* 1977–1978, Vol. 18 (4), lk. 35–47). Põhitextide hulka kuuluvad nt. ka J.-L. Comolli, *Technique et idéologie. Caméra, perspective, profondeur de champ*. – *Cahiers du cinéma* 1971, nr. 229–1972, nr. 241; J.-L. Baudry, *L’effet-cinéma*. Paris: Albatros, 1978. Vt. ka *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader*. Ed. P. Rosen. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

4 Vt. nt. D. Bordwell, K. Thompson, *Film Art: An Introduction*. Seventh Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004, lk. 175jj; J. Gibbs, D. Pye, *Introduction*. – *Style and Meaning: Studies in the Detailed Analysis of Film*. Eds. J. Gibbs, D. Pye. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, 2005, lk. 10.

seada nii autori kui ka vaataja seisukohalt⁵.

Need vormielemendid on ajas ja ruumis, erinevatel perioodidel ja geograafilistes punktides pidevalt muutunud, moodustades mängufilmides jutustustega üha uusi ja pea alati unikaalseid kooslusi. Siinne kirjutus seab sihiks analüüsida jutustuse esitusviise, s.t. filmi aegruumi loomist juhtumi analüüsi vormis, vaadeldes ja võrreldes kaht filmi: “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?”⁶ ja “Viini postmark”⁷. Mind huvitab, mil moel neis filmides ruumiaspekte kasutatakse ning kas ja kuidas põimuvad kujutatud keskkonnad narratiivi jõujoontega, teviidaks on David Bordwelli väide, et teose “sisu jõuab meieni [film] tehniliste võtete sihipärase kasutamise vahendusel”⁸, ning nõukogude sulaja filmi uriija Alexander Prokhorovi teesid⁹.

Eesti kontekstis peetakse 1960. aastaid “rahvusfilmi taassünniajaks”,¹⁰ mil Moskvas ja Leningradis erialase hariduse saanud loojad võtsid üle teatempelga siinset filmitegemist Teise maailmasõja järgseil kümnendeil valitsenud külalisautorite (peamiselt -režissööride) käest. Samas jäi filmikunst kultuuriareenil endiselt “suure üksiklase” rolli, nagu tõdes Lennart Meri 1968. aastal.¹¹ “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?”, aga mõneti ka “Viini postmark” kuuluvad siiski selliste linatoste hulka, mis mingil moel suutsid publiku ja kriitikute tähelepanu võita: “Lapeteus” kindlasti seetõttu, et oli ju 1963. aastal ilmunud Paul Kuusbergi romaangi (“Andres Lapeteuse juhtum”) saanud ideoloogiliselt kahtlust äratava teosena poleemilis-positiivse vastuvõtu osaliseks¹², režissöör Grigori Kromanov oli Jüri Müüri kõrval pälvinud heakskiitva hoiaku “Põrgupõhja uue Vanapagana” (1964) eest ning kokkuvõttes oli Kuusbergi mõnevõrra žurnalistliku stiili ülekandmine ekraanile toimunud “kadudeta”¹³ saades ehk visuaalselt üsna värsket vormistusest jõudu juurdegi. “Viini postmargi” tee teatrilavalt¹⁴

kinolinale sellega võrreldav polnud, kuid filmi kunstniku Rein Raamatu efektsed ruumi-

5 “...film on meediumina eripärane kogum tehnikaid, mille abil representeeritakse ekraanil aega, ruumi ja põhjuslikkust. Enamasti ei peeta neid tehnikaid (nt. heli- ja pildimontaaž, kaamera liikumine ja misansteen) iseenesest mõnd “tähendust” kandvaks, vaid “juhusteks”, mis seostuvad vaatajate poolt teatud komplekti suhetevõrgustike konstrueerimiseks kasutatavate protseduuride ja reeglitega. Need protseduurid pole õiged ega valed, vaid mõõdetavad üksnes sedavõrd, kui võrd edukaks või äpardunuks nad osutuvad mõne püstitatud eesmärgi suhtes.” (E. Branigan, *Narrative Comprehension and Film*. London, New York: Routledge, 1992, lk. 117.)

6 Režissöör Grigori Kromanov, operaator Mihhail Dorovatovski, kunstnik Linda Vernik, “Tallinnfilm”, 1966. Paul Kuusbergi romaani “Andres Lapeteuse juhtum” (1963) ekraniseering, stsenaarist Paul Kuusberg.

7 Režissöör Veljo Käspär, operaator Harry Rehe, kunstnik Rein Raamat, “Tallinnfilm”, 1967. Ardi Liivese samanimelise näidendi põhjal, stsenaarist Ardi Liives.

8 D. Bordwell, *Figures Traced in Light: On Cinematic Staging*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2005. lk. 32; vt. ka D. Bordwell, K. Thompson, *Film Art*, lk. 175jj.

9 A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse: Stalinist Tropes in Thaw Culture*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 2002. – <http://etd.library.pitt.edu/ETD/available/etd-07242002-135513/>; A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave: Soviet Cinema of the 1960s. – Springtime for Soviet Cinema: Re/Viewing the 1960s*. Ed. A. Prokhorov. Pittsburgh, 2001, lk. 7–28. – <http://www.rusfilm.pitt.edu/booklets/Thaw.pdf>.

10 Ö. Orav, *Tallinnfilm I. Mängufilmid 1947–1976*. Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus, 2003, lk. 20.

11 L. Meri, *Suur üksiklane*. – *Sirp ja Vasar* 9. II 1968.

12 Vt. nt. E. Nirk, *Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega? Arupidamisi uue romaani puhul*. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 1963, nr. 12, lk. 705–712; ka autori vestlus Maie Kaldaga 22. XI 2006. Ideoloogiavalvurid loopisid ka ikkagi kodaraisse ka filmile, kuid teose valmimist see siiski lõpuks ei takistanud, vt. L. Meri, *Suur üksiklane*.

13 Kirjandusteoste ekraniseerimisel, millele tugines suur osa toonasest kohalikust filmikunstist, tuli sageli ette, et kriitika silmis ei küündinud linastunud tulemuse kvaliteet originaali lähedalegi (vestlus M. Kaldaga 22. XI 2006).

14 Ardi Liivese samanimelise näidendi lavastas V. Kingissepa nimelises TRA Draamateatris Gunnar Kilgas, kes pidi algselt olema ka filmi režissöör.

lised lahendused ja ennekõike “kastarhitektuuri” metafoor osutusid piisavaks, et tekitada ajakirjanduse filmiveergudel “ülielava ... poleemika”¹⁵.

Narratiiv ja esitus. Seoseid nõukogude uue laine filmikunstiga

“Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?” esitab minoorse tooniga isikudraama, milles peategelase arengu kaudu lahatakse õigupoolest Teise maailmasõja järgseid ühiskondlikke muutumisi. Nimategelast Andres Lapeteust (Einari Koppel) portreeritakse väliselt edukaka mehena, kel õnnestub problemaatilistes poliitilistes tingimustes laveerides saavutada ainealine heaolu ning võrdlemisi stabiilne sotsiaalne seisund. Pindmisele tõusutrajektorile vastandub aga küsitavate eraeluliste valikute pea fataalsena lõppev ahel. Õieti põimuvad need kaks liini filmis oluliselt, andes teosele tugeva moraliseeriva värvingu, mis mõistab hukka kalkuleeritud karjerrismi ning kollektiivse mälu ja ühise kogemuse ohverdamise kitsalt isikliku sotsiaalse ja olmelise profiidi nimel. Juurtest ja/või põhimõtetest lahtihaakimise vs. neile truus jäämise teema kannab Nõukogude Eesti kultuuripraktikale omaselt ka üsna selgeid vaimse vastasseisu noote.

Film säilitab romaani ajatelje segipaisatuse ja jutustuse killustatuse: mõlemad algavad loo kulminatsiooniga – Lapeteuse ja Viktor Haaviku (Rein Aren) autode letaalse kokkupõrkega – ning liiguvad sealt rohkete tagasivaadete pikitult edasi, püüdes meenutuste kaudu otsida lahendust “Andres Lapeteuse juhtumile” või küsimusele “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?”. Romaaniga võrreldes jääb aga filmi lõpp avatumaks, vastuse asemel järgneb dünaamilisele stoppkadrite reale tiitritena taas esialgne küsimus. Kui Paul Kuusbergi raamatus annab küllalt selge kokkuvõtte viimane lause: “Ning talle oli

järsku kõik üksipuha”, siis Grigori Kromanovi filmi lõpp meenutab mõneti François Truffaut’ debüütfilmi “400 lööki” (“Les quatre cents coups”, 1959) finaali. See tabab küll Lapeteuse eksistentsiaalset ängi ning kinnitab tema varasemaid kahtlusi oma truuduse tu abikaasa Reeda (Ada Lundver) suhtes, andmata siiski ammendavaid vastuseid. Selle – ja nii mõnegi teise – vormivõttega asetub film 1960. aastate nõukogude nn. uue laine filmikunsti¹⁶ taustale, mis rõhutas narratiivset katkendlikkust, ambivalenti ning toetas kunstilisi otsinguid lugude uudsel visualiseerimisel. Muidugi aimub siit ka 1950.–1960. aastate Lääne “kunstifilmi” traditsioon, mida kokkuvõtlikult iseloomustab klassikalise narratiivi modifitseerimine, eriti loobumine sündmuste seostamisest selgelt avalduval põhjuse-tagajärje teljel, tegelaste motiveerimata või hägusatel psühholoogilistel motiividel põhinev käitumine ning viimaks tugevalt rõhutatud autoripositsioon.¹⁷ Kõik need tunnused esinevad suuremal või väiksemal määral ka Kromanovi filmis.

“Viini postmargi” süžee keerleb ümber töö rääkimise teema. Jantlikus võtmes lugu kastivabriku meistri ja andunud filatelisti Martin Rolli (Jüri Järvet) autoriteedi (taas)kehtestamisest nii professionaalses kui ka perekondlikus plaanis saab alguse Martini ning tema ammuse sõbra Tõnis Uppi (Alfred Rebane) intrigeerivast kihlveost, mis paneb proovile Martini võime kõnelda ühe päeva jooksul ainult tõtt ning mille pandiks on “Wipablokk” – hinnaline ja haruldane Austria margikomplekt. Probleem pole mitte selles, et

15 Õ. Orav, Jüri Järvet. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 1977, lk. 39.

16 A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave*, lk. 7.

17 Vt. D. Bordwell, *The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice* [1979]. – *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Sixth Edition. Eds. L. Braudy, M. Cohen. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, lk. 774–782.

Martin oleks krooniline valetaja, vaid selles, et ta on liialt mugandunud, eelistades kõnelemisele vaikimist, teokusele taandumist. (Ühiskonna)kriitilise hoiaku ja aktiivse elulusuhtumise propaganda, mis läbib kogu jutustust, on nõukogude filmipraktikas tüüpiline ning pea kohustuslik element, ent kohati õõnestab “Viini postmark” neid ideaale, mida teisel heaks kiidetakse. Kuigi peainsener Saulus (Einari Koppel) saab oma mahhinsatsioonide eest õiglase palga ning üldise naerualuse positsiooni, ei viita miski sellele, et vabrikus valitsev üldine *siesta*-mentaliteet võiks asendada “hästi organiseeritud tööajaga”, millest teavitab tehase õuel asuv valjuhääldi. Ehkki filmi lõpukaadritest võiks järeldada, et vanad kombes annavad teed uutele – selle paralleeli lubab tõmmata kaadripaarik suurplaanis Martin Rollist, kes on tänu tõerääkimisele leidnud oma õige koha nii perekondlikus kui ka tööalases hierarhias, ning üldplaan vana eramut neelata töotavast uuslinnast –, asetub peamine rõhk siiski teatud individuaalsetele nihetele, mitte üleüldisele progressile. Selline “antimonumentalistlik” lähenemine on Alexander Prokhorovi sõnul 1960. aastate nõukogude filmikunstis väga iseloomulik.¹⁸

Prokhorov, kes kaitses 2002. aastal Pittsburghi ülikoolis väitekirjaga “Päritud diskursus: stalinistlikud narratiivid sulaaegses kultuuris” doktorikraadi, on üks vähestest 1960. aastate nõukogude filmiga tegelevatest uurijatest.¹⁹ Ta tõestab võrdlemisi veenvalt, et kuigi toonased filmitegijad pidasid oma loomingut stalinistliku filmikunsti antiteesiks, keskendusid nad – tõsi, modifitseeritud vormis – endiselt stalinistliku kultuuri kesksedele teemadele: positiivne kangeline, perekond ja sõda. Samas toimus oluline nihe mõõtkavas: stalinistlik suurejooneline heroism asendus kammerlikumate ja isiklikumate saavutuste ning kordaminekutega, lahinguväljade

asemel keskenduti sageli kodusele miljöole, (tuum)perekond ei peegeldanud enam ühemõtteliselt “suurt rahvaste peret”, massidele eelistati nüüd (meessoost) indiviidi, kelle identiteet, personaalne eneseväljendus ning tundemaailm said sageli lugude sõlmpunktiks. Märgatava transformatsiooni läbis kangeline ja kaabakatega seonduv ikonograafia.²⁰ Oluliseks muutus ka stalinistliku režii käigus kaotsi läinud revolutsioonilise meeluse taastamine ning 1920. aastate “puhaste”, leninlike ideaalide juurde naasmine.²¹

Need jooned esinevad ühel või teisel moel mõlemas kõnealus filmis. “Viini postmargi” Martin Roll on suhteliselt puhtakujuline positiivne kangeline, kes algul küll kõheldes, kuid siis üha kasvava kindlameelsusega

18 A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave*, lk. 8.

19 A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*. Vt. nt. ka H. Marshall, *The New Wave in Soviet Cinema*. – *The Red Screen: Politics, Society, Art in Soviet Cinema*. Ed. A. Lawton. London, New York: Routledge, 1992, lk. 175–192. Läänemaailmas ilmus esimene monograafia sel teemal alles 2000. aastal (J. Woll, *Real Images: Soviet Cinema and the Thaw*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2000). Venemaal on selle perioodi filmikunsti käsitlevat kirjandust ilmunud veidi rohkem, vt. nt. *Кинематограф оттепели. Книга первая*. Ред. В. А. Трояновский. Москва: Материк, 1996; *Кинематограф оттепели. Документы и свидетельства НИИ киноискусства Госкино РФ*. Сост., коммент. В. И. Фомин. Москва: Материк, 1998; *Кинематограф оттепели. Книга вторая*. Ред. В. А. Трояновский. Москва: Материк, 2002. Ajastu üldisema mentaalse kohta vt. nt. П. Вайль, А. Генис, 60-е: мир советского человека. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 2001.

20 A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*, lk. 51jj; A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave*, lk. 8jj.

21 A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*, lk. 30–31. Võib küll väita, et Eesti kontekstis pole leninlikke 1920. aastaid kunagi eksisteerinud, kuid samas ei tohi unustada, et siinsed filmitegijad said hariduse Moskvast, mille intellektuaalne õhkkond neid kahtlemata mõjutas, samuti nagu kaasaegne nõukogude filmikunst üldisemalt, mille toonane tunnustatuim osa lähtub just neist ideaalidest.

loobub halvavast konformismist ning tekitab tõelise mikrorevolutsiooni nii omaenda isiksuse tasandil kui ka perekondlikus ja ametialases lähikonnas – muuhulgas genereerib film selgelt maskuliinseid väärtusi ja toetab tuumperekonna kui ühiskonna pisimudeli ideaali. Niisugune inimliku südametunnistuse ning ühiskondliku teadlikkuse järk-järguline küpsemine seob filmi stalinistliku narratiivi põhijoontega, ent, nagu öeldud, puudub sellest siiski üldistust taotlev plakatlikkus. Kuigi Martini tegudele on iseloomulik teatud prometheuslik kangelaslikkus – kasvab vanatüdrukust dispetšer Klaara Kukk (Leida Rammo) võrdleki Martini käitumist Sauluse paikapanemisel “vabastatud Prometheusega” –, ei ole see siiski stalinistlikule kultuuripraktikale omane ideaalide nimel ambrasuurile viskumine, vaid paraku üksnes sisyphoslikke tulemusi andev tegevus.²² Veelgi enam, filmi irooniline kõneviis²³ nihestab viidet Prometheusele sedavõrd, et see muutub iseenda antiteesiks.

Andres Lapeteust on esmapilgul mõnevõrra keerulisem positiivse kangelasena määratleda, seda enam, et ideoloogilist korrektsust kontrollivate instantside jaoks oli Lapeteuse karakter ülepea väär nõukogude inimese (ja veel endise punaväe ohvitseri!) representatsioon,²⁴ kuid kahtlemata asetub tema tegelaskuju soodsamasse valgusse, kui kõrvutada Andreest Reeda ja viimase sõpruskonna selgelt miinismärki kandva väikekodanliku elukäsitlusega. Reeda ja ta kaaslasi kujutatakse filmis rabavalt grotesksel viisil, mis meenutab mõneti Eduard Wiiralti “Põrgu” visuaali. Reeda tegelaskuju vastandub kõigil tasandil diametraalselt Andrese hüljatud noorpõlvearmastusele ja sõjakaaslase Helvi Kaartnale (Ita Ever), kes ühes Oskar Põdruse (Heino Mandri) ja Ants Pajuviidikuga (Kaljo Kiisk) moodustavad omamoodi kollektiivse positiivse kangelase kuju. Nii jääb Andres

nende kahe leeri vahele, suutmata õieti identifitseeruda kummagagi. Üksiti annab selline ambivalentne tunnistus positiivse kangelase teema teisenemisest sulaaegses filmikunstit.

Kuigi nii filmi “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?” kui ka “Viini postmark” tegevus toimub sõjajärgseil rahuastail, palmub sõjateema olulisel määral nende narratiividega, nii nagu argieluski oli sõja kohalolu veel 1960. aastail tajutav. “Lapeteuses” on see oluliste inimsuhete nurgakivi ning omandab nende suhtevõrgustike lõdvenedes ja lagunedes esmapilgul koguni mõningase nostalgivarjundi kui kadunud maailm, kus õnneks oli vaja väga vähe ning lähikontaktid sündisid hõlpsalt ja kiiresti. Samuti märgib sõda mõlemas filmis omamoodi süütuse aega, mil heroilisus oli võimalik ja loomulikki, mil luges vaid üks küsimus – elu või surm –, hea ja halva vahekord oli lihtne ja selge²⁵ ning maskuliinne identiteet domineeris vaieldamatult ja iseenesest mõistetavalt. Viimane aspekt kerkib eriti reljeefselt esile “Viini postmargi” esimeses episoodis, mis algab kaadriga Rollide elutoa seinal rippuvast sõjaväevormi ja vuntse kandvat noort Martinit kujutavast fotost. Filmi esimene lause tuleb

22 Prokhorov kasutab stalinistlike ja sulaaegsete positiivsete kangelaste iseloomustamiseks samuti Prometheuse ja Sisyphose võrdlust: kui stalinistlikud “Prometheused” märkisid tegelikult toimuma pidavaid muutusi, siis sulaaegsed “Sisyphosed” ei suutnud kunagi ületada ühiskonna fundamentaalset rikutust ega parandamatust (A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*, lk. 311).

23 Iroonia oli hilisel sulaajal 1960. aastate lõpus üks olulisemaid kõneviise, mis andis tunnistust stagnatsiooniaegse kultuurimudeli tugevnemisest ja stalinistlike peateemade ammendumisest. Komöödia oli peamine filmiironiat kandev žanr. Vt. A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*, lk. 266–269, 302jj.

24 Vestlus M. Kaldaga 22. XI 2006.

25 Eestlaste osalemisele mõlema võitleva poole sõdijate hulgas ning sellest võrsuvalve probleematale kumbki film otseselt ei viita.

Martini sõjakaaslaselt Tõnis Uppilt: “Miks sa vuntsid maha ajasid?” Sõda ja vuntsid osutavad siin kaotatud ideaalidele ning kindlasti ka kaotatud maskuliinsusele, sest Martin on selgelt femineeritud, allutatud oma võimukale kaasale Elmale (Herta Elviste) kodus ning avantüristist peainsenerile tööl. Jutustuse arengu käigus taastab Martin vähemalt osaliselt nende väärtuste kehtivuse (ehk kasvatab tagasi vuntsidki?) ning kor-dab seega sümboolselt tsiviilelus sõjas kord saavutatud võitu. Otseselt viitab lahingu võrdkujule Martini ja Tõnise dialoog tõerääkimi-se päeva hommikul, kui Martin astub ülima vastumeelsusega esimese sammu kihlveo võit-miseks ning keeldub täitmast peainseneri käs-ku saata oma korterisse vabriku töömehed ja ehitusmaterjal. (Tõnis: “Mäletad, kui me sõja ajal Luki all...” Martin: “Luki all, Luki all, siin läheb hullemaks kui Luki all.”) “Lape-teuse” sõjakäsitus pole see-eest kaugeltki nii positiivne, lahingumälestused muutuvad loo hargnedes üha kibemagusamaiks, märkides ühelt poolt küll omamoodi õnnelikku, tuge-vate sõprussidemete ja suhtelise korrumpree-rumatus aega, teisalt aga ka Lapeteuse “hin-ge amortiseerumise”²⁶ üht võimalikku algus-punkti või mõjutajat. Kuigi jahenevate sõp-russuhete ning komplitseeritud poliitiliste intriigide valguses tundub sõjaaeg tegelaste minapildis säilitavat positiivse aura, muutub filmi käigus sõja tegelik mõju nende (tun-de)elule siiski aina problemaatilisemaks. Sa-muti asendub sõda lahinguväljal rahuaegse võitlusega võimukoridorides ja pereringis: omad ja vaenlased kuuluvad nüüd ühte kogu-konda, ühte süsteemi²⁷ ning, mis veelgi oluli-sem, see rindejoon muudab parteipoliitika ja isiklike suhete teisenedes pidevalt asukohta.

Filmitehnilises ja stiililises plaanis on olu-line visandada 1960. aastate nõukogude, seal-hulgas Nõukogude Eesti filmikunsti mõju-tanud ja kujundanud jõujooned. Stalini-aeg-

ne filmitööstus (mille alusel jätkus pärast Teist maailmasõda ka sinne tootmine) rajati paljus 1930. aastail Hollywoodi studiosüs-teemi eeskujul²⁸ ning suures osas võeti üle klassikalisele Hollywoodile omased repre-sentatsioonimudelid, mis taotlesid narratiiv-set selgust ja sõlmitust, põhjuse-tagajärje ahelal põhineva jutustuse domineerimist²⁹, filmiaparaadi kui kujutist tekitava ja mani-puleeriva agendi varjamist usutava ja publi-ku vahetult mõjutava illusoorse filmimaail-ma loomisel³⁰. Samas polnud nõukogude fil-

26 M. Unt, Romaan ja film ehk mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega. – Edasi 26. III 1966.

27 Vt. ka A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*, lk. v, 192jj.

28 Vt. nt. R. Taylor, *Ideology as Mass Entertainment: Boris Shumyatsky and Soviet Cinema in the 1930s.* – *Inside the Film Factory: New Approaches to Russian and Soviet Cinema.* Eds. R. Taylor, I. Christie. London: Routledge, 1991, lk. 193–216.

Nõukogude filmikunst polnud seejuures mingi erand, sest Hollywoodi studiosüsteemi ja stilistikapagasi mõju ulatus ka Suurbritannia, Prantsusmaa, Saksamaa, Jaapani jpt. filmitoodangu põhivooluni, saades omamoodi “transnatsionaalseks standardiks” (D. Bordwell, J. Staiger, *Historical Implications of the Classical Hollywood Cinema.* – D. Bordwell, J. Staiger, K. Thompson, *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960.* London, Melbourne, Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985, lk. 379). Noël Burch nimetab 1930.–1940. aastate põhivoolu filmipraktikat nn. Hollywoodi stuudiostiili institutsionaalseks representatsiooniviisiks (*institutional mode of representation*) ja “filmistiili nullpunktiks” (N. Burch, *Theory of Film Practice.* Trans. H. R. Lane. London: Secker & Warburg, 1973, lk. xix; N. Burch, *Life to Those Shadows.* Trans. and ed. B. Brewster. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990, lk. 6–7.

29 Vt. nt. D. Bordwell, *The Classical Hollywood Style, 1917–60.* – D. Bordwell, J. Staiger, K. Thomp-son, *The Classical Hollywood Cinema*, lk. 50. Idee, et mis tahes tekstis või tekstide kogumis allutab teatud element – dominant – teised, laenab Bordwell vene formalistidelt, vt. samas; R. Jakobson, *The Dominant.* – *Readings in Russian Poetics.* Eds. L. Matejka, K. Pomorska. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971, lk. 82.

30 Vt. S. Heath, *Narrative Space.* – S. Heath, *Quest-ions of Cinema.* London: Macmillan, 1985, lk. 19–75.

mikunst absoluutselt muutumatu, nagu seda polnud ka Hollywoodi kino.³¹ Ametlikult hülgas stalinistliku filmi peavool 1920. aastate nõukogude avangardi eksperimentaalse, mitmesuguste filmitehnoloogiate, ennekõike aga montaaži võimalustel põhineva kujutusviisi,³² mis oli omane Sergei Eisensteini, Dziga Vertovi jt. loomingule. Eisensteini enese filmides, tõsi küll, leidis autor sotsrealistliku narratiivi ja “formalistlikuks” tembeldatud pildilise külje vahel teatava kompromissi, kuid üldisema linapildi taustal jäid need siiski üsna erandlikeks. Sulaaeg tõi 1950. aastate teisel poolel kaasa laiahaardelisema väljendusvahendite värskendamise, mida muuhulgas iseloomustab visuaalsete aspektide eelistamine narratiivsetele ja helilistele.³³ Euroopa “kunstifilmi” eeskujul tõusis esiplaanile erinevate ekraanitehnikatega katsetamine: kiiretempoline montaaž, mis alati ei järginud ajalise-ruumilise selguse põhimõtteid, sagedased ülesulamisega kaadriüleminekud, keerulised panoraamvõtted ning subjektiivsed võttepunktid ja kaameramustrid,³⁴ mida võimaldas kaalu kaotanud filmiaparatuur. Ilmnes 1920. aastate Saksa ekspressionismile ja sellest mõjutatud 1940.–1950. aastate Ameerika *film noir*’ile iseloomulik reljееf-selt kujundit loov valgusekäsitlus, oma mõju oli ka Itaalia neorealismi³⁵ ja Prantsuse uue laine uuendustel loomuliku valguse, natuuris filmimise, amatöörnäitlejate kasutamise ning argieluliste situatsioonide rakendamise vallas³⁶. Nõukogude filmikunsti ajaloost taaselustati eelkõige 1920. aastate avangardi montaažitehnikad, mis, tõsi küll, pakkusid filmiloojaile rõõmu kui enese kujuteldav seostamine “õõnestava revolutsioonilise kunstitraditsiooniga ajal, mil see traditsioon oli turvaliselt hääbunud”³⁷. Avangardi stiili jäljendati või tsiteeriti pea alati narratiivsetel kõrghetkedel, mil loo kulg peatati viivuks näiteks tegelase tugevate tunnete ja tema sub-

jektiiivse vaatepunkti edastamiseks. Enamasti põhjendas tempokat ja assotsiatiivset montaaži, ebatavalisi võttepunkte, ekspressiivset valguskasutust vmt. visuaalselt vaatamängulisi elemente mõni jutustuslik aspekt ning tähelepanu filmimeediumile kui iseseisvate entiteedile – nagu see oli kombeks Eisensteini või Vertovi loomingus – ei tõmmatud. Niisugused viited tähistavad muuhulgas seda, et 1920. aastate avangard oli sulaajaks saanud osaks kaanonist, mille kasutamine pigem toetas 1930. aastail loodud narratiivse režiimi mitmekesisust,³⁸ kui püüdis õõnestada viimase aluseks olevat ideoloogiat.

Uuenduslikke visuaalseid stiilielemente võib üsna ohtralt leida nii “Viini postmargist” kui ka “Lapeteusest”. Üldjoontes on “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?” selles plaanis huvitavam ja mitmekesisem, ent mõnin-

31 Näiteks mõjutas Ühendriikide filmide ilmet tugevalt 1920. aastate Saksa ekspressionistlik film, kõige enam teatud valgustustehnikate, kaameravõtete ja eriefektide osas. Vt. nt. D. Bordwell, *The Classical Hollywood Style*, lk. 73. Hiljem oli oma mõju ka Itaalia neorealismil, Prantsuse uuel lainel ja järgnevatelgi innovaatilistel meediatehnika arengutel, ent kõik need uuendused on alati integreeritud Hollywoodi narratiivsesse süsteemi valikuliselt ja printsibiil, et nad ei ohusta selle peamist eesmärki, narratiivset, ajalist ja ruumilist selgust.

32 Vt. nt. D. Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film*. London: Routledge, 1985, lk. 145.

33 A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave*, lk. 12–13. Nõukogude Eesti filmides oli heli kasutamine tugeva kujundina siiski levinud ning omandas sageli pildiliste väljendusvahenditega vähemalt võrdse kaalu.

34 A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave*, lk. 13.

35 Itaalia neorealismi aktuaalsusele nõukogude sulaaegses kultuuris viitab ka Prokhorov: A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave*, lk. 14.

36 S. C. Aitken, L. E. Zonn, *Re-Presenting the Place Pastiche. – Place, Power, Situation, and Spectacle*, lk. 13.

37 A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*, lk. 67.

38 A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*, lk. 62–67.

Vt. ka A. Maimik, “Hullumeelsus” – modernistlik üksiklane 1960. aastate eesti mängufilmis. – Teater. Muusika. Kino 1999, nr. 11, lk. 85.

gaid dünaamilisi pildilahendusi pakub ka “Viini postmark”. Märkimisväärselt kuuluvad paljud neist kaameratöö ja montaaži valdkonda – mitmete uurijate väitel³⁹ olid tollases nõukogude filmikunstis sageli just operaatorid need, kes mängisid kaalukat rolli filmi tähenduse konstrueerimisel ning metafooride loomisel. “Lapeteust” ja “Viini postmarki” ühendab sage altrakursi kasutamine, mis korduvalt keskendub ainsale, hetkel tähtsaimale tegelasele, sugereerides tema (võimu)-suhteid teiste karakteritega ning osutades tema jõupositsioonile ja enesekindlusele. Selles suhtes on silmatorkavalt järjekindel “Viini postmargis” loodud muster, mis seostub valdavalt Rollide majaperemehe, mornilt vaikiva Riitsinuse (Andres Särev) terava altrakursiga, rõhutades nii tema uhket eraldatust allkorrusel elavatest Rollidest, lahutades omaniku ja üürnikud, aga ka vana ja uue ühiskondliku, poliitilise ning kultuurilise fooni. Kuigi kaamera vaatab talle alt üles, rõhutades nii teatavat võimukust, on see pigem subjektiivne vaatenurk Riitsinuse enesepildist kui objektiivne seisukohavõtt: ruumilises ja ideoloogilises mõttes kuulub ta äärealale (ekspositsiooniepisoodi eelviimasest kaadris on ta seda sõna otseses mõttes, jäädes üldplaanis võetud majaesisel kaadri vasakus nurgas pea märkamatuks; alles järgmine, iseloomulikult altrakursist filmitud kaader juhib tähelepanu tema vaikivale kohalolekule), millest muuhulgas annab tunnistust ka tema alatine soleerimine kaadris. Martini iseteadlikkuse järk-järgulisest kasvust teatavad samuti sagedased altrakursid, mis ühtlasi järgnevad olulistele narratiivsetele sõlmpunktile. Näiteks kui Martin pärast paikapanevat jutuajamist Sauluse kabinetist lahkub, kadreerib kaamera ta madalast võttepunkti ning võrdlemisi järsust altrakursist; kaks sarnase rakursilise kaameratööga stseeni naabri tige-da koeraga – üks päris filmi alguses, teine

aga peaaegu lõpus, kui Martin naaseb riskantselt tõetsija aktsioonilt kilbiga – moodustavad pildilise silla üle tormakalt kulgenud loo voolu, toetades jumekalt Martini kordaläinud ristiretke. Kui esimeses stseenis ei söanda Martin veel närviliselt haukuvat peni kätte haaratud kivikamakaga õpetada ja viskab selle koera peremehe tigidat pilku määrgates mööduva veoauto killustikukoormasse, siis teises pole tal enese kehtestamiseks enam viskematerjali vajagi – bulldog vaikib ise Martini hüpnootiseeriva pilgu mõjul. Kogu filmi jooksul on täheldatav rakursskaadrite arvu kasv võrdeliselt olukorra üha vohavama absurdusega. Siiski tuleb möönda, et tõenäoliselt mõjutas filmi pildikeelt ja kaadrikompositsioone lisaks sisulistele motiividele ka toonases fotograafias ülimalt populaarne rakursifoto suund.

Hämmastav unenäostseen, mis järgneb Martini ja Tõnise kihlveole ning korralikule pummeldamisele, on üks neist stseenidest, mis rõhutavad narratiivseid sõlmpunkte ja kanalavad peategelase emotsioone. Assotsiatiivne montaaž, korduvad ülesulamid, kummastav-ekspressiivne valgus, nihestatud kaadrikompositsioon ja ilmekas helikujundus moondavad argisesse keskkonda kuuluvad olendid ja objektid sürreaalseks kompotiks. Wipa-bloki markidel kujutatud hoburakend sõidab Mustamäe paneelmajade vahel, kutsariks torukübarat ja vuntse kandev Martin, tema kõrval istub vaguralt naabri tige bulldog; ekstaatilise ilmega Elma puistab kõigisse ilmakaartesse Rollide kodumaja eesaias kasvanud lilli, juubeldades moodsas uusrajoonis asuva uue korteri pärast, mille hankimiseks oli Saulus Elmale unenäoelisel päeval lubanud abi anda. Võrdlemisi triumfaalselt alanud ulm, kus hoburakendis mööda-

39 Vt. nt. A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave*, lk. 13; E. Margolit, *Landscape, with Hero*. – *Springtime for Soviet Cinema*, lk. 34–35, 37jj.

sõitvale Martinile kumardavad paneelmaja trepikodade ustele astuvad inimesed, omandab peagi košmaarse värvingu, kui vanker veereb kastivabriku õuele ning töölised piiravad selle sisse (visuaalselt sarnaneb see filmi lõpukaadriga, kus paneelmajade massiiv on tihedalt oma haardesse võtnud Riit sinuse eramu), viidates nii Martini kartusele eelseisva tõerääkimise päeva ees. Unenäo viimases osas eksleb kõik orientiirid kaotanud Martin sihitult tormise kõrbe liivaluudete vahel, taustaks terav tuulevihhin ja kummituslikult katkendlik heliriba, ümberringi keerlemas sajad Wipa-blokid, millest ei õnnestu tal aga kinni püüda mitte ühtki. Unenäost aimub Martini äng ja viha, soovid ja kartused: tahe taas kord ise oma elu ohjata (ja lõpuks ometi taltsutada see pagana naabri krants!) ning saavutada tunnustust, põlgus intrigeeriva, lipitseva ja mugava abikaasa suhtes, hirm kaotada Wipa-blokk, mis tähistab talle veel ainsana säilinud sõltumatuse sfääri, märkides ühtlasi tema senist reaalsel pagendust kujutlusmaailma. Unenäo sürrealistlik süste on aga kindlalt haagitunud narratiivi realistlikuma karkassi külge, sest vaheldub perioodiliselt kaadritega voodis vähkrevast Martinist. Algse ülemineku juhatab kaudselt sisse eelneva stseeni subjektiivne kaamera käsitus, mis jäljendab purjus Martini kakerdamist, ent säilitab seejuures enamasti objektiivse vaatepunkti (v.a. kaadris, kus Martin vaatab oma seinal rippuvat portreed).

“Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?” sisaldab rohkelt peenelt orkestreeritud pildilähendusi, mis kasutavad rida erinevaid visuaalseid registreid jutustuse haripunktide markeerimiseks. Filmi visuaalselt silmapaistvaimate stseenide hulka kuulub kahtlemata episood, kus Reeda soolaleivapeolt lahkunud Andres kohtub hilisõhtusel jaamaplatvormil nokastanud Pajuviidikuga. Õise stseeni igast lihvitult komponeeritud kaadrist aimub ilm-

seid Saksa ekspressionistliku filmi ja *film noir*'i eeskujud: pilkane ja süngel tegevuspaik, tugevalt tsentrist nihestatud raskuskeskme, tihti diagonaale rõhutavad kaadrikompositsioonid, teravad kaamerarakursid, kontrastsed valguslahendused, mille tajutavaiks allikaiks on tänavavalgustid. Need jätvad tegelaste nägudest sageli nähtavale vaid poolkuuna kumavad (pool)profiilid ning tekitaavad misanstseeni intensiivseid valgusevarju mustreid. Isegi Andrese ja Pajuviidiku rõivastus – elegantsed kaabud ja tolmumantlid – meenutavad Billy Wilderi, Otto Premingeri ja Fritz Langi⁴⁰ 1940.–1950. aastate detektiivfilmide ikoonilisi kostüüme. *Film noir*'i esimesed ja krestomaatilised näited “Malta pistrik” (“The Maltese Falcon”, rež. John Huston, 1941) ning “Casablanca” (rež. Michael Curtiz, 1942) lansseerisid žanri võtmeteema, keskendudes inimestele, kelle elu ja maailm järk-järgult koost pudenes.⁴¹ Ka Lapeteus on nimetatud stseenis jõudnud etappi, kust alates hakkab ta üha selgemalt tajuma, et midagi on läinud parandamatult viltu. Kui stseeni alguses tervitavad nad Pajuviidikuga teineteist sõbralikult, imiteerides aasvalt armeereglementi – mis muuhulgas paigutab filmi stalinistlikke põhiteemasid ironiseerivasse hilise sulaaja diskursusesse –, siis vestluse käigus koorub välja Pajuviidiku vaieldamatu halvaksapanu Lapeteuse ametialase auahnuse ning libeda laveerimise suhtes. Seejuures meenutab ta rohkem kui ühel korral nende suhete sõjaaegseid lätteid, mis asetab Lapeteuse hilisema elutee tema silmis üsna ilmselt moraalsele allakäigutrajektorile. Sol-

40 Need režissöörid olid koolituse saanud 1920. aastail Saksamaal ning poliitiliste olude tõttu 1930. aastail Ühendriikidesse emigreerudes mõjutasid tugevalt sealset filmikunsti. Vt. nt. L. Ford, *Sunshine and Shadow: Lighting and Color in the Depiction of Cities on Film*. – Place, Power, Situation, and Spectacle, lk. 119–136.

41 L. Ford, *Sunshine and Shadow*, lk. 122.

vunud Lapeteus tõmbub seepeale endasse, Pajuviidiku pidevad meeldetuletused, et ta on siiski “ministri järel teine mees”, panevad ta kohmetuma. Siiski ei tunnista Andres tõenäoliselt veel endale, et sotsiaalne positsioon, mille eest ta on kompromissitult ja “üle laipade” võidelnud, on ta juba asetanud olukorda, kus “keegi teda ei vihka, ent ei pea ka eriliseks sõbraks”, nagu tunnistas Põdrus filmi lõpus. Filmi läbiv moraalne ambivalents, samuti peategelase isoleerituse ja juurtetuse või kodutuse ning võõrandumise teemad saavad siin tuge visuaalsest seosest *film noir*’iga, mille süžeesid läbis sageli nõrgenenud normitajuga seotud aines ning fundamentaalse eraldatuse tajumine. *Film noir*’i tüüpilise temaatikaga seondub ka “Lapeteusest” kõlama jääv tõdemus, et maailm on keeruline ja sageli vaenulik koht, kus parimad kavatsused võivad paratamatult viia halbade tulemusteni. Stseeni lõpus jätab Lapeteus Pajuviidiku, kes räuskab talle järele “Karjuma peab, kapten, karjuma!”, perroonile ning episoodi lõpetab kaader tema ebakindlal sammul eemalduvaist jalgadest, taustaks kõle kaja ning hoiatavalt huilgav vedurivile. Muide, järgmise stseeni esimene kaader kattub sisult ja ülesehitusel sellega peaaegu täielikult: muutunud on vaid suund (lähenevad sammud eemalduvate asemel) ning tegelane (Andrese asemel Reet). Niisugustel kompositsioonilistel, liikumissuunalistel ja tegevuslikel kattuvustel põhinevaid kaadriüleminekuid kasutab film ohtralt, et tekitada sujuvamaid siirdeid ajas ja ruumis pidevalt kohta vahetava narratiivi fragmentide vahel ning luua sidemeid tegelaste, olukordade ja tähenduste seas.

Kui selline ekspressionistlik ~*film noir*’ilik kujutusviis loob varjamatult kunstliku filmiruumi, tõmmates stiililiste liialduste (ingl. *excess*⁴²) toel tähelepanu jutustuse laineharjadele, siis Teise maailmasõja järgse autori-

filmi ja Itaalia neorealismi representatsioonistrateegiate teatav mõju avaldub n.-ö. rahulikumates stseenides, mis moodustavad filmi põhikoe. Nii on “Lapeteuses” loobutud stuudiovõtetest: interjöörid on pea eranditult filmitud reaalselt eksisteerivates majades ja korterites, mille akendest paistab alati ka tükike argiseid toimetusi – inimeste sagingat ja liiklusvoolu – täis välisruumi; ka natuurivõtetes on sageli taustaks tänavamelu. Vahetu side ümbritseva keskkonnaga avaldub hästi näiteks autosõidustseenides, mis vastupidiselt “Viini postmargile” on filmitud liikuvast autos ja tõeliselt maanteel, mitte studios tagantprojektsiooni (ingl. *rear projection*) abil. Valguslahendused mõjuvad enamasti loomulikena, vaatamata sellele, et päikesevalgust on toetatud elektrilampidega. Läbivalt kasutatakse professionaalseid näitlejaid, kelle mäng ning dialoogid valdavas osas aga ei tundu puiselt konstrueerituina. Ka kaameratöö on paiguti subjektiivsust suureerivalt hüplik. Kuigi need vormivõtted on varasemasse kujutusarsenali lükitud ilmselt valikuliselt, annavad nad isegi osaliselt ja vähesel määral kasutatuna filmile teatud elulise voolavuse, mis oli iseloomulik ka neorealismi taotlustele. Neorealistlik praktika ei pidanud isegi mitte alati kinni teoreetilistest retseptidest, näiteks filmis “Jalggrattavargad” (“Ladri di biciclette”, rež. Vittorio de Sica, 1948) on tänavail kihutava veoauto akende taga erakordselt halvasti sünkroniseeritud ja udune, päevselgelt studioseinale projitseeritud välisruum. Veelgi enam, paljude neorealistlike filmide narratiiv pole sugugi argielulist juhuslikkust, sündmustiku pooljuhuslik-

42 Vt. nt. S. Heath, *Film and System: Terms of Analysis*, Part I. – Screen 1975, Vol. 16 (1), lk. 7–77; R. Barthes, *The Third Meaning*. – R. Barthes, *Image, Music, Text*. Ed. S. Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977, lk. 50–68; K. Thompson, *The Concept of Cinematic Excess*. – *Film Theory and Criticism*, lk. 513–524.

ku triivimist sisendav, vaid järgib üsna lähedastelt etableerunud (s.t. klassikalise Hollywoodi eeskujulist) filmijutustuse skeemi.

Filmi ruum

Sügava kolmemõõtmelise ruumi illusiooni tekitamine lamedal ekraanipinnal on alati olnud osa filmikunsti – või vähemalt selle suuremal või vähemal määral reaalsusega kontakti taotleva haru – juurde kuuluvast problemaatikast. Kõik peamised filmielemendid – kaameratöö, montaaž, misanstseen ja heli – võtavad enamasti aktiivselt osa enam-vähem tervikliku tegevussfääri loomisest, mis koosneb nii ekraanil nähtavast kui ka kaadrist välja jäävast alast. Ruumilise selguse saavutamiseks, filmile loomupäraselt omase pildilise fragmentaarsuse ületamiseks on aja jooksul kasutusele võetud rida tehnilisi ning lavastuslikke nippe ja võtteid.⁴³ Nii on Läänemaailma põhivoolu filmikunsti jaoks ehk olulisim 20. sajandi kahel esimesel aastakümnel välja töötatud järjestikmontaaži (ingl. *continuity editing*) tehnika⁴⁴, mis allutab vormilised otsustused narratiivi huvidele. Nende võtetega loodud tegevusruum või stsenograafiline ruum, nagu nimetab seda David Bordwell⁴⁵, on lahutamatu seotud teist sorti ruumiga, mille rajamisel mängib peaosana nimetatud filmielementide ja mängufilmis jutustatava loo koostöö ning milles füüsiline ruum võib omandada väga erinevaid funktsioone. Paljudel juhtudel on selle “jutustuse ruumi” esmaülesanne tegelastevaheliste suhete ning nende ühiskondliku ja ajalise-ruumilise asetuse määratlemine, aga ka autori vaatepunktide esitamise ning publiku positsioneerimine (ning seega nende mõjutamine⁴⁶). Selles raamistikus on oluline eristada kahte sorti ruumisuheteid: esiteks need, mis n.-ö. personaliseerivad ruumi, väljendades tegelaste karakterit ja meelelaadi ning toetades nendevaheliste suhtevõrgustike esile toomist; teiseks aga need, mis

tekkivad reaalse ja fiktsionaalse ruumi vahel. Viimased avalduvad ehk kõige reljeefsemalt teatud ehitatud või looduslike keskkondade kaasamisel filmijutustusse.

43 Vt. nt. D. Bordwell, *The Classical Hollywood Style*, lk. 50–58; N. Burch, *Theory of Film Practice*, lk. 3–16; *Early Cinema: Space, Frame, Narrative*. Ed. T. Elsaesser. London: British Film Institute, 1990; M. A. Doane, *The Voice in the Cinema: The Articulation of Body and Space*. – *Film Theory and Criticism*, lk. 373–385.

44 Selle olulisimad komponendid kuuluvad õieti kaameratöö valdkonda ning need taotlevad “vaataja identifitseerumist kaameraga”: (1) nn. sätestav, enamasti üldplaanis võetud kaader filmi/episoodi alguses, mis annab ülevaate tegevuspaigast (nõukogude filmikunstile on iseloomulik sätestava kaadri hilisemaks jätmine, vt. D. Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film*, lk. 118) ning aitab vaatajal orienteeruda episoodi ülejäanud, segmenteerunud ruumis; (2) tegevuse telg ehk 180 kraadi reegel, mis tähendab, et kaamera jääb stseeni kõigi kaadrite jooksul ühele poole mõttelist sirgjoont – see tagab, et erinevates kaadrites säilib liikumise ja tegelaste asetuse loogika ning klapitab vaataja jaoks “ekraaniruumi jutustuse ruumiga”; (3) 30 kraadi reegel: kahes järjestikus kaadris peab kaamera võttepunkt muutuma vähemalt 30 kraadi võrra, et ei tekiks arusaamatuid “hüppeid” (ingl. *jump cut*) – nii varjatakse montaaži ja punutakse narratiivi sujuvalt kokku; (4) üleõlakaadrid, mida kasutatakse sageli dialoogide salvestamiseks, on konstrueeritud nii, et parajasti kõnelevat tegelast on filmitud üle tema vestluspartneri õla, ületamata seejuures tegevuse telge; (5) vaatesuuna monteeruvus (ingl. *eye-line matching*), mis tekib, kui esimene kaader näitab kaadrist väljapoole suunatud pilguga tegelast ning järgmine kujutab selle pilgu objekti ligikaudu tegelase vaatepunktist – nagu üleõlakaader, seob ka vaatesuuna monteeruvus erinevate kaadrite ruumi üheks tervikuks; (6) tegevuse monteeruvus (ingl. *matching on action*), mis sobitab kaadrid tegevuse alusel; (7) taassätestav kaader (ingl. *re-establishing shot*), mis naaseb stseeni kestel uuesti ruumi üldpildi juurde ning suunab nii vaatajat toimuvass (R. Lapsley, M. Westlake, *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988).

45 D. Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film*, lk. 113.

46 Seda aspekti on kõige enam uurinud psühhoanalüüsist mõjutatud teoreetikud, neist olulisim Stephen Heath ja tema teos “Narrative Space”.

“Lapeteust” ja “Viini postmarki” seob ühine geograafiline tegevuspaik ning suhteline lähedus ajas: aastase vahega valminud filmid käsitlevad oma kaasaegses Tallinnas toimuvaid sündmusi. Need on suuremal või vähemal määral analepsiste kaudu seotud minevikuga, kuid see ajaline mõõde ei ulatu kaugemale Teisest maailmasõjast. Tõsi, “Viini postmargis” ei mainita linna nime otsesõnu kunagi, ent kontekstuaalsed asjaolud (sellist arhitektuurset situatsiooni teistes Eesti linnades toona ei eksisteerinud) ei jäta tegevuspaiga suhtes erilisi kahtlusi. Samas loovad need linateosed kaks võrdlemisi erinevat ruumimudelit, eelistades isesuguseid filmielemente ning ruumi ja narratiivi ühendamise viise. Kui “Lapeteuses” tundub domineerivat personaliseeritud ruum, kus reaalsusest valitud või spetsiaalselt filmi tarbeks konstrueeritud tegevuspaik sugereerib mõne tegelase vaimuseisundit, märgib tema sotsiaalset positsiooni ja väärtushinnanguid või kannab osaliste vahel valitsevate (võimu)suhete väljendamise funktsiooni, siis “Viini postmargis” tõuseb lisaks ruumiliste polaarsuste kaudu tegelaste küllaltki karkeerivale iseloomustamisele kaunis selgelt esile ka taotlus tõmmata mõttelisi paralleele keskkonna ning jututuse teatud süžeealiste arengute vahel. Arhitektuuri- ja sisustuselemendid kui kujundid on silmatorkavamalt markeeritud “Viini postmargis”, samas kui “Lapeteuses” on ehitatud keskkond ja selle detailid punutud narratiivi märksa lihvitumalt ja peenekoelisemalt. Nii on “Lapeteuses” ehk olulisemal kohal filigraanne kaameratöö ja tegelaste hästi kaalutletud asetus kaadris, samuti montaaž, mis säilitab jätkuvuse suhtelisel killustatud, ajas ja ruumis siia-sinna hüppavas süžees, “Viini postmargis” tõusevad esile aga (studio)dekoratsioonid ja natuurivõtete ehitatud keskkond. Need erinevused tulenevad muuhulgas ilmselt ka filmide žanrilistest eri-

nevustest: “Lapeteus” kui ühiskondlike suhete taustal hargnev isikudraama peabki keskenduma inimloomusele ja -suhetele, “Viini postmark” järgib aga komöödiažanrile sageli omast joont kasutada koomiliste situatsioonide allikana ümbritseva keskkonna elutute objektide “hingestamist”. Paralleelina võiks viidata Charlie Chaplini ja Jacques Tati komöödiaklassikasse kuuluvale loomingule, ent samuti näiteks René Clairi filmile “Vabadust meile!” (“À nous la liberté”, 1931), millega “Viini postmarki” ühendab muuhulgas ka modernistliku arhitektuuri kujundistu. Tähtis erinevus “Lapeteuse” ja “Viini postmargi” ruumikäsitluses eksisteerib ka võttepaikade osas: kui “Lapeteus” on, nagu eespool mainitud, filmitud põhiliselt natuuris, siis “Viini postmargis” domineerivad pavidjonivõtted.

“Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?": ruumid ja tegelased

Filmi “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?” ruumirežiimi määratlevad ennekõike nimitegelase isiklikud sisemised pinged ja üha keerulisemaks muutuvad suhted lähedastega, mis viivad lõpuks Andrese sügava endasetõmbumise ning vaimse ja sotsiaalse võõrandumiseni. Loo kronoloogilises alguses – sõjast kojusõidul – on Lapeteusel veel oma lähikondlaste, sõjasõpradega tihedad ja võrdlemisi usalduslikud sidemed, mida peegeldab hästi kaader Tallinna jõudmise stseenist, kus rongi aken raamib välja vaatava seltskonna õnnelikud näod omamoodi perekonnaportreeks. Sündmustiku edenedes annavad kadreeringud tunnistust peategelase aina suurenevast eraldatusest: sagenevad ta näole keskenduvad suurplaanid, mis lahutavad ta ruumiliselt ja vaimselt ümbritsevast keskkonnast; kesk- ja üldplaanides isoleerivad teda teistest misanstseeni elemendid – ukse- ja aknapiitade vertikaaljooned, mööblieseme-

te massid. Üsna filmi lõpus, kui küllakutsutud sõpradest on Andrese seltsi jäänud vaid Põdrus, rõhutavad kaadrikompositsioonid, kehade asetus ja sügav ruum nende vahelist mentaalset kaugust.

Andrese siseheitluste üheks kulminatsiooniks võib pidada stseeni, kus Põdrus, tema endine polgukaaslane, nüüdne kooliõpetaja, visatakse parteiaktiivi koosolekult välja “väärastööri” tõttu. Kuigi kaamera võttepunktid ja liikumistrajektorid ei kattu otseselt Andrese pilguga, sugereerib operaatoritöö paljuski just tema subjektiivset vaatepunkti nii otseses kui ka kaudses mõttes. Sellele vihjab juba stseeni esimene kaader, mis näitab Andrese kohmetult süles lebavaid ning ebamugavustundest rusikasse tõmbuvaid käsi ning libiseb seejärel tema tõsisele, kergelt kulme kibrutavale näole. Kui Andres pöörab pead, et heita pilk tagapool istuvalle Põdrusele, nihkub kaamera üle valendavate näolappide tema vaatesuunas, peatub viivuks ning kihutab tagasi, lavale püstitatud kõnepuldi poole, sulatades inimmassi hetkeks abstraktseks hämuks. Meenutagem, et Prokhorovi sõnul oli sulaaegsele filmikunstile omane loo emotsionaalsetes sõlmpunktides jäljendada avangardi praktikatele viitavaid vormivõtteid, mille hulka selline ekspressiivne kaameramarsruut kahtlemata kuulub. Ka järgmine kaader sisendab dünaamiliselt kogu stseeni kandvat Andrese halvavat ärevustunnet: lühike, ent ootamatult terav suum parteisekretärile ja kompromissitule ideoloogiavalvurile Madis Jürvenile (Ants Eskola), kes istub presiidiumilauas teiste parteiliidrite hulgas, sugereerib tema ähvardavat võimukust, mida toetavad puldist sõna võtvate süüdistajate järsust altrakursist filmitud suurplaanid. Need kompositsioonivahendid viitavad Andrese silme läbi saalis viibijate vahelisele võimuhierarhiale, millele ühtlasi osutab ka peategelaste asetus ruumis: Põdrus istub tagumistes rida-

des, Andres umbes saali keskel ning presiidium kõrgub ruumi eesotsas laval. Samuti peegeldavad need horisontaalsed ja vertikaalsed koordinaatteljed, mille otseses ja mõttelises ristumiskohas Andres paikneb, tema keskset positsiooni stseenis: kuigi ühelt poolt on tähelepanu suunatud Põdrusele, jälgitakse toimuvat Andrese vaatepunktist. Üksiti asub Andres sõna otseses mõttes kahe leeri vahel: hääletamisel jääb ta ainsana erapoolikuks, vastupidiselt Helvile, kel jätkub julgust – samuti ainsana – mitte nõustuda Põdruse väljaheitmisega. Tema habras valendav käsivars tõuseb “tühise vähemuse” üksiku esindajana tumeda inimmassi kohale ning kaamera sõidab Andrese pilku järgides sellele lähemale. Põdrus on nüüd sunnitud oma märkmiku, kuhu ta “kogu aeg midagi kirjutab”, presiidiumile loovutama ning ruumist lahkuma. Terav ülarakurss kahandab ta presiidiumilaua ees tähtsusetuks kääbuseks; kaameratöö markeerib üksiti tema alanduse sügavust. Kui stseeni esimene osa on filmitud ruumi kokku suruva teleobjektiiviga, mis väljendab hästi Põdruse, aga ka Andrese nurkasurutuse muljet (eriti hästi tabab seda suurplaanis kaader Andrese näost kesk poolthääletajate kätemerd) ning taandab aktiivist osavõtjad tuimaks, homogeenseks ja hõlpsalt manipuleeritavaks inimmassiks, siis kaadris, mis näitab Põdruse märkmiku üleandmist, kasutatakse lainurkobjektiivi – koos kõrge võttepunkti ning ülarakursiga muudab see presiidiumilaua taga püsti tõusnud esiplaanile kadreeritud Jürveni üsna kõhetu keha hiiglaslikult suureks, võrreldes saali täitvate inimeste väikeste, anonüümsete ja fookusest väljas näolappidega. Suurplaan üle laua Põdruse poole kummarduvast Jürvenist, taustaks lava kaunistavad raskepärased ja isegi mustvalgel filmil veripunastena tunduvad drapeeringud ning õõnes kiiskavvalge loosung “Tööviljakus on uue ühiskonna võiduks kõige

tähtsam”, jätab viimasest monstrooselt kiskjaliku mulje. Selline kujutamislaad annab tajutavalt tunnistust nii autorite, Põdruse kui ka Helvi antipaatiast Jürveni suhtes, ent kahtlemata osutab vähemalt teatud määral Andresegi esialgu tõrksavõitu ja kõhklevale vastumeelsusele kui mitte Jürveni isiku, siis vähemalt temas inkarneerunud silmakirjaliku dogmatismi suhtes.

Loo algupoolel, kui Andres kehastab veel “raudse inimese” – nagu Reet teda meelitava tituleerib – võrdkuju ning karjäär juhtiva kaadrina tundub ülesmäge minevat ja talle endale rahuldust pakkuvat, seostuvad Andrese nn. personaliseeritud ruumiga eelkõige poolavalikud kontorid ja kabinetid, tema poissmehekodu üht tuba, seegi tööruum, näidatakse vaid ühes lühikeses kaadris. Isegi ametiredelil temast kõrgemal positsioonil olivate ametiruumides, näiteks ministri kabinetis, domineerib Andrese imposantne kuju ja resoluutsed seisukohad. Siiski kaotab ta kübekese oma enesekindlust iga kord, kui kohutub Jürveniga. Viimase kabinet on pigem saali mõõtu, kõrge lae ja suurte akendega, raskepärase mööbliga sisustatud ning puitahveldisega kaetud seintega ruum, mille monumentaalsust rõhutab veelgi lainurkobjektiiv. Parteisekretäri mõjukat positsiooni markeerib ka tema liikumist järgiv kaamera, mille võttenurk kattub aeg-ajalt Jürveni pilguga. Andrese teenistuslikku tõusu märgivad üha avaramad kabinetid, mis ühtaegu tõstavad ikka enam esile tema irdumist endisest sõpruskonnast. Kui Lauri Roogas (Uno Loit), Andrese kunagine rühmakaaslane sõjaväes, nüüd tema alluv metsatööstuse ministriuurimis, tuleb Andrese juurde ametist lahkumisest teatama, osutab kahe mehe paigutus ruumis nende suhtelisele võrdsusele: mõlemad istuvad ühel pool lauda, kaamera kadreerib nad keskplaanis. Ometi lahutavad neid kogu vestluse käigus kaadripäär või misanstsenei

elementide vertikaaljooned, algul kahepoolse ukse keskel, siis aknapiit. Kui Andres on edutatud oblasti täitevkomitee juhiks ning Pajuviidik tuleb talle kurtma ehitusel valitseva korralageduse üle, jääb Andres kogu vestluse ajaks oma laua taha istuma ega püüagi ületada nende vahele siginenud sotsiaalse kihistuse lõhet, mida kabinetiruum, sisustuse paigutus ning tegelaste asetus nii ilmekalt väljendab. Nende tööruumide taustale projitseeritud “raudsele” Andresele vastandub järsult avarii järel haiglavoodis lebav, vigastatud, soniv ja jõuetu Lapeteus, kelle armetu vaimne seisund tõuseb kongilaadse palati helevalgel sügavuseta tühjuses teravalt esile. Kui senini seostusid Andresega sageli tema mõjukat positsiooni markeerivad alt-rakursist võetud kaadrid, siis nüüd kujutatakse teda pea eranditult justkui maadliku suruvast kõrgest võttepunktist ja ülarakursist.

Myrto Konstantarakos kirjutab eessõnas kogumikule “Spaces in European Cinema”: “Filmi liigendavad [sageli] ruumilised opositsioonid.”⁴⁷ “Lapeteuse” silmapaistvaim ruumipolaarsus avaldub kahtlemata Andresega seotud tõise sfääri ning Reeta iseloomustava eramaja vastasseisus. See kontrast ei tugine mitte üksnes avaliku ja isikliku ruumi erinevustele, millele lisandub üsna ilmselt ka teatav soolisuse aspekt – avaliku ruumi maskuliinsus kandub mõneti üle ka seal liikuvaike naistele, eelkõige Helvile, kelle kodu ei näidata –, vaid kannab võrdlemisi konkreetselt ka ideoloogilisi lahknevusi *à la* sotsialistlik kollektiivsus *versus* (väike)kodanlik individualism. Kui esimesega seostub võitlus eetiliste ja poliitiliste ideaalide eest, siis teine haakub demoniseeritud seksuaal-

47 M. Konstantarakos, Introduction. – Spaces in European Cinema. Ed. M. Konstantarakos. Exeter, Portland: intellect, 2000, lk. 4.

suse ja lihaliku liiderdamisega. Eriti efekt-selt avaldub Reeda ja tema sõpruskonna saatanliku kõlblusetuse aspekt kahe kaadri kõrvutuses ning nendevahelises montaažiüleminekus. Esimeses kaadris kohtub Lapeteuse kabinetist ja metsatööstuse ministeeriumi alluvusest lahkunud Roogas tänaval juhuslikult Põdrusega, kes on just parteist välja heidetud. Koos kõnnivad nad Eliel Saarise projekteeritud Tallinna Vastastikuse Krediidühistu maja (Pärnu mnt. 10) siseõue, kus kõnelevad kommunistlikest ideaalidest (Põdrus: “Kõige tähtsam on, et me end alati kommunistidena tunneksime ja igas olukorras selleks ka jääksime.”). Veidi paatoslikule dialoogile annab jõudu siseõue arhitektuurne keskkond ning kaamera positsioon, mis filmib ovaalse aatriumi rinnatisele nõjatavaid mehi tugevast altrakursist, hoovi alumiselt tasandilt. Kaader on komponeeritud nii, et õlg õla kõrval seisvad figuurid jäävad majaseintest moodustuva nurga taustale, mis tundub otsesõnu osutavat nende ühisele nurkasurutusele; nende ühtekuuluvusest annavad tunnistust ka karniiside ristuvad jooned tagaplaanil. Põdruse sõnadele annab kõlajõudu juurde võimsate müüride vahel kaikuv kajaefekt. Kaadri lõppedes langetavad mõlemad mehed silmad ning justkui nende pilku järgides laskub kaamera allapoole, hoovi sügavusse. Pärast hetkelist pimendust jätkub film stseeniga Reeda orgiamaiguliselt soolaleivapeolt, mille esimene kaader ümber lookas pidulaua “Õllepruulijat” laulvatest külalistest on võetud peaaegu linnulennurakursist. Nii tekib kahe stseeni vahel vertikaalne ruumisuhe, mis pole üksnes geomeetriline, vaid ka üsna kõnekalt sümbolne.

Reeda vampiirlikku seksuaalsust toetab muuhulgas tema portreeterimiseks kasutatud valguslahendus, mis paneb ta blondid kiharad nimbusena helendama. Selle ingellikust ja deemonlikkust lõimiva *femme fatale*’i ris-

tandikonograafia lõi 1930. aastail legendaarse “sinise ingli” Marlene Dietrichi jaoks režissöör Josef von Sternberg ning seitsaadiik on juukse kroonile langev, neid paradoksaalsel moel spiritualiseeriv ülaltvalgus olnud saatuslike naiste peamine representatsiooniviis. “Lapeteuses” vastandub Reeda agressiivsele erotismile Andrese hüljatud sõjaaegse kallima Helvi aoseksuaalne ja sõna otseses mõttes halastajaõelik (Helvi teenis sõjaväes sanitaarpataljonis) malbus. Ruumiliselt markeerib seda hästi naiste ainus kohtumine, kus Reet läheb parteikomiteesse Andrese eest paluma, kuid leiab sekretäri kohalt Jürveni asemel Helvi. Stseeni läbivalt seostub Helviga valgusküllane ja avar ruum, mis rõhutab tema moraalselt puhtust ja siirust, isegi tema rõivastus on heledates toonides, samas kui Reet kannab tumedat kostüümi ning seisab, ise kimbatuses ja ebaseadlikult üllatunud, raskepäraste puitpaneelidega kaetud umbse seina taustal.

Nagu juba ülalpool mainitud, võib filmi pea igas kaadris näha akende taga kihavat tänavamelu, mis esmajoones osutab Teise maailmasõja järgse filmikunsti stiiliuudenduste – Itaalia neorealismi ja Prantsuse uue laine teatava dokumentaalsuse ja eluläheduse taotluse – jõudmisele siinsetesse lineteostesse. Narratiivselt peaks see ilmselt rõhutama filmi sündmustiku ning käsitletava probleemistiku tõetruudust ja elulist aktuaalsust. “Lapeteust” läbiv ühiskonnakriitika teema viitab ka sellele, et reaalse ja fiktsionaalse ruumi vahelised seosed pole niivõrd arhitektuursesse, kuivõrd sotsiaalsesse ruumi, ühiskondlikesse suhtevõrgustikesse puutuvad. Ehitatud keskkond funktsioneerib küll kahtlemata ajalise-geograafilise koordinaatteljestiku markeerijana, ent jutustusega haakuvad selle elemendid pigem tegelaste hingeelu, sotsiaalseid positsioone ning inimsuhteid väljendavate kujunditena. Näiteks stseenis,

kus Helvi ja Põdrus istuvad pärast saatusliku parteiaktiivi koosolekut kohvikus, on nende taustaks klombitud paekivist müür, mis enamikus kaadrites täidab pea poole pildiväljast. Ühelt poolt märgib see lihtsalt filmi valmimise aegse ajaviiteasutuste interjööri-disaini moesuunda, mis eelistas arhailisi kujunduselemente, teisalt aga omandab müür Helvi ja Põdruse vestluse taustal piltliku tähenduse, viidates nende kahe ideoloogilisele ja eetilisele eraldatusele (muuhulgas teisel pool müüri nende kõnelust salaja pealt kuulavast Haavikust, kes oli sõja ajal Lape-teuse jt. polgukaaslane, sõja järel aga varjamatult ambitsioonikas ja küüniline elunautleja ning lõpuks ka Reeda armuke) ning sisemisele vankumatusse. Analoogselt funktsioneerib Reeda Andresele pillatud meelitav lause viimase tõepoolsest ahtavõitu metsatööstuse ministeeriumi kabinetis: “Teil on siin kitsas.” Lisaks ruumi tegeliku ulatuse nentimisele vihjab Reet siin selgelt Andrest tõepoolsest iseloomustavale auahnusele, tema (ja ka Reeda enese) soovile töusta kõrgemale ja haarata rohkem.

“Viini postmark” ja arhitektuursed opositsioonid

Kui “Lape-teuse” ruumirepresentatsioone määras ennekõike filmi tegelasgalerii karakteriseerimise ning nendevaheliste suhete väljendamise eesmärk, mis avaldus peaaesjalikult kaameratöö ja montaaži kaudu, siis “Viini postmargi” ruumirežiimi kaalukaim element on arhitektuurne keskkond nii stuudiodekoratsioonide kui ka välisvõttepaikade kujul. See tahk domineerib efektse kujundina filmis kui tervikus sedavõrd, et teenis esilinas-tuse järel kriitikutelt, kes olid ilmselt harjunud toonase Eesti filmikunsti suhtelise “elutruuduse” ja teatava visuaalse summutatusega, ebaharilikult poleemilise ning hämmeldunud vastukaja.⁴⁸ Retseptisioonist jäi ühest

küljest kõlama mõte, et elamuehituse probleem pole naljaasi ning selle teema tarvis tuleks kasutada dokumentaalsemaid žanreid.⁴⁹ Teisalt leidsid mõnedki arvustajad, et kunstnik-lavastaja (Rein Raamat) töö soleerib filmi kontekstis liialt, tõmmates tähelepanu kõrvale peamiselt – Martin Rolli kasvamiselt “tõeliseks nõukogude inimeseks”.⁵⁰ Kuigi osaliselt tuleb ilmselt viimase väitega nõustuda – mahlane kunstnikutöö ei sulandu ehk tõesti piisavalt sujuvalt tervikusse (aga kas peabki?) –, leian siiski, et esitatud arhitektuursed opositsioonid pole jutustuse suhtes kaugeltki ebaolulised, vastupidi – ehitatud keskkond aitab olulisel määral väljendada Martini moraalset metamorfoosi.

Raamatus “Sets in Motion” toovad Charles ja Mirella Jona Affron välja viis dekoratsiooni ja jutustuse vahekorra tasandit.⁵¹ Esiteks dekoratsioon kui denotatsioon (*set as denotation*), mis kannab jutustust vaid vähesel määral, märkides üksnes hädavajalikud aja, koha ning meeolelu piirjooned ning “toetades üldiselt tunnustatud tõelisuse kujutamist”.⁵² Sellised “lääbipaistvad” dekoratsioonid on iseloomulikud madalaeelarvelistele filmidele ning ei torka märkimisväärselt silma. Dekoratsioon kui punktuatsioon (*set as punctuation*) haarab filmi käigus kohati vaataja tähelepanu, sest on jutustusega põhjus-

48 Vt. selle kohta ka E. Närripea, Kaadrid modernistlikust ideaallinnast: “Viini postmark” ja Mustamäe. – Kohandumise märgid. Koost. ja toim. V. Sarapik, M. Kalda, R. Veidemann. Tallinn: Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus, 2002, lk. 156–158.

49 Nt. E. Treier, “Viini postmargist”, teravatest nurkadest, kastidest ja suurpaneelmajadest. – Noorte Häääl 19. I 1968.

50 Nt. H. Luik, Siit nurgast ja sealt nurgast. – Rahva Häääl 16. I 1968.

51 C. Affron, M. J. Affron, Sets in Motion: Art Direction and Film Narrative. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1995.

52 C. Affron, M. J. Affron, Sets in Motion, lk. 37.

likult seotud, toetades filmi süžee ja teema teatud tahke ning iseloomustades tegelaste karakterit ning sotsiaalset, kultuurilist, rahvuslikku vms. kuuluvust. Punktuatsiooni-tasandi ekspressiivne dekoratsioon esineb enamasti kallimates filmides ning püüab sihikärselt eristuda konventsionaalsetest kujundusstrateegiatest. Dekoratsioon kui kaunistus (*set as embellishment*) on jutustusega veelgi tihedamalt seotud, selle retooriline jõud ja stilistiline mõjukus tekitavad teatud võõristusefekti, mis lahutab dekoratsiooni üheplaanilisest realistlikkuse taotlusest ning annab sellele sümboolse väärtuse. Kaunistavad dekoratsioonid esinevad sageli ajaloolistes kostüümidraamadades, aga ka sellistes filmides, mille süžee on otseselt seotud kujutavate kunstide või arhitektuuriga, näiteks “Rembrandt” (rež. Alexander Korda, 1936) või “Allikas” (“The Fountainhead”, rež. King Vidor, 1949). Tehislik dekoratsioon (*set as artifice*) tõstab esile omaenese konstrueerituse; sellisele dekoratsioonile pühendatakse rohkelt ekraaniaega, see on igas mõttes esiplaanil, kandes selget mitterealistlikkuse, fiktsionaalsuse ja uute maailmade loomise taotlust. Dekoratsioon on sellel tasandil jutustuse peamine väljendaja, kahandades teadlikult süžee ja tegelaste osatähtsust, näiteks “Dr. Caligari kabinet” (“Das Kabinett des Doktor Caligari”, rež. Robert Wiene, 1919), “Päikeseloojangu bulvar” (“Sunset Boulevard”, rež. Billy Wilder, 1950), “Blade Runner” (rež. Ridley Scott, 1982). Viimase, viienda tasandi dekoratsioon kui jutustus (*set as narrative*), mida esineb suhteliselt harva, iseloomustab ainsasse tegevuspaika koondatud sündmustikuga filme, kus dekoratsioon ja narratiiv sulavad ühte. Selle paiga dekoratsioon võib olla nii denotatiivne, punktupeeriv, illustreeriv kui ka tehislik, “ruumiliselt lihtne või keeruline, täpselt piiritletud või üsna laialivalguv”.⁵³

“Viini postmargi” ehitatud keskkondadest – eramurajoon *versus* paneellinn – tähistab üksnes esimene selgelt teatud tegelaste meelst: rahulikus elurajoonis asuv Vaikne tänav peegeldab sealsete asukate (ennekõike Rollide naispere ning Riitsinuse) väikekodanlikku individualismi (mida ei märgi üksnes võrdlemisi väike asustustihedus, vaid ka näiteks tarade ja aedade rohkus ning kaalukus kaadrikompositsioonides) ja rõhutatud omanditunnet. Seevastu paneellinn ei seotu otseselt ühegi tegelasega: keegi neist seal ei ela, samuti puuduvad läbini positiivsed kangelased, kellega seda sotsialistlikku progressiideed kandvat keskkonda seostada. Siiski – juba Riitsinuse maja esimesel korrusel paiknev Rollide korter, mis olevat sisustatud nii, et ühtegi eset ei saaks Martini omaks pidada⁵⁴, on märk sellest, et dekoratsioonid ei markeeri selles filmis pelgalt üksikute tegelaste iseloomujooni ega mentaliteeti, vaid toetavad kujundlikult filmi peamist süžeele: Martini järk-järgulist enesekehtestamist. Nii võiks “Viini postmargi” dekoratsioonid ülalkirjeldatud raamistikus asetada kolmandasse rühma, sest see loob “ilustatuse” tasandile iseloomulikke jõulisi ning suhteliselt sageli ekraanipinda valitsevaid⁵⁵ kujundeid – kuidas siis veel nimetada kastivabriku hoo vi kerkinud paneelmaju meenutavaid kastivirnu? –, mis “seostuvad jutustuse teatud aspektidega”⁵⁶, antud juhul siis illustreerivad Martini loobumist vanadest kommetest ning uute suhtesüsteemide sisseseadmist. Kruusa ja killustikku ning toasuurusi paneele vedavate veoautode vooide ja juba valminud uuelamurajoonide varal loodud ehitamisele viitav kujundistu pole sugugi asjakohatu, kui

53 C. Affron, M. J. Affron, *Sets in Motion*, lk. 38–40.

54 M. Liidja, *Komöödia sünd*. – *Õhtuleht* 7. IX 1967.

55 C. Affron, M. J. Affron, *Sets in Motion*, lk. 82.

56 C. Affron, M. J. Affron, *Sets in Motion*, lk. 38.

tõmmata paralleel samavõrra konstruktiivse isiksuseloomeprotsessiga. Nõndasama tähendab Martini jõuline tõerääkimine ka ruumilist invasiooni nii abikaasa Elma ja kogu Rollide pere seni kindlalt struktureeritud isiklikku sfääri kui ka kastivabriku juhtkonna võimuareaali. Nii võib öelda, et Martini muutumine hõlmab muuhulgas ka tema isik(sus)liku ruumi laiendamist ja restruktureerimist ning “Viini postmargi” arhitektuursed opositsioonid toetavad seda teemat küllaltki reljeefselt.

Filmid võivad ruumi kasutada väga erinevatel eesmärkidel, ent mängufilmile, eriti selle peavoolulisele osale, kuhu nii “Lapeteus” kui ka “Viini postmark” kahtlemata asetuvad, on enamasti iseloomulik ruumiaspektide tugev seostumine jutustusega, andes olulist teavet tegelaste karakteri, sotsiaalse positsiooni ning mentaliteedi kohta, sätestades tegevuse aja ja koha, väljendades tegelastevahelisi suhteid ning toetades filmi üldisemaid sõnumeid. Jutustuse tegevusruumi aitavad luua kõik filmi-aparaadi elemendid ning kuigi misanstseen ja eriti dekoratsioonid, loodus- või tehiskeskkonnad on ehk ruumirepresentatsioonide välja- paistvaimad kandjad ning arhitektuursed vormid silmatorkavaimad kujundiloojad, võivad ka kaameratöö, montaaž ja heli komponeerida põnevaid narratiivseid paiku.

Film, Space and Narrative: 'What Happened to Andres Lapeteus?' and 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna'

Summary

Each film creates its own characteristic chronotope, in Mikhail Bakhtin's sense¹, which marks the spatio-temporal framework of the narrated story (time and place of the plot), determines the situations and relations between the characters, and conveys various more general messages and value criteria. However, besides what is being depicted, the way it is depicted must also be kept in mind. Film commands diverse equipment, apparatus that help create a three-dimensional world on a two-dimensional screen, 'where space and time are compressed and expanded'², and manipulates all spatio-temporal, narrative and formal aspects. This is a set of effective techniques and methods³ which considerably influence the patterns of meaning of the film text as a whole. Besides the narrative, camera-work, montage, different elements of the *mise-en-scène* and sound comprise a formal system that inevitably constitutes a factor that creates a message⁴, from the viewpoint of both the artists and spectators.

As the above-mentioned formal elements have been constantly changing over time and space, at different periods and geographical locations, establishing new and, almost always, unique associations with the narratives in feature films, their comprehensive mapping is practically impossible. The current article therefore approaches the issues of film space in the form of case analysis, tackling and comparing two films: 'What Happened to Andres Lapeteus?'⁵ and 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna'⁶. I will examine how the films use spatial aspects and whether and how the depicted environments merge with the lines of the narrative. The first part of the

article is a more general form analysis, guided by David Bordwell's claim that the work's 'content comes to us in and through the patterned use of the medium's techniques'⁷, and by the theses of Alexander Prokhorov⁸, a researcher of 1960s Soviet cinema.

1 See M. M. Bahtin, *Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes Toward a Historical Poetics*. – *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*.

Ed. M. Holquist, trans. C. Emerson, M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981, pp. 84–258.

2 J. Hopkins, *A Mapping of Cinematic Places: Icons, Ideology, and the Power of (Mis)representation*. – *Place, Power, Situation, and Spectacle: A Geography of Film*. Eds. S. S. Aitken, L. E. Zonn. Lanham, London: Rowman & Littlefield, 1994, p. 47.

3 The apparatus theory was one of the leading frameworks in film studies in the 1970s, which emerged from semiotics and psychoanalytical theory, mainly based on the ideas of Jacques Lacan and Louis Althusser.

4 See, e.g., D. Bordwell, K. Thompson, *Film Art: An Introduction*. Seventh Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004, p. 175ff; J. Gibbs, D. Pye, Introduction. – *Style and Meaning: Studies in the Detailed Analysis of Film*. Eds. J. Gibbs, D. Pye. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, 2005, p. 10.

5 'Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega', dir. Grigori Kromanov, cinematographer Mikhail Dorovatovsky, set designer Linda Vernik, Tallinnfilm, 1966. Screen version of Paul Kuusberg's novel 'The Case of Andres Lapeteus' (1963), script by Paul Kuusberg.

6 'Viini postmark', dir. Veljo Käsper, cinematographer Harry Rehe, set designer Rein Raamat, Tallinnfilm, 1967. On the basis of Ardi Liives's play of the same title, script by Ardi Liives.

7 D. Bordwell, *Figures Traced in Light: On Cinematic Staging*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2005, p. 32; see also D. Bordwell, K. Thompson, *Film Art*, p. 175ff.

8 A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse: Stalinist Tropes in Thaw Culture*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 2002. – <http://etd.library.pitt.edu/ETD/available/etd-07242002-135513/>. A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave: Soviet Cinema of the 1960s*. – *Springtime for Soviet Cinema: Re/Viewing the 1960s*. Ed. A. Prokhorov. Pittsburgh, 2001, pp. 7–28. – <http://www.rusfilm.pitt.edu/booklets/Thaw.pdf>.

In the Estonian context, the 1960s are considered the era of the ‘rebirth of national film’⁹, when professionals educated in Moscow and Leningrad took over the baton from guest artists (mostly directors) who were dominant in local film-making during the post-war decades. In the general cultural arena, film still remained in the role of a ‘big loner’, as Lennart Meri bitterly admitted in 1968.¹⁰ ‘What Happened to Andres Lapeteus?’, and partly also ‘The Postage-Stamp of Vienna’ were both films that, nevertheless, managed to attract the attention of the public and of critics.

Narrative and Presentation: Connections with Soviet ‘New Wave’ Cinema

‘What Happened to Andres Lapeteus?’ presents a personal drama with desolate undertones against the background of insecure social circumstances during the decades after the Second World War. The protagonist Andres Lapeteus is shown as an outwardly successful man, who shrewdly operates under sensitive political conditions and achieves material prosperity and a relatively stable social position. However, his superficial ascending trajectory is opposed by a chain of questionable personal choices, soon to become fatal.

The plot of ‘The Postage-Stamp of Vienna’ centres on the topic of telling the truth. The story, in a farcical tone, tells of the (re-)establishing of the authority, both in his professional and family life, of Martin Roll, a skilled worker in a box factory and a keen philatelist.

Alexander Prokhorov, who received his PhD in 2002 from Pittsburgh University for his thesis ‘Inherited Discourse: Stalinist Narratives in Thaw Culture’, proves quite convincingly that, although during the 1960s film-makers regarded their work as an an-

tithesis of Stalinist cinema, they still focused – true, in a modified form – on the essential topics of Stalinist culture: the positive hero, family and war. At the same time there was a significant shift in scale: the grand heroism of Stalinism was replaced by more chamber-like and personal achievements, the domestic milieu often replaced battlefields, the (nuclear) family no longer reflected only the Big Family of Nations, and the (male) individual, whose identity, personal self-expression and world of perception formed the core of the stories, was preferred to the masses. The iconography connected with heroes and scoundrels went through a remarkable transformation. Another significant aspect was restoring the revolutionary mentality lost in the course of the Stalinist regime, and returning to the ‘pure’ Leninist ideals of the 1920s.¹¹ These narrative features are present in both films, in one way or another.

The mainstream of Stalinist film officially rejected the Soviet avant-garde’s experimental manner of depiction of the 1920s, which relied on various film technologies, primarily on the possibilities of montage. The period of the ‘Thaw’, in the second half of the 1950s, introduced new means of expression which preferred visual aspects to narrative and sound aspects. Following the example of European ‘art cinema’, film-makers started experimenting with different screen technologies (quick-paced montage, which did not always follow the principles of spatio-temporal clarity, frequent dissolves, complicated panoramic shots and subjective point-

⁹ Õ. Orav, *Tallinnfilm I. Mängufilmid 1947–1976*. Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus, 2003, p. 20.

¹⁰ L. Meri, *Suur üksiklane*. – *Sirp ja Vasar* 1968, February 9.

¹¹ A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*, pp. 30–31, 51ff; A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave*, p. 8ff.

of-view camera patterns¹²). What was mostly revived from the history of Soviet film were the montage techniques of the avant-garde of the 1920s. However, the avant-garde style was imitated or quoted almost always at elevated narrative moments, when the story was momentarily halted in order to, for example, convey a character's strong emotions and his subjective point of view. By the time of the Thaw, the 1920s avant-garde had become part of the canon, and its usage supported the diversifying of the narrative regime created in the 1930s¹³, rather than trying to undermine the ideology on which it was based.

Innovative visual style elements can be found in abundance both in 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna' and in 'Lapeteus'. In that sense, 'What Happened to Andres Lapeteus?' is more interesting and diverse, although "The Postage-Stamp of Vienna" also offers some dynamic pictorial solutions. Many of those are a part of the field of cinematography and montage. 'Lapeteus' and 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna' are similar in the usage of low-angle close-ups, which often focus on only the most important character at a given moment, pointing to his (power) relations with other characters, his superior position, and his self-confidence.

Film Space

'Lapeteus' and 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna' are connected by a common geographical location and relative proximity on the diegetic and the real time axis: the films were completed within one year of each other, and both depict events happening in contemporary Tallinn. At the same time, they create two rather different space models, emphasizing divergent film elements and methods to unite space and narrative. 'Lapeteus' is dominated by a strongly personified space, where

the existing place of action, or one specially created for the film, alludes to the state of mind of some characters, notes his or her social position and value criteria, or has the function of expressing the (power) relations between people. In 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna', on the other hand, characters are depicted in a caricatured manner by means of spatial polarities; in addition, there is a clear aim of drawing mental parallels between the environment and some developments of the plot. Elements of architecture and interior design as images are more strikingly marked in 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna', whereas in 'Lapeteus' the constructed environment and its details are woven into the narrative in a much more refined and polished manner. 'Lapeteus' is more focused on filigree cinematography and the characters' placement in each shot, as well as montage that maintains the continuity in the relatively fragmented plot, which leaps both in time and space. 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna' is more keen on (studio) decorations and a constructed environment. These differences are partly caused by the diverse genres of the two films: 'Lapeteus', as a drama of relationships and the individual, indeed concentrates on human nature and relations, whereas the other film, in true comedy genre, 'animates' the inanimate objects in the surrounding environment as a source of comical situations. We could refer here to such comedy classics as Charlie Chaplin and Jacques Tati, as well as, for example, to René Clair's film 'À nous la liberté' (1931). The latter is associated with 'The Postal-Stamp of Vienna' by the imagery of modernist ar-

12 A. Prokhorov, *The Unknown New Wave*, pp. 12–13.

13 A. Prokhorov, *Inherited Discourse*, pp. 62–67.

See also A. Maimik, "Hullumeelsus" – modernistlik üksiklane 1960. aastate eesti mängufilmis. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 1999, no. 11, p. 85.

chitecture. A significant difference between the treatment of space in the films also exists in their locations: 'Lapeteus', as mentioned above, was mostly filmed in a natural setting, whereas 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna' mainly uses pavilion shots.

* * *

Films can use space for vastly different purposes, creating compact and unique timespaces, together with the narrative. However, feature films, especially those of the mainstream, where both 'Lapeteus' and 'The Postage-Stamp of Vienna' are certainly placed, are mostly characterised by the strong association of spatial aspects with the narrative, thus offering significant information about the personalities of the characters, their social positions and mentalities, fixing the time and place of action, expressing the relations between the characters and supporting the film's more general messages. All elements of the film apparatus help create the narrative's space of meaning and, although the *mise-en-scène* and especially sets, as well as the natural or artificial environments, carry the spatial representations better and architectural forms produce more remarkable images, fascinating narrative places can also be produced by cinematography, montage and sound.

*Translated by Tiina Randviir
proof-read by Richard Adang*

Spojrzenie turysty
jako strategiczne
narzędzie przedstawienia
architektonicznego:
starówka tallinnska
a sowiecki marketing
turystyczny
w latach sześćdziesiątych
i siedemdziesiątych
XX wieku

Tourist Gaze
as a Strategic Device
of Architectural
Representation:
Tallinn Old Town and
Soviet Tourism Marketing
in the 1960s and 1970s

A facsimile of an article published in

TURYZM.

Panoptikum: Film, Media, Sztuka,
no. 8 (15), 2009, pp. 108–116

Eva Näripea

Spojrzenie turysty jako strategiczne narzędzie przedstawienia architektonicznego: starówka tallińska a sowiecki marketing turystyczny w latach sześćdziesiątych i siedemdziesiątych XX wieku

Struktura urbanistyczna Tallina jest doskonałym odzwierciedleniem kultury estońskiej jako kultury zerwania i nieciągłości, co w istotnej mierze jest następstwem szczególnego położenia geograficznego Estonii – jej statusu „państwa granicznego”¹ – oraz nader skomplikowanych uwarunkowań historycznych. Znamieniem zabudowy tallińskiej jest obecność wielu niekompletnych zespołów architektonicznych, co w sumie składa się na krajobraz miejski pełen sprzeczności i osobliwych zestawień. Ale w samym sercu tego pejzażu leży stare miasto – otoczona czterokilometrowym murem z wapienia najstarsza część miasta, będąca integralnym i dobrze zachowanym zespołem architektonicznym zabudowy średniowiecznej, którego postać ukształtowała się głównie w okresie od XIII do XV wieku. To malownicze środowisko miejskie zawsze było atrakcyjnym źródłem obrazów dla mediów wizualnych, przy czym oczywiście w sposób szczególny w kontekście pojawiania się i rozwoju – a także kontestacji – nowoczesnych praktyk turystycznych. Jednocześnie środowisko to było i jest miejscem negocjacji między niezgodnymi ideologiami i tożsamościami (narodowymi), a także ważną areną (re)prezentacji władzy, oporu i przystosowania. W okresie władzy sowieckiej w latach sześćdziesiątych i siedemdziesiątych procesy te nakładały się na siebie, generując szczególnie skomplikowaną i wieloznaczną konfigurację przedstawień, refleksji i praktyk. W latach sześćdziesiątych stare miasto i ogólniejszy temat dziedzictwa średniowiecznego zaczęły nagle być niesłuchanie istotne zarówno w kręgach akademickich, jak i w kulturze masowej, co zrodziło bogactwo tekstów literackich i wizualnych. Ten cokolwiek nostalgiczny i romantyczny „nurt średniowieczny” zaowocował mnóstwem artykułów konsumpcyjnych, wyraził się szeroko w wystroju wnętrz i przyniósł pokaźną liczbę filmów. W rozprawie tej zajmę się przede wszystkim filmami krótkimi, tak zwanymi filmami pejzażowymi (*scenic*), a dosłownie „widokowymi” (*view film*)², jakie przez tamte dwie dekady powstawały w dwóch estońskich wytwórniach filmowych okresu sowieckiego, czyli w Tallinnfilmie i Eesti Telefilmie (Estońskim Filmie Telewizyjnym). Zamierzam dokonać przeglądu stosowanych w tych filmach sposobów przedstawiania pejzażu starego miasta i jego charakterystycznych obiektów, dowodząc, że choć zasadniczym motywem ruchu ochrony dziedzictwa narodowego, który wyraził się między innymi w postaci owego „nurtu średniowiecznego”, był sprzeciw wobec sowieckiego dyskursu kulturowego wyrażany w terminach tożsamości narodowej, to prądy przeważające w sferze kultury popularnej były bliżej związane z przyswojeniem sowieckich skłonności kulturalnych. Można by nawet bronić dalej idącego twierdzenia, że była to sprytna strategia Sowietów mająca prowadzić do zasymilowania okupowanego kraju – strategia w swej istocie pokrewna dawniejszej stalinowskiej polityce ucisku, lecz znacznie bardziej wyrafinowana praktycznie. Z drugiej strony w obrębie

tego „nurtu średniowiecznego” – nawet w filmie, czyli w najsumienniejszym nadzorowanym obszarze kultury masowej, nie mówiąc już o innych jej obszarach – wyraźnie widoczne są również akcenty odrębności i ostrożne, lecz fundamentalne taktyczne odwrócenia panującego porządku.

Okupacja sowiecka stworzyła sytuację kulturową, która paradoksalnie pomogła Estończykom w końcu przyswoić sobie dziedzictwo dawniejszych kolonizatorów i włączyć tallińskie stare miasto jako pradawną cytadelę niemiecką w lokalną tożsamość narodową, a nawet – jak twierdzi estoński historyk architektury Mart Kalm – obrócić je w szaniec własnego oporu narodowego. Ale opór ten w postaci ustanawiania lokalnej/narodowej tożsamości kulturowej urzeczywistniał się *w ramach* panującego systemu sowieckiego, co za Michélem Foucault można ująć w ten sposób, że to oficjalne działania władz stwarzały okazję do tego oporu³. Było tak dlatego, że oprócz stawiania własnych pomników władza sowiecka nie zaniedbywała okazji do, jak to się mówi, „strojenia się w nieswoje piórka”, przywdziewania rozmaitych kostiumów z historii zarówno Rosji, jak i pozostałych republik, i zgodnie ze stalinowską zasadą „narodowo w treści, socjalistycznie w formie” umiejętnie wplatała samą materialną skorupę widomie spornego ideologicznie starego Tallina w internacjonalistyczny kontekst kulturowy Związku Sowieckiego, kodując na nowo jego znaczenia i modyfikując jego funkcje poprzez wykonywanie w sowieckiej propagandzie.

Począwszy od schyłku lat sześćdziesiątych nieodzownym źródłem dewiz i gałęzią istotną dla funkcjonowania całej sowieckiej gospodarki stała się turystyka. Szybko rosnący dług w twardej walucie wobec zachodnich instytucji finansowych, który powstał w wyniku zaciągnięcia kredytów na zakup zachodnich technologii i miał być spłacony z – urojonych, jak się okazało – dochodów czerpanych z eksportu towarów, wytworzonych dzięki tym technologiom, nadał niebywałą rangę przemysłowi turystycznemu w Związku Radzieckim, którego władze były zarazem ogromnie, niekiedy wręcz paranoicznie nieufne wobec gości z zagranicy i w ogóle świata zewnętrznego. Centralne radzieckie biuro podróży Inturist na liście atrakcji, którymi wabiono zagranicznych turystów, obok Wołgogradu, Nowogrodu, Kalinina, Zagorska, Suzdału, Jarosławia, Kijowa, Lwowa, Użhorodu, Rygi, Wilna, Mińska, Taszkientu, Ałma Aty, Buchary, Samarkandy, Tbilisi, Erewania i wielu innych miast umieściło również Tallin⁴. Ta praktyczna, gospodarcza przyczyna była bez wątpienia jednym z najważniejszych czynników szerokiego spopularyzowania średniowiecznego wizerunku tallińskiej starówki.

Materiał wizualny upowszechniany przez media masowe spowił stary Tallin jako towar turystyczny w wielowarstwowe „treści reklamowe”, które – zgodnie z twierdzeniem estońskiego medioznawcy Peetera Linnapa⁵ – do wartości kulturowych dziedzictwa historycznego dodają wartość rynkową, prezentując je przez pryzmat tak zwanego „spojrzenia turysty”. Ukute przez socjologa turystyki Johna Urry’ego w ważkim studium *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies* (1990) pojęcie „spojrzenia turysty”, choć odnosi się również do swoistej ciekawości turystycznej, to (głównie za sprawą fenomenologii) utarło się jako kategoria oznaczająca przede wszystkim pewien ogólny modus postrzegania. Zdaniem wielu badaczy ten sposób patrzenia stał się w drugiej połowie, a zwłaszcza pod koniec XX wieku najważniejszą zależnością w środowisku międzyludzkim. Nastawienie takie obejmuje między innymi motywowane komercyjnie, hierarchiczne i zreifikowane ujmowanie krajobrazu mniej lub bardziej oderwanego od codziennej praktyki.

Wspomniany już dogmat socrealizmu „narodowo w treści, socjalistycznie w formie” był od połowy lat trzydziestych jedyną oficjalną doktryną artystyczną w Związku

Sowieckim. Choć Chruszczowowska odwilż przyniosła wiele zmian, usuwając lub przekształcając niemało rygorystycznie sformułowanych wymogów formalnych i treściowych, sama zasada nie przestała odgrywać wiodącej roli zarówno w dyskursie oficjalnym, jak i w praktyce artystycznej, zwłaszcza w kinematografii tak prowincjonalnej, jak przemysł filmowy sowieckiej Estonii.

Nie będzie przesadą stwierdzenie, iż główne założenia socrealizmu mają niemało wspólnego z turystycznymi sposobami przedstawiania. Jedno z najgłębszych podobieństw polega na wytwarzaniu iluzjonistycznego, eskapistycznego i wybiórczego świata marzeń, który nie ma prawie nic wspólnego z rzeczywistością i praktykami dnia powszedniego czy to w wymiarze społecznym, czy środowiskowym. „Spojrzenie turysty zwraca się ku tym cechom krajobrazu i pejzażu miejskiego, które odrywają je od doświadczenia codziennego”, pisał John Urry⁶. Choć kanon socrealizmu – zgodnie z uchwałami pierwszego kongresu pisarzy sowieckich z 1934 roku – „wymaga od artysty wiernego i konkretnego historycznie przedstawiania rzeczywistości w jej rozwoju rewolucyjnym”⁷, to stosowanie tego postulatu w praktyce artystycznej oznaczało zawsze wytwarzanie cukierkowej pseudorzeczywistości pełnej patosu i wyidealizowanych obrazów. Ten sposób przedstawiania jest bardzo podobny do metod ukazywania krajobrazów i środowisk miejskich w zachodnich filmach i broszurach reklamujących wszelkiego rodzaju atrakcje turystyczne zarówno w krajach zachodnich, jak w Trzecim Świecie. Ning Wang wskazuje kilka idei kształtujących tego rodzaju „przekształcenie symboliczne rzeczywistości”, w tym upiększanie, uromantycznianie oraz idealizację⁸. Autorzy broszur reklamowych dla turystów wytwarzają wyidealizowany obraz reklamowanego miejsca, ograniczając uwagę do urokliwych pejzaży i elementów i pomijając widoki nieprzyjemne, nieciekawe lub nieodpowiednie. Ponadto, jeżeli reklamowane miejsce nie dostarcza widoków pięknych samych w sobie, to specjaliści od reklamy turystycznej upiększają je, ukazując jako romantyczne lub w sposób „wyidealizowany”. Przykłady podane przez Wangę obejmują takie atrakcje turystyczne jak ruiny i miejsca dzikie. Ale takie same metody przekształcania rzeczywistości stosowano również w odniesieniu do tallińskiej starówki. Po pierwsze istniała silna skłonność do skupiania uwagi na odnowionych „klejnotach”, takich jak ratusz, kilka starych kościołów i parę innych budynków. Po drugie ikonografia turystyczna starego miasta wykorzystywała szeroko skojarzenia romantyczne, jakie budzą rozmaite faktury materialne tego rodzaju środowiska: szorstkie i rustykalne powierzchnie wapiennych murów, mozaikowe przestrzenie dachów z czerwonej dachówki, malownicze fasady o chropawym tynku i miejscami spłowiałych kolorach, kręte uliczki o brukowych nawierzchniach. Ale romantyzm tej historycznej scenerii był powierzchowny, a jego drugą stroną była często ruina i zaniedbanie – jak byśmy się przekonali, gdybyśmy zajrzeli na brudne i zaśmiecone podwórka za świeżo odnowionymi murami lub wejrzeli w ponure życie codzienne w komunalnych mieszkaniach, jakie mieściły się w kamienicach o malowniczych, lecz na ogół zapuszczonych fasadach. Ekspresję romantyczną uzyskiwano często po prostu dzięki filmowaniu z odpowiedniej odległości, na przykład z powietrza.

W studium na temat fotografii podróżniczej i przedstawiania ludów egzotycznych Patricia C. Albers i William R. James wskazują trzy główne mechanizmy symboliczne charakteryzujące wyidealizowany świat przedstawień turystycznych, a mianowicie: homogenizację (która polega na tym, że „cechy danego obszaru i jego mieszkańców podciąga się pod stereotypy pewnego panującego modelu kulturowego”), dekontekstualizację (która „polega na umieszczaniu podmiotów etnicznych w kontekstach pozbawionych konkretnego odniesienia w realnie przeżytej historii”) oraz mistyfikację⁹. Mechanizmy homogenizacji oraz dekontekstualizacji są integralną częścią stalinowskiego dogmatu „narodowo w for-

mie, socjalistycznie w treści”, a ich konkretne funkcjonowanie uwidacznia się w większości filmów na temat starówki tallińskiej. Podciąganie pod stereotypy było oczywiście jednym z fundamentalnych mechanizmów realizmu socjalistycznego, który obowiązywał we wszystkich dziedzinach sztuki i owocował, na przykład, pseudoetnograficznymi przedstawieniami ludów wszystkich tak różnych republik Związku Sowieckiego w strojach ludowych (co jest również nieodłącznym elementem zachodniej ikonografii turystycznej) i w otoczeniu archaicznych obiektów kultury materialnej. Tallińska starówka jest kolejnym przykładem działania tego mechanizmu, z tą tylko różnicą, że wytwarzanie stereotypu polega tu na ustawicznym powtarzaniu na pocztówkach, pamiątkach i w filmach tych samych wizerunków budowli historycznych, tych samych szczegółów i widoków. Taka stereotypizacja wiąże się bezpośrednio z dekontekstualizacją, ponieważ przedstawienia starego miasta w filmach widokowych polegają na ogół na pocztówkowych ujęciach starych budynków i innych artefaktów w oderwaniu od ich historii. Ponadto, począwszy od lat sześćdziesiątych, co roku w Tallinie zjawiało się kilka ekip filmowych z „siostrzanych republik” w celu kręcenia własnych filmów kostiumowych, co czyniło z tallińskiej starówki tło oderwanych wydarzeń historycznych, które w rzeczywistości rozegrały się gdzie indziej, i w ten sposób pozbawiało ją autentycznego kontekstu. Takie praktyki przedstawieniowe korespondują blisko z twierdzeniem Wanga, że „turyści widzą zazwyczaj tylko turystyczne widoki i atrakcje, a kontekst społeczny, w którym te atrakcje się pojawiają, jest z reguły ignorowany”, a także z jego uwagą głoszącą, że „turystyczny sposób widzenia jest [...] patrzaniem ahistorycznym [...] i patrzaniem upraszczającym”. Twierdzenia te, podobnie jak teza Albers i Jamesa o dekontekstualizacji, odnoszą się również do uderzającego w filmach widokowych braku autentycznych treści żywego doświadczenia codzienności, właściwej im tendencji do usuwania ludzi z kadru i wykluczania, jak to już wskazałam, smętnej rzeczywistości schowanej za fasadą.

Ten ahistoryczny sposób patrzenia i przedstawiania nasuwa kwestie historii i pamięci. Zgodnie z twierdzeniem Carol Crawshaw i Johna Urry’ego z rozprawy *Tourism nad the Photographic Eye*¹⁰ „turystyka w wielkiej mierze polega na pamięci. Turystyka jest na swój sposób zawłaszczaniem wspomnień innych ludzi”. Zawłaszczanie pamięci, rekonceptualizacja i pisanie na nowo historii innych ludzi było kluczowym momentem „wytwarzania” estońskiego „nurtu średniowiecznego”. Nasuwa to szereg kwestii dotyczących z jednej strony teorii i praktyki ochrony i odnawiania dziedzictwa w ZSRR, a z drugiej stanowisk zajmowanych wobec tych kwestii i tej praktyki w lokalnym dyskursie estońskim.

Główną zasadą radzieckiej ochrony dziedzictwa było „naukowe odnawianie”, które w ogólności oznaczało przywracanie budowlom historycznym pierwotnej postaci i usuwanie późniejszych naleciałości. Ta metoda naukowa miała rzekomo gwarantować odsłonięcie obiektywnej, koniecznie układowej ideologicznie i administracyjnie nadzorowanej „prawdy”, w następstwie czego w rzeczywistości prowadziła do wymazywania pewnych fragmentów historii, a często również do okaleczania zabytków. W przypadku starówki tallińskiej za ów charakter pierwotny uznano rodowód średniowieczny i styl gotycki i takie wyobrażenie utrwaliło się w dyskursie potocznym, mimo że miejscowi konserwatorzy zabytków zwracali uwagę, że choć układ ulic i parceli starego Tallina był rzeczywiście średniowieczny, co w istocie decyduje o naturze starówki, to przeważającym stylem architektonicznym jest klasycyzm, a nie gotyk. Niemniej w kulturze popularnej – w znacznej mierze za sprawą ikonografii obfitości filmów widokowych, a także wizerunku starówki upowszechnianego przez filmy innych gatunków (powstających często, jak już mówiłam, na zamówienie władz moskiewskich) – utrwaliło się wyobrażenie o starym Tallinie jako mieście gotyckim, co w pewien sposób okaleczało rzeczywistość i rekonceptualizowało historię w świadomości po-

tocznej. Dokonywano tego za pomocą stosowania wyżej wspomnianych narzędzi symbolicznych – zasadniczo tożsamy z metodami komercyjnej reklamy turystycznej i zarazem wpisanych w zasady realizmu socjalistycznego. Jednocześnie mechanizmy, które w społeczeństwach kapitalistycznych funkcjonowały w obszarze komercyjnej „turystyki historycznej”¹¹, w Związku Sowieckim określały nie tylko sposoby przedstawiania wizualnego, lecz wszystkie w ogóle praktyki ochrony dziedzictwa jako takie. Bodaj najbardziej wymownym tego przykładem jest to, w jaki sposób po obydwu stronach żelaznej kurtyny w miastach uważanych za ośrodki turystyki historycznej zmieniało się znaczenie określonych budowli, a zwłaszcza obiektów sakralnych. W obydwu przypadkach przybytki te traciły związek z wcześniejszymi praktykami życia codziennego i „stawały się przedmiotami spojrzenia turysty”¹². A choć wiele budowli religijnych „zawsze było także atrakcją dla zwiedzających [...]”, to zmiany sposobu ich wykorzystywania spowodowały zerwanie ciągłości historycznej¹³. Takie zerwanie – „muzealizacja” w terminologii Edwarda Relpha¹⁴ – dokonało się również w przypadku starówki tallińskiej, z tym że było o wiele bardziej agresywne, a wiele kościołów literalnie zamieniono w muzea. „Muzealizacja” oznaczała tu wygodną dla nowych władz zmianę funkcji miasta, polegającą na zastąpieniu tradycyjnej powszedniej krzątanimy ludzi zastygłą ekspozycją muzealną. Wymazaniu ulegają stare znaczenia i kody symboliczne, autentyczny sens danego miejsca odchodzi w przeszłość, a ono samo staje się jakimś wszędzie i nigdzie; giną nieuprzedzone reakcje i doświadczenia¹⁵. Egzemplifikacją tego procesu jest los kościoła św. Mikołaja, który mocno ucierpiał podczas II wojny światowej. Początkowo, zgodnie z wrogą religii polityką sowieckiej Estonii, planowano przekształcić go w muzeum naukowego ateizmu, ale odbudowa bardzo się przeciągała i ostatecznie kościół otworzył na nowo swoje podwoje w 1984 roku jako muzeum sztuki dawnej i sala koncertowa. Chociaż pierwotny zamiysł radykalnego wyłączenia tego kościoła z powszedniego użytku nie został urzeczywistniony, niemniej nie odzyskał on pierwotnej funkcji sakralnej. Budowlę tę zepchnięto na margines areny społecznej, w dziedzinę sztuki, która funkcjonowała zgodnie z kanonem realizmu socjalistycznego – „narodowo w formie, socjalistycznie w treści” – i jako taka podlegała, przynajmniej oficjalnie, nadzorowi władz. To, że ów czyniący pewne ustępstwo na rzecz nacjonalizmu dogmat w rzeczywistości nie spełniał zamierzonej funkcji zaworu bezpieczeństwa i że w sytuacji, w której opozycja polityczna była niemożliwa, właśnie w zepchniętej na margines społeczny sferze kultury pojawiły się możliwości opozycji wobec sił panujących, jest zupełnie inną historią. Zgodnie z twierdzeniem Johna Urry’ego, takie przypadki wskazują, że „wszelkiego rodzaju grupy społeczne, instytucje i społeczności [...] rozwijają różnorodne i często sprzeczne praktyki zapamiętywania”¹⁶.

Muzealizacja” wpływała istotnie na sposób przedstawiania starówki tallińskiej w mediach wizualnych i oddziaływała bardzo podobnie na materiały reklamujące turystykę na Zachodzie. „Muzealizacja” pejzażu miejskiego jest w istocie podstawą wskazywanych wcześniej tendencji do homogenizacji i dekontekstualizacji oraz tworzenia iluzjonistycznego świata marzeń. To jedna z przyczyn szerzenia się w sferze ikonografii związanej z turystyką fasadowego sposobu przedstawiania, co pociąga za sobą dzielenie pejzażu miejskiego na stereotypowe i wyidealizowane porcje, wypreparowane z organicznej tkanki miasta i oczyszczone z wszelkich śladów codziennego życia, a także nieuchronnego starzenia się i rozpadu.

W przypadku starówki tallińskiej pewnym paradoksem jest, że ludzie rzeczywiście uwierzyli w ten socrealistyczny świat marzeń, chociaż nie mieli żadnych złudzeń w stosunku do wcześniejszych, stalinowskich form kultury socjalistycznej. Najłatwiej uchwytny tego powód polega na tym, że podczas gdy stalinowska kultura wizualna opierała się na jaskrawo fałszywej i bezkontekstowej ikonografii pseudoetnograficznej

oraz irytująco optymistycznych wizjach całkowicie sprzecznych z przygnębiającą rzeczywistością, co urażało boleśnie lokalną wrażliwość kulturalną i ustanawiało jedynie swoiście sowiecki obszar obrazowania, to nowa ikonografia była o wiele subtelniejsza w rejestrze konotacji czysto sowieckich (które zaiste musiały być wręcz niewidoczne). Po drugie, ta nowa ikonografia dotyczyła kwestii niekłamanie lokalnych i stwarzała nawet możliwość dowiedzenia się czegoś o historii i tradycjach epoki sprzed brutalnego zerwania ciągłości kulturowej. Wreszcie, co najważniejsze, ten świat marzeń reprezentował pewien paradygmat zachodni jako przeciwstawny tradycjom zwróconym na Wschód (tzn. w kierunku Rosji). I właśnie ten aspekt zachodni okazał się źródłem energii rozsadzających ów system od wewnątrz, ponieważ umożliwiał całkowicie nieortodoksyjne odczytywanie wytwarzanych w nim tekstów. (Warto podkreślić, że trzy republiki bałtyckie uchodziły powszechnie za „sowiecki Zachód”, co oczywiście wpływało na ich wyobrażenie o sobie). Gdy z jednej strony, jak już wskazałam, owe filmy widokowe spełniały wymogi stylistyki realizmu socjalistycznego i zawierały nieodzowne nawiązania do postępowości Związku Sowieckiego, z drugiej – były w nich elementy umożliwiające całkowicie inne ich rozumienie. Przede wszystkim ukazywane w tych filmach obrazy i symbole konsumpcjonizmu były rodnikami interpretacji sprzecznych z systemem sowieckim, ponieważ zgodnie z „oficjalną linią” partii obowiązywała retoryka potępienia „zachodniego materializmu” i zachodniej skłonności do komercjalizacji wszystkiego. Względna obfitość dóbr konsumpcyjnych była z jednej strony mistyfikacją mającą dowodzić „postępowości” Sowietów (ponieważ bardzo wiele z tych filmów pełniło funkcje reklamy turystycznej w krajach zachodnich), z drugiej zaś odrywała realia lokalne od ogólnej sytuacji gospodarczej Związku Sowieckiego – dobra konsumpcyjne, a zwłaszcza niesłychanie wówczas pożądane towary zagraniczne, rzeczywiście były łatwiej dostępne w krajach bałtyckich, które leżały najbliżej „wolnego świata”. I rzecz w tym, że te różnice materialne postrzegano zarazem jako wyraz różnic kulturowych. Staje się to szczególnie uderzające w szerszej skali przestrzennej, jak w przypadku tallińskiej starówki, pięknego i kuszącego, spójnego i kompletnego zespołu urbanistycznego o głębokich (zachodnich) korzeniach historycznych, który jaskrawo odstawał od brudnych, szarych i zimnych, niedbale i nie w pełni zabudowanych, sztampowych sowieckich osiedli mieszkaniowych, pozbawionych korzeni w historii betonowych pomników nomadycznych wartości *homo sovieticus*.

W kontekście tego przeciwstawienia szczególnej wagi nabiera kwestia istoty spojrzenia turysty. Zwłaszcza badacze o nastawieniu fenomenologicznym utrzymują, że w społeczeństwach nowoczesnych ludzie utracili „zaangażowanie praktyczne w stosunku do otoczenia, nie nawiązują już z nim relacji istotnych, lecz ujmują w sposób abstrakcyjny, który zasadniczo jest spojrzeniem turysty”¹⁷. W nieco innym kontekście podobne spostrzeżenie wysunął John Urry: „To, co nazywam spojrzeniem turysty, w coraz szerszym zakresie splata się z wszelkiego innego rodzaju praktykami społecznymi i kulturowymi, stając się ich nieodłączną częścią. W miarę jak «turystyka» *per se* traci odrębność, prowadzi to do uniwersalizacji spojrzenia turysty – czy chcą tego, czy nie, ludzie przez większość czasu są «turystami». Spojrzenie turysty jest immanentną częścią doświadczenia współczesnego – postmodernizmu”¹⁸.

W ten sposób spojrzenie turysty staje się szczególnie istotne jako powszechny sposób postrzegania i poznawania świata. W tym kontekście turystyczne przedstawienia tallińskiej starówki uzmysławiają, że pewne podstawowe schematy poznawcze, które następnie generują podobne postawy, praktyki i sposoby obrazowania, są wspólne różnym, a nawet sprzecznym systemom ideologicznym. Przedstawienia te są jeszcze jednym potwierdzeniem często wysuwanego twierdzenia, że Związek Sowiecki wcale nie był tak bardzo różny od swego nominalnego przeciwnika ideologicznego, czyli kapitalistycznego świata zachodnie-

go. To jednak nie unieważnia wieloznacznych, a nawet w pewnym sensie trudno uchwyt-nych negocjacji między niezgodnymi tożsamościami, jakich obszarem były obrazowe przed-stawienia starego miasta, ponieważ, po pierwsze, filmy widokowe i inne gatunki filmowe zawierające przedstawienia, które można podciągnąć pod turystyczny tryb obrazowania, nie były jedynymi formami filmowymi odnoszącymi się do tallińskiej starówki, po drugie zaś, same te filmy operują na różnych poziomach turystyczności i są przejawem różnego stopnia wrażliwości przestrzennej, przez co dowodzą, że nie istnieje pojedyncze spojrzenie turysty, lecz pewna wiązka sposobów doświadczania turystycznego (zob. np. Urry 1990, s. 86; Urry 1992) wyczulonych na otoczenie w zasadniczo różnych aspektach.

Mówiąc ogólnie, sposoby przedstawiania znamienne dla dziedziny wizualnej marke-tingu turystycznego łączą bliskie powinowactwa z zasadami obrazowania tkwiącymi w głównych założeniach realizmu socjalistycznego. Jedne i drugie wcielają podobne posta-wy wobec przedmiotu przedstawianego, ukazując go często w negatywnych kategoriach homogenizacji, dekontekstualizacji, muzealizacji i tak dalej. Ale nawet w ramach sche-matów turystycznych można praktykować, a tym samym i wykrywać różne postawy wobec środowiska zabudowanego. W ten sposób motywy starówki tallińskiej z jednej strony były osadzone w realizmie socjalistycznym, „nurt średniowieczny” odzwiercied-łał ideologiczne ambicje władz sowieckich do (re)konstruowania przeszłości, heroizacji terażniejszości i ustanawiania przyszłości, a starówkę wciągnięto w wir przemysłu tury-stycznego i rozrywkowego; ale z drugiej strony pietyzm w stosunku do starego Tallina wypływał także z lokalnych ambicji do odrębności kulturowej. Wzbudzał szczere zaangażowanie miejscowych, ponieważ w przeciwieństwie do pustych obietnic szczęśliwej, lecz abstrakcyjnej przyszłości komunistycznej, był bezpośrednio związany ze swojskimi i namacalnymi tematami lokalnymi, zawierał utajony sentyment narodowy i działał na rzecz odnowienia pamięci lokalnej. Ponadto średniowieczna starówka była środowiskiem uderzająco odmiennym od monotonnych nowych dzielnic mieszkalnych, wypełnionych budowlami anonimowymi, seryjnie wytwarzanymi w fabrykach domów.

Tłumaczył Michał Szczubiałka

Artykuł jest zmienioną wersją referatu, który został wygłoszony na międzyna-rodowej konferencji „CinemArchitecture” (Porto, Portugalia, 7-8 kwiecień 2008 r.).

Redakcja pragnie podziękować Autorce za udostępnienie tekstu oraz zgodę na jego tłumaczenie i publikację.

Translated and published by the kind permission of Eva Närriepa.

Bibliografia

- P.C. Albers, W.R. James, *Travel photography: A methodological approach*, „Annals of Tourism Research” 1988, no. 15, s. 134-158.
- G.J. Ashworth, J.E. Tunbridge, *The tourist-historic city: Retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city*, Pergamon, Amsterdam 2000.
- J.G. Carrier, *Mind, gaze and engagement: Understanding the environment*, „Journal of Material Culture” 2003, no. 8(1), s. 5-23.
- C. Crawshaw, J. Urry, *Tourism and the photographic eye*, [w:] *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory*, red. Ch. Rojek, J. Urry, London, New York 1997, s. 176-195.
- S.S. Fainstein, D.R. Judd, *Cities as places to play*, [w:] *The tourist city*, red. R.D. Judd, S.S. Fainstein, New Haven, London 1999, s. 261-272.

- M. Foucault, *Nadzorować i karać. Narodziny więzienia*, tłum. T. Komendant, Warszawa 1998.
- D.R. Hall, *Tourism and economic development in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*, London, New York, Toronto 1991.
- M. Heidegger, *Budować, mieszkać, myśleć*, tłum. K. Michalski, [w:] idem, *Budować, mieszkać, myśleć*, Warszawa 1977.
- M. Heidegger, *...poetycko mieszka człowiek...*, tłum. J. Mizera, [w:] idem, *Odczyty i rozprawy*, Warszawa 2008.
- D.M. Hummon, *Tourist worlds: Tourist advertising, ritual, and American culture*, „The Sociological Quarterly” 1988, no. 29(2), s. 179-202.
- P. Kenez, *Cinema and soviet society from the revolution to the death of Stalin*, London, New York 2001.
- P. Linnap, *Pictorial Estonia*, [w:] *Kohi ja paik / Place and location: Studies in environmental aesthetics and semiotics 3. Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Arts 14*, red. V. Sarapik, K. Tüür, Tallinn, s. 433-443.
- Ch. Norberg-Schulz, *Genius loci: Towards a phenomenology of architecture*, Rizzoli, New York 1984.
- E. Relph, *Place and placelessness*, London 1986.
- E. Tode, *Border state*, Evanston 2000.
- J. Urry, *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*, London 1990.
- J. Urry, *The tourist gaze “revisited”*, „American Behavioral Scientist” 1992, no. 36(2), s. 172-186.
- N. Wang, *Tourism and modernity: A sociological analysis*, Pergamon, Amsterdam 2000.

Przypisy

- ¹ E. Tode, *Border state*, Evanston 2000.
- ² W sowieckim kinie estońskim „nurt średniowieczny” wyrażał się w szerokim zakresie gatunków i form filmowych, z których nie wszystkie znajdują adekwatne odpowiedniki terminologiczne w języku angielskim. Ogólny termin „film widokowy” (*vaatefilm*) daje się tylko częściowo i powierzchownie objaśnić za pomocą takich wyrażen angielskich jak *travel film* (film z podróży), *travelogue* (film podróżniczy) lub *scenic* (film pejzażowy), ponieważ wszystkie filmy widokowe o starówce tallińskiej były dziełami miejscowych na miejscowy temat, podczas gdy *travel film*, *travelogue* lub *scenic* odnozą się z reguły do filmów kręconych za granicą, w dalekich krajach przez ludzi obcych w stosunku do filmowanego miejsca. Zarazem wszystkie te terminy są o tyle równoznaczne, o ile wyrażają (czego nie muszą robić) turystyczną świadomość danego miejsca. W rzeczy samej bardzo wiele estońskich filmów widokowych w okresie sowieckim powstawało na zlecenie centralnych władz moskiewskich, wobec czego musiało spełniać oczekiwania tych władz co do sposobów ukazywania krajobrazu miejskiego i elementów, które należało podkreślić. W ten sposób filmy widokowe upodobią się do filmu podróżniczego czy pejzażowego za sprawą swego rodzaju perspektywy kolonialnej (choć kolonializm zachodni na Wschodzie różni się pod wieloma zasadniczymi względami od zależności między Związkiem Sowieckim i jego republikami).
- Jak już wspomniałam, wyrażenie „film widokowy” jest nazwą-workiem i mogło również oznaczać filmy przypominające nieco tak zwane symfonie miejskie lub przynajmniej mające pewne cechy charakterystyczne tego gatunku (zwłaszcza schemat narracyjny „od świtu do zmierzchu”). Co więcej, istniały terminy pokrewne tej kategorii (lub raczej jej podkategorie), takie jak „film zlecony” (*tellimusfilm*, co oczywiście znaczyło, że dany film nie został zainicjowany przez producenta i mógł niekiedy wyrażać obce mu stanowiska), „film reklamowy” (*reklaamfilm*, co wskazywało na bezpośredni zamiysł propagandowy), „film wystawowy” (*stendifilm*, co sugerowało prezentowanie go na festiwalach ogólnozwiązkowych lub zagranicznych, a także wydźwięk propagandowy), a nawet „film pocztówkowy” (*sueniirfilm*). W niektórych przypadkach filmy te nazywano po prostu filmami dokumentalnymi lub krótkimi, przy czym terminy te odnoszono zwłaszcza do obrazów lepszych warsztatowo, wyższej jakości i bardziej skomplikowanych dramaturgicznie lub nawet kontrowersyjnych ideologicznie.
- Poza filmami widokowymi „nurt średniowieczny” zaznaczył się w licznych krótkich filmach rewiowych, obejmujących szereg luźno związanych numerów muzycznych i tanecznych (filmy takie produkowano głównie w Telefilm). Wreszcie tallińska starówka, zwłaszcza w okresie 1969-1972, była tłem akcji wielu estońskich (sowieckich) pełnometrażowych filmów fabularnych, w tym dwóch musicali, dwóch przygodowych filmów kostiumowych, jednego kostiumowego dramatu psychologicznego i jednego „czarnego” dreszczowca (przy czym fabuły produkowano raptem trzy rocznie!).
- ³ M. Foucault, *Nadzorować i karać. Narodziny więzienia*, tłum. T. Komendant, Warszawa 1998, s. 28-29.

- ⁴ D.R. Hall, *Tourism and economic development in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*, London, New York, Toronto 1991, s. 37, 81.
- ⁵ P. Linnap, *Pictorial Estonia*, [w:] *Koht ja paik / Place and location: Studies in environmental aesthetics and semiotics 3. Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Arts 14*, red. V. Sarapik, K. Tüür, Tallinn, s. 436.
- ⁶ J. Urry, *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*, London 1990, s. 3; Zob. także: D.M. Hummon, *Tourist worlds: Tourist advertising, ritual, and American culture*, „The Sociological Quarterly” 1988, no. 29 (2), s. 179; N. Wang, *Tourism and modernity: A sociological analysis*, Pergamon, Amsterdam 2000, s. 165.
- ⁷ Cyt. za: P. Kenez, *Cinema and soviet society from the revolution to the death of Stalin*, London, New York 2001, s. 143.
- ⁸ N. Wang, *Tourism and modernity: A sociological analysis*, Pergamon, Amsterdam 2000, s. 165.
- ⁹ P.C. Albers, W.R. James, *Travel photography: A methodological approach*, „Annals of Tourism Research” 1988, no. 15, s. 154-155.
- ¹⁰ C. Crawshaw, J. Urry, *Tourism and the photographic eye*, [w:] *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory*, red. Ch. Rojek, J. Urry, London, New York 1997, s. 179.
- ¹¹ G.J. Ashworth, J.E. Tunbridge, *The tourist-historic city: Retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city*, Pergamon, Amsterdam 2000.
- ¹² S.S. Fainstein, D.R. Judd (1999), *Cities as places to play*, [w:] *The tourist city*, red. R.D. Judd, S.S. Fainstein, New Haven, London 1999, s. 264.
- ¹³ Ibidem.
- ¹⁴ E. Relph, *Place and placelessness*, London 1986, s. 18.
- ¹⁵ Ibidem, s. 80.
- ¹⁶ J. Urry, *The tourist gaze “revisited”*, „American Behavioral Scientist” 1992, no. 36 (2), s. 185.
- ¹⁷ J.G. Carrier, *Mind, gaze and engagement: Understanding the environment*, „Journal of Material Culture” 2003, no. 8 (1), s. 6. Zob. także: E. Relph, *Place and placelessness*, op. cit., s. 80-87; Ch. Norberg-Schulz, *Genius loci: Towards a phenomenology of architecture*, Rizzoli, New York 1984; M. Heidegger, *Budować, mieszkać, myśleć*, tłum. K. Michalski, [w:] M. Heidegger, *Budować, mieszkać, myśleć*, Warszawa 1977; M. Heidegger, *...poetycko mieszka człowiek...*, tłum. J. Mizera, [w:] M. Heidegger, *Odczyty i rozprawy*, Warszawa 2008.
- ¹⁸ J. Urry, *The tourist gaze...*, op. cit., s. 82.

Summary

This essay looks at a series of touristic shorts, the so-called scenics released during the 1960s and 1970s by the two Soviet Estonian film studios, Tallinnfilm and Eesti Telefilm (Estonian Television Film). The films concentrate on the picturesque environment of Tallinn's Old Town – the oldest part of the city presenting a well-preserved medieval milieu. The representations of the Old Town, as well as its architectural features, has always been an important arena for negotiations between conflicting ideologies and (national) identities, evoking complex issues of power, resistance and adaptation. In the 1960s, the Old Town and the broader subject of medieval heritage became extraordinarily topical for both the academic circles and mass culture, inspiring an extensive array of visual and literary texts. This somewhat nostalgic and romantic “medieval trend” materialized in countless articles of consumer goods, numerous interior designs and in a whole range of motion pictures. The aim of this essay is to give an overview of the modes of representation of the Old Town's cityscape and landmarks, arguing that although resistance to the Soviet cultural discourse in terms of national identity was absolutely central in the field of heritage protection, which was a major force behind the initial emergence of this “medieval trend”, in the sphere of popular culture the dominant currents seemed to be more connected with the espousal of the Soviet-style cultural inclinations. Perhaps it is even appropriate to suggest that this was, in fact, a clever strategy of the Soviet powers that be to assimilate the occupied nation, essentially in a similar vein to the Stalinist oppressive politics, yet with much more refined methods. On the other hand, even in film – the most rigidly controlled art form – the signs of certain cautious but fundamental tactical inversions of the dominating order are also clearly discernible.

The structure of Tallinn's urban fabric reflects perfectly the nature of Estonian culture as that of rupture and discontinuity, which owes much to the particular geographical location, to its position as a "border state" (see Tode 2000), and to rather complicated historical circumstances. The built environment in Tallinn is defined by numerous incomplete architectural ensembles, resulting in a cityscape full of sharp contrasts and peculiar juxtapositions. In the very heart of it, however, lies the Old Town – the oldest part of Tallinn inside the four-kilometer-long limestone Town Wall, constituting an integral ensemble and displaying a well-preserved medieval milieu and structure that acquired its appearance mainly in the 13th–15th centuries. This picturesque environment has always been an attractive source of imagery for visual media, especially so, of course, in connection with, but also in opposition to, the rise and development of modern tourism practices. At the same time it has also been the place for negotiations between conflicting ideologies and (national) identities, and an important arena for (re)presentations of power, resistance, and adaptation. These processes intersected and generated a particularly complex and ambivalent configuration of representations, reflections and practices under Soviet power during the 1960s and 1970s. In the 1960s, the Old Town and the broader subject of the medieval heritage suddenly became extraordinarily topical for both academic circles and mass culture, and inspired an array of visual as well as literary texts. This somewhat nostalgic and romantic "medieval trend" materialized in countless articles of consumer goods, numerous interior designs, and in a whole range of motion pictures. This paper concentrates on a set of short films, the so-called scenics or, literally, "view films"¹ released

¹ In Soviet Estonian cinema, the "medieval trend" spread across a whole scale of different genres and forms of filmmaking all of which don't even have plausible terminological equivalents in English. The umbrella term "view film" (*vaatefilm*) is only partly and roughly comparable to "travel film" or "travelogue" or "scenic" in English since all those view films representing the Old Town were made by the locals and about the local surroundings, while travel film, travelogue or scenic usually denotes films shot abroad, in distant countries by people foreign to the location. Still, they are comparable to certain extent in a sense that both can (although not necessarily) convey a touristic sense of place. And, importantly, many Soviet Estonian view films were actually commissioned by central authorities in Moscow and thus had to follow their requirements in terms of how the cityscape was shot and what exactly was shown. This, in fact, relates view films to travelogues/scenics also by virtue of a somewhat colonial perspective (although the Western–Oriental colonialism was in many respects profoundly different from the relations between Soviet Union and its Republics). As already mentioned, "view film" is an overarching notion and could, for example, also signify something remotely similar to the so-called city symphonies, or at least contain some features characteristic to this genre (most commonly from-dawn-till-dusk structure). Moreover, view film also has parallel (or rather sub)terms, such as "commissioned film" (*tellimusfilm*, referring, of course, to the fact that it was not initiated by the studio and could at times even contain stances not approved by the studio), "promotional film" (*reklaamfilm*, indicating clearly its propagandistic purpose), "stand film" (*stendifilm*,

during those decades by the two Soviet Estonian film studios Tallinnfilm and Eesti Telefilm (Estonian Television Film). I attempt to give an overview of the modes of representation of the Old Town's cityscape and landmarks, arguing that although resistance to the Soviet cultural discourse in terms of national identity was absolutely central in the field of heritage protection that, in turn, was a major force behind the initial emergence of this "medieval trend," in the sphere popular culture the dominant currents seemed to be more connected with the espousal of the Soviet-style cultural inclinations. One may even go further to claim that, in fact, this was a clever strategy of the Soviets to assimilate the occupied nation, still similar in its essence to Stalinist oppressive politics, yet much more refined in its practices. On the other hand, even in film – the most rigidly controlled art form – as well as in other areas of mass culture in the framework of this "medieval trend" the signs of differentiation and certain cautious but fundamental tactical inversions of the dominating order are also clearly discernible.

The Soviet occupation created a cultural situation which, on the one hand, allowed integrating the Old Town as an ancient German citadel into the local national identity, helping Estonians finally to adopt the heritage of the one-time colonisers, and even to make it a *locus* of national *résistance*, as an Estonian architectural historian Mart Kalm has argued. This resistance in the form of prescribing nationalist/local cultural identity, however, took place *within* the confines of the dominant Soviet system, or, to use Michel Foucault's line of reasoning: the legal acts of the authorities also brought the opportunity for resistance (see e.g. Foucault 1991, 27). This was caused by the fact that, besides building its own monuments, the Soviet power did not neglect the chance to dress up in "borrowed plumes" from the history of Russia as well as of all other Soviet republics, following the Stalinist thesis "national in form, socialist in content" by craftily weaving the material crust of the seemingly ideologically conflicting heritage of the Old Town into the international cultural texture of the Soviet Union, by recoding its meanings and transforming its functions, by harnessing it into the service of Soviet propaganda.

From the late 1960s and early 1970s onward, tourism was an indispensable source for obtaining currency and an inevitable phenomenon from the viewpoint of keeping the

suggesting its use at all-Union or international exhibitions and usually implying propagandistic content), or even "souvenir film" (*suveniirfilm*). In some cases, they were called just "documentaries" or "shorts," and these terms seemed usually to denote better-crafted, higher-quality, and more intricate or even ideologically somewhat contradictory pieces. In addition to view films, the "medieval trend" also infiltrated numerous short revue films compiled of loosely connected musical and dance numbers (especially in Telefilm productions). Finally, Tallinn Old Town appeared as a backdrop in several Soviet Estonian feature-length fiction films, notably between 1969 and 1972, including two musicals, two historical adventure films, a historical psychological drama, and a *film noir* style "thriller" (out of the annual output of circa three features!).

entire economical system in the Soviet Union functioning altogether. An ever growing hard currency debt to Western financial institutions that had incurred by taking out loans for purchasing Western technologies, which were – unsuccessfully so – intended to be paid back from the profits obtained from the production manufactured on the basis of these technologies, brought about an unprecedented increase in the importance of the tourist industry in the Soviet Union, the authorities of which were otherwise notoriously cautious, sometimes to the point of paranoia, in all relations concerning foreign visitors and the world abroad. Alongside Volgograd, Novgorod, Kalinin, Zagorsk, Suzdal, Yaroslavl, Kiev, Lvov, Uzhgorod, Riga, Vilnius, Minsk, Tashkent, Alma-Ata, Bukhara, Samarkand, Tbilisi, Yerevan and many other cities, Tallinn was included to the chain of attractions that the Soviet central tourism agency Inturist marketed to foreign tourists (see e.g. Hall 1991, 37, 81). This practical, tourism-related cause was one of the factors that contributed rather heavily to the massive popularization of medieval imagery of the Old Town.

The visual material circulating in mass media surrounded the Old Town as a product for tourism with multiple “layers of advertising,” that in addition to earlier cult values also attached market value to historical heritage, as an Estonian media critic and scholar Peeter Linnap (2003, 436) has suggested, observing it with a so-called tourist gaze. The concept of the tourist gaze coined by tourism sociologist John Urry in his seminal study *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies* (1990) is not only associated with the curious glance of the tourist, but has rather become a term denoting a certain universal way of perception (primarily due to phenomenological theory). In the opinion of many, it has evolved into the predominant mode of human-environment relations in the latter half of the 20th century and particularly towards the end of the century. Among other things, it signifies a commercially motivated, hierarchized and reified view of the landscape that is more or less detached from everyday practices.

As mentioned briefly above, the socialist realist dogma of “national in form, socialist in content” was since the mid-1930s the dominant official artistic paradigm in the Soviet Union. Although the era of Thaw under Nikita Khrushchev brought many changes, eroding and transforming the once extremely rigorously defined regulations of representation and content, the concept itself retained its firm position both in the official discourse and actual artistic practices, especially so in provincial cinema like that of Soviet Estonia.

I believe that it is not too far-fetched to suggest that the tenets of socialist realism had quite a lot in common with touristic modes of representation. One of the most profound similarities is perhaps the creation of an illusionist, escapist, and selective dreamworld that has next to nothing to do with everyday reality and practices, neither in social nor environmental terms. “The tourist gaze is directed to features of landscape

and townscape which separate them from everyday experience,” writes John Urry (1990, 3; see also Hummon 1988, 179, and Wang 2000, 165). Although the canon of socialist realism “demands of the artist the truthful, historically concrete representation of reality in its revolutionary development,” as stated in 1934 at the first all-union Congress of Soviet Writers (quoted in Kenez 2001, 143), the application of this requirement in artistic practice invariably meant the construction of a falsely positive pseudo-reality full of pathos and idealized imagery. This mode of representation corresponds perfectly to the way landscapes and urban environments were depicted in Western-made promotional travel films and brochures advertising tourist destinations all over the world, both in Western countries and in the Third World. Ning Wang brings out a few notions informing this “symbolic transformation of reality,” including beautification, romanticization, and idealization (Wang 2000, 165). He argues pointedly that tourism brochures tend to render prominent attractive vistas and locations and exclude unpleasant, uninteresting or unsuitable views and places in order to construct an idealized image of the advertised locale. Also, according to him, if some sights happen to be not physically straightforwardly beautiful enough, the tourism advertising may draw attention to them by means of portraying them as romantic and “idealized images,” thus transforming them into beautiful. Wang’s examples include relics and the primitive. However, all the above could just as well be detected in the representations of Tallinn’s Old Town. First, there was a strong tendency to depict mainly newly restored beautiful “gem objects,” such as the Town Hall, some old churches, and certain other buildings. Secondly, the touristic imagery relies heavily on the romantic appearances of various material textures characteristic to this environment: the coarse and rustic surfaces of limestone walls, the expanses of red tiled roofs, the picturesque façades covered with rough and sometimes slightly crumbled coat of plaster and faded colors, and the winding streets covered with uneven cobblestone pavement. The romanticism of these aged features, however, was stringently controlled in order not to go beyond it to reveal the mere decay and neglect – as would have been the case if one had looked behind the freshly restored façades into the courtyards full of debris and dirt, or just turned the eye next door, to the grim everyday life of the communal apartments that so many still picturesque but usually not restored façades concealed. Very often the romantic overlook was retained by simply shooting from sufficient distance, from aerial perspective, for example.

Patricia C. Albers and William R. James, writing about travel photography and exotic ethnic representations, bring out three principal notions that characterize the dreamworld of tourist representations (Albers, James 1988, 154–155): homogenization (“features of an area and its people are stereotyped according to some dominant cultural model”), decontextualization (“involves a process whereby ethnic subjects appear in

settings that lack some concrete lived-in, historical referent”), and mystification. The concepts of homogenization and decontextualization are integral to the Stalinist dogma “national in form, socialist in content” as well as, more concretely, to the majority of the films representing the Old Town. The stereotyping was, of course, one of the basic properties of socialist realism, occurring in virtually every conceivable artistic medium, for example, in the form of pseudo-ethnographical depictions of the people from all the different Soviet Republics, wearing national costumes (which is notably also an inseparable part of Western tourist images) and being surrounded by archaic artifacts. The Old Town is actually just another, slightly altered instance of that, only in this case the stereotypical was articulated as the endless repetition of the same images of certain historical buildings, details, and vistas on postcards, on souvenir items, and in films. This, in turn, is directly linked with the process of decontextualization since the representations of the Old Town in the view films consist more often than not of picture-postcard like snapshots of old edifices and artworks the real history of which is seldom explained. Additionally, from the 1960s on, every year several film crews from the “friendly sister Republics” came to shoot their historical epics in Tallinn, transforming the Old Town into a backdrop to some random historical event that actually took place elsewhere, literally loosing the environment’s genuine context. These depictional practices correspond strikingly with Wang’s (2000, 161) claim that “[t]ourists usually see only tourist sights and attractions and the social context in which these sights appear is usually ignored,” and to his remark that the “tourist way of seeing is [---] ahistoricizing seeing [---] and simplifying seeing.” Moreover, these arguments, as well as Albers’ and James’ notion of decontextualization also refer to the lack of the sense of everyday lived-in-ness that can be detected in many view films as, for example, a tendency to exclude people from the frame, and to avoid, as mentioned above, the grim reality behind the façades.

The ahistoricizing mode of seeing and representing raises issues of history and memory. As Carol Crawshaw and John Urry (1997, 179) put it in their article *Tourism and the Photographic Eye*, “[m]uch of tourism involves memory. In a kind of way tourism is the appropriation of the memories of others.” The practice of appropriation of other’s memories, the reconceptualizing and rewriting of (other’s) history is central to the “making” of this “medieval trend.” It concerns a set of questions about theories and practices of heritage protection and restoration in the USSR on the one hand, and the approaches to these questions and practices in the local Estonian discourse on the other hand.

The main principle of Soviet heritage protection was “scientific restoration,” which generally meant the restoration of the buildings’ authentic, original shape and the removal of all later layers. This scientific method was supposed to guarantee the arrival at the objective, necessarily ideologically suitable and administratively controlled “truth,”

which, in turn, led to the denial of certain historical layers and often to the mutilation of the monuments. In the case of Tallinn's Old Town, its medieval origin, Gothic in terms of style, was established as the dominant characteristic, especially in the popular discourse and much in spite of the local heritage protector's research results, which suggested that although the network of streets and basic structure of the lots – features that in a way were of determinative importance in relation to the Old Town's essential character – indeed developed in the middle ages, the statistically governing style among the edifices, however, was classicism, not Gothic. In the popular culture, much reinforced by the imagery of those numerous view films as well as by the depictions of the Old Town in other cinematographic genres (as mentioned above, often commissioned by the central authorities in Moscow), the Gothic was set as a normative style of Tallinn's Old Town, thus in a way mutilating the real circumstances and reconceptualizing the history in the popular frame of mind. This was done very much with the help of the above-described devices resembling those characteristic to commercial tourism promotion and simultaneously distinctive to tenets of socialist realism. At the same time, not just the visual representations but, indeed, first of all the socialist practices of heritage protection itself bore considerable resemblance to the approaches to the "tourist-historic" (see Ashworth, Tunbridge 2000) cities or districts in capitalist societies. The most striking similarity is perhaps the way the meaning of certain buildings, especially religious structures, is changed in the tourist-historic cities on both sides of the Iron Curtain. In both cases they lose the engagement in the previous everyday practices and "become objects of the tourist gaze" (Fainstein, Judd 1999, 264). And even though many religious edifices "have always been sightseeing attractions as well ..., changes in their use imply a rupture in historic continuity" (Fainstein, Judd 1999, 264). This rupture, "museumization" as Edward Relph terms it (Relph 1986, 80), is equally perceivable but far more aggressive in the case of Tallinn's Old Town where many churches, but also numerous other buildings, were literally turned into museums. The "museumization" meant a change in the function of the city, favored by the new regime, where the everyday spatial practices were replaced by a frozen museum exhibition. The old meanings and symbolic codes were cancelled, the authentic sense of the place fell back and was replaced by placelessness; pure reactions and experiences were muted (Relph 1986, 80). This process is exemplified by St. Nicholas church, which had been severely damaged in World War II. At first, St. Nicholas was supposed to be converted into a museum of scientific atheism in the religion-hostile Soviet Estonia, but as the restoration stretched over more than twenty years, the church opened in 1984 as a museum of old art and a concert hall. In such a way, the removal of this construction from everyday use was not brought to its radical end, but it, nevertheless, did not fulfill its original sacral function any more. It was pushed into the marginal

zone of the social arena, into the realm of art, which operated according to the canon of socialist realism – “national in form, socialist in content” – and should have been as such, at least in theory, controlled by the authorities. The fact that an ideological hole in this dogma proved to be bigger than the initially planned valve for letting out the steam of national tensions and in the situation where political opposition was impossible and the sphere of culture, being on a marginal position in society, enabled to organize resistance to the governing forces, is altogether another matter. Cases like that also imply that “All sorts of social groups, institutions, and societies ... develop multiple and often contradictory memory practices,” as suggested by John Urry (1999, 85).

The “museumization” contributed significantly to the way the Old Town was represented in visual media, and it had very similar results in Western tourism promotion materials as well. The tendencies of homogenization and decontextualization, the creation of ahistorical and simplified illusionistic dreamworld have already been mentioned, and the “museumization” of the cityscape is the essential foundation to all of them. It is one of the causes for the dominant, façade-based mode of representation in the realm of tourism related visuals, which simultaneously meant fragmentation of the cityscape into stereotypical and idealized images, isolated from the organic whole of the urban texture and void of all traces of everyday life and of inevitable deterioration and decay.

In Tallinn’s Old Town’s case, it is somewhat paradoxical that people actually accepted this socialist realist dreamworld although they had perfectly clearly seen through the previous, Stalinist forms of socialist culture. The most apparent reason seems to be the fact that while Stalinist visual culture relied heavily on obviously fake and out-of-context pseudo-ethnographical imagery and on overly optimistic depictions which were in complete dissonance with actual depressing circumstances, thus offending profoundly the local cultural sensibility and creating a distinctly Soviet realm of representations, the new imagery was far more subtle in its purely Soviet connotations (in fact, they must have been almost invisible). Secondly, it dealt unmistakably with local issues, even giving a chance to get in touch with history and traditions that belonged to the era before the cultural continuity was so violently split. Finally and most importantly, this dreamworld represented a Western cultural paradigm as opposed to eastern (=Russian) orientated traditions. And precisely this aspect of Western-ness proved to be a way of undermining the system from within, through giving a totally different reading to the same texts. (It is worth emphasizing that the three Baltic republics were commonly referred to as the “Soviet West,” which, in turn, obviously reflected also in their self-image.) While the socialist realist stylistic features were clearly inherent in those films, as explained above, as well as the markers of the progressiveness of the Soviet Union, so were the cues that allowed completely different comprehension of them. Most notably, the images

and markers of consumerism represented in those films proved to be contradictory to the Soviet system since the rhetoric of the official “party line” strongly disapproved “Western materialism” and the tendency of commodification. The relative abundance of consumer goods was on the one hand a fake indicator of Soviet “progressiveness” (since very many of these films functioned, after all, as tourism advertisements for Western audiences), but on the other hand it set the local conditions apart from the common economical situation of the Soviet Union at large – the consumer items, especially the extremely valued foreign ones, were, indeed, easier to acquire in the Baltic states that were physically closer to the “free world.” And this material differentiation was perceived as a cultural one as well. This becomes especially evident on a larger environmental scale: the beautiful and inviting, spatially coherent and complete, deeply historically rooted (Western-originated) Old Town stands in complete contrast with the ugly, dull and cold, unevenly and fragmentarily developed Soviet mass-produced residential districts, concrete projects that lacked any historical continuity or rootedness, and represented the nomadic values of *homo soveticus*.

Connected with the latter contrast stands the question concerning the essence of the tourist gaze. Especially the phenomenological theory has maintained that in modern societies people have lost “a practical engagement with their surroundings, they no longer have a meaningful relationship with their surroundings, but instead see them in an abstract way, quintessentially that of the tourist gaze” (Carrier 2003, 6; see also Relph 1986, 80–87, Norberg-Schulz 1984, Heidegger 1997a and 1997b). John Urry (1990, 82) has also expressed a similar idea in a somewhat different context:

What I have termed the tourist gaze is increasingly bound up with and is partly indistinguishable from all sorts of other social and cultural practices. This has the effect, as ‘tourism’ *per se* declines in specificity, of universalizing the tourist gaze – people are much of the time ‘tourists’ whether they like it or not. The tourist gaze is intrinsically part of contemporary experience, of postmodernism.

Thus the tourist gaze has acquired a special importance as a dominant way of perceiving and cognizing the world. In this context, the touristic representations of Tallinn’s Old Town reveal that different and even ideologically opposing systems share basic cognitive frameworks which, in turn, produce similar attitudes, practices, and imagery. They confirm yet again the oft-repeated claim that the Soviet Union was not that much dissimilar from its supposed ideological antagonist, the Western capitalist world. This, however, does not cancel the ambiguous, even somewhat elusive negotiations of conflicting identities inherent to the depictions of the Old Town because, first of all, the view films and other cinematographic genres containing representations that could be linked with the touristic mode were not the only filmic forms related to the imagery of the Old Town,

and secondly, the view films themselves demonstrate different levels of tourist-ness and varying degrees of spatial sensibility, thus testifying that there exists no singular tourist gaze but rather several modes of tourist experience (see e.g. Urry 1990, 86; Urry 1992) which engage with the environment on profoundly diverse grounds.

In sum, the modes of representation characteristic to the visual realm of commercial tourism promotion bears close resemblance to the rules of depiction set by the tenets of socialist realism. They share similar attitudes towards the objects portrayed, rendering them often in the negative terms of homogenization, decontextualization, museumization, etc. But even in the confinement of the touristic frameworks, different approaches to the built environment can be practiced and thus detected. On the one hand, then, the motifs of Tallinn Old Town were embodied into socialist realism and the “medieval trend” reflected the ideological ambitions of the Soviet power in (re)constructing the past, heroicising the present and constituting the future; in addition, the Old Town was also dragged onto the commercial merry-go-round of the tourism industry and entertainment business; but on the other hand, enthusiasm about the Old Town also contained the local ambition of being culturally different. It attracted local people’s sincere interest, since, contrary to hollow promises of happy, but abstract communist future, it was directly related with familiar and palpable local themes, containing latent national sentiment and working to refresh the local memory. In addition to that, the medieval Old Town offered a real alternative environment to the sad monotony of new housing districts filled with anonymous industrially prefabricated mass architecture.

References

- Albers, Patricia C.; James, William R. 1988. Travel photography: A methodological approach. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15: 134–158.
- Ashworth, G. J.; Tunbridge, J. E. 2000. *The tourist-historic city: Retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- Carrier, James G. 2003. Mind, gaze and engagement: Understanding the environment. *Journal of Material Culture* 8(1): 5–23.
- Crawshaw, Carol; Urry, John. 1997. Tourism and the photographic eye. In *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory*, ed. Chris Rojek, John Urry, 176–195. London, New York: Routledge.
- Fainstein, Susan S.; Judd, Dennis R. 1999. Cities as places to play. In *The tourist city*, ed. Dennis R. Judd, Susan S. Fainstein, 261–272. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Penguin Books.

- Hall, Derek R. 1991. *Tourism and economic development in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. London: Belhaven Press; New York, Toronto: Halsted Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1997a. Building. Dwelling. Thinking. In *Rethinking architecture: A reader in cultural theory*, ed. Neil Leach, 100–109. London, New York: Routledge.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1997b. ...Poetically man dwells... In *Rethinking architecture: A reader in cultural theory*, ed. Neil Leach, 109–119. London, New York: Routledge.
- Hummon, David M. 1988. Tourist worlds: Tourist advertising, ritual, and American culture. *The Sociological Quarterly* 29(2): 179–202.
- Kenez, Peter. 2001. *Cinema and soviet society from the revolution to the death of Stalin*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Peeter Linnap, Pictorial Estonia. In *Koht ja paik / Place and location: Studies in environmental aesthetics and semiotics 3. Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Arts* 14, eds. Virve Sarapik, Kadri Tüür, 433–443. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts.
- Norberg-Schulz, Christian. 1984. *Genius loci: Towards a phenomenology of architecture*. New York, Rizzoli.
- Relf, Edward. 1986. *Place and placelessness*. London: Pion.
- Tode, Emil. 2000. *Border state*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Urry, John. 1990. *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Urry, John. 1992. The tourist gaze “revisited.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 36(2), 172–186.
- Wang, Ning. 2000. *Tourism and modernity: A sociological analysis*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

New Waves,
New Spaces:
Estonian
Experimental
Cinema
of the 1970s

Previously published online in

Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema,
Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema.
Eds. Eva Näripea, Ewa Mazierska,
Mari Laaniste.
2010, [http://www.kinokultura.com/
specials/10/naripea.shtml](http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/naripea.shtml)

Introduction

Using the label of “new wave” in the context of Estonian cinema is highly problematic and controversial because, unlike in France or, to take a more similar socio-political framework, in Czechoslovakia, the (Soviet) Estonian filmic arena did not see a creative outburst synchronous with and comparable to, both in scope of innovative production and international acclaim, the cinematic practices adorned with the adjective “new” elsewhere in Europe. While the heyday of various new waves, both in Western Europe and in the Soviet bloc, is normally limited to the period between the mid-1950s and the ruptures of 1968, in Estonia, as the local literary critic Mart Velsker (1999: 1211) has accurately argued, the essence of the innovative 1960s “is manifested in its most vivid form some time between 1968 and 1972, that is, at the end of the decade and partly even beyond it.” Compared to other artistic genres, however, Estonian cinema was severely lagging behind, both in achievement and in reputation. The true “Estonian New Wave” has been defined by local critics as born and burgeoning in the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s (Orav 2003: 54ff; Kärk 1995: 117; Kirt 1980: 33-4), when a new generation of young filmmakers entered the stagnated cinematic stage with bravado, finally inverting the low ebb that had lasted nearly a decade. Yet, in the midst of the ebbing waters of the early 1970s, a dark horse emerged, whose artistic contribution to Estonian cinematic heritage deserves to be identified as a new wave in miniature, a veritable diamond, albeit perhaps rough-cut. This author was Jaan Tooming, an actor and a theatre director, whose films constitute a fundamentally unprecedented phenomenon in Estonian cinema. His controversial, stylistically and semantically rich output, composed of unceasingly intriguing visual utterances, provides a fascinating order of spatial representations, which reconfigure Estonian cinematic territories in several respects and, at the same time, re-evaluate and criticize quite provocatively the historical and conceptual framework of imagining national, social and personal identities. The following investigation of Tooming’s films will concentrate chiefly on the spatial representations and practices, with digressions into the domain of re/constructing identities, both personal and collective.

Stagnation and Innovation

Although in the early 1960s Estonian cinema had seen a notable shift in content and style, away from the banalities and stereotypes of Stalinist socialist realism towards the emergence of both locally rooted and trans-nationally disposed film production, this development remained rather modest in its scope, both in terms of the force of its formally/narratively innovative impulse and its effect on the audiences, whether local or international. Moreover, the mainstream of cinematic output in the first part of the

1970s is usually seen as a product of an era of severe stagnation. According to Arvo Iho, “the 1970s were a time of stagnant water in Estonian narrative cinema; many films were made which had no effect on anybody and no connection with actual life” (Iho 1991).

In this regard, cinema—which has often been treated by critics and audiences alike as a not fully qualified part of Estonian national culture—stood in stark contrast with the rest of the local cultural arena, which saw a true boom of creative innovation in literature, fine arts and theatre. In the late 1960s and early 1970s this became especially visible in the university town Tartu, the second-largest city of Estonia, where a new generation of intellectuals and artists, born largely after World War II, formed a thriving circle of young critically minded and forward-looking thinkers and authors. One of the most important centers of these cutting edge developments was Vanemuine Theater, once the cradle of Estonian national theatre during the national awakening of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, first amateur and then professional. Kaarel Ird, the legendary creative head (1944-1948 and 1956-1985) of Vanemuine, invited several young talents—actors, writers and directors—to the theater, including Jaan Tooming, Evald Hermaküla and Mati Unt, who modified radically the face of Estonian theater during the late 1960s and the 1970s. This “theater revolution,” breaking with the “cardboard and make-believe” (Hermaküla [1992] 2002: 315) aesthetics of the previous years, was deeply stimulated by the innovations generated in theater by Antonin Artaud (“Theatre of Cruelty”), Peter Brook, Jerzy Grotowski and Western avant-garde groups, such as the Living Theater in New York (Unt 1968, 1972, 2002; Valgemäe 1995: 120ff; Rähesoo [1976] 1995: 73; Sang 1986). According to Mati Unt, it was characterized, first, by a conscious “separation from literature and detachment from the word, an attachment to the human, the bodily and its presence,” and secondly, by a “separation from the rational and the Apollonian, and an attachment to the subconscious and the Dionysian” (Unt 2004: 58; see also Rähesoo 1997: 13; Valgemäe 1995: 118). The first stage of this break, epitomized by Hermaküla’s much-celebrated production of the *Cinderella Game* (*Tuhkatriinumäng*, 1969, written by Paul-Erik Rummo; see e.g. Karja 2001), and aptly described by Jaak Rähesoo in Flaubert’s words as the period of *rage et impuissance* (Rähesoo [1976] (1995): 64), “found its expression in the aggressiveness and physicality of stage action, and in heavy reliance on symbols and metaphors,” which “reflected a hysterical rage born out of a feeling of political hopelessness after the Prague Spring had been crushed” (Rähesoo 2007: 248; see also Rähesoo 2002: 451; Epner 2006: 2439; Epner 2002). Later, between 1976 and 1983, Tooming staged a whole array of productions in Vanemuine, which “pumped new life into a series of Estonian classics by Kitzberg, Tammsaare, and Vilde” (O’Connor 2006: 194), and, even more importantly to the following discussion, “pointed to various Oriental and Occidental spiritual or

folkloristic traditions, and actively satirized all manifestations of human oppression, greed, hypocrisy, and vanity” (Rähesoo 2007: 249; Rähesoo 2003: 71).

In the first half of the 1970s, Jaan Tooming’s brimming creative energy also overflowed into cinematic endeavors,¹ giving occasion to talk about experimental film—in fact, for the first time in the history of (Soviet) Estonian cinema. His works, although few in number and extremely limited in terms of exposure to audiences even within Estonia, introduced in the field of Estonian filmmaking an entirely new narrative, visual and spatial discourse.

As already indicated, Tooming’s cinematic output is small in quantity, yet undoubtedly great in significance, encompassing only four films: *Endless Day* (*Lõppematu päev*, Eesti Telefilm/Eesti Kultuurfilm, 1971, rel. 1990) and *Colorful Dreams* (*Värvilised unenäod*, Tallinnfilm, 1974), both co-directed with Virve Aruoja; *The Misadventures of the New Satan* (1977, Eesti Telefilm; initially a play he directed in Vanemuine, adapted for stage and screen from an Estonian literary classic) and, finally, *Man and Pine Tree* (Eesti Telefilm, 1979). For several reasons, the largest portion of my discussion concentrates on the *Endless Day*. Foremost, it was Tooming’s first and shortest, yet undoubtedly most radical film, both in terms of its visual and narrative style and controversial content. It was not only banned even before its completion, but also designated for destruction, sharing thus the same level of “ultimate political threat” as, for example, Jan Němec’s *The Party and the Guests* (*O slavnosti a hostech*, 1966), which was infamously “banned forever” by the reactionary administration of the Czechoslovakian period of “normalization” in 1973. The *Endless Day* thus never reached its contemporary audiences and was completed nearly twenty years later, in 1990, after the materials, miraculously preserved in a shed of one of the film’s cinematographers, Vello Aruoja, were found and brought to light.

Another critically important fact is that three of Tooming’s films, including the infamous *Endless Day*, were produced by Estonian Television Film, a secondary studio alongside the republic’s main film studio, Tallinnfilm. Whereas the latter belonged to the Union-wide system, topped and carefully controlled by Goskino in Moscow, whose Russian-speaking and rigidly Soviet-minded management was undeniably (one of) the main reason(s) for the suspicious treatment of the whole Estonian cinematic

¹ In fact, Hermaküla had also been interested in filmmaking, and between 1966 and 1971 he worked as a director for Estonian Television, but left the studio after realizing that his artistic pursuits would be severely limited by the censorship politics under Brezhnev, which affected the mass media far more seriously than theatre (see e.g. Hermaküla 1992: 6). According to Hermaküla, theatre was preferable because it was less “state-controlled and industrial” than cinema or television (Hermaküla 2002: 36). Equally interesting is what remains unsaid, namely that behind the breakup were also, or perhaps even chiefly, creative tensions with the older generation who, according to Hagi Šein, did not trust the modernist experiments of the younger cohorts (Šein 2005: 31). In addition, the “planned production television,” emerging around the turn of the decade (*ibid.*), did not leave much space for innovative zest.

output by local audiences and critics alike, the Television Film studio, a unit of film production under Estonian Television (as, in fact, the greater part of local television as a whole), enjoyed much more liberal conditions in the 1960s (Šein 2005: 25, 31), as well as greater sympathy and support of local audiences. This in turn means that the production of the Television Film studio must be considered in a different light from that of the main studio in terms of intent, content and reception. In the beginning of the 1970s, however, the ideological grip also tightened in television, affecting also the unit of film production (since 1971 all scripts had to be approved in Moscow, in addition to the Artistic Council of the studio itself; Šein 2005: 77). Nevertheless, although in the aftermath of 1968 “the ideological demands brought about the lessening importance of creative criteria,” Estonian Television Film still managed to produce, even if not always broadcast, a whole array of remarkable narrative and documentary films (see Unt 2005). Finally, among Tooming’s filmic works, *Endless Day* provides perhaps the most eloquent material for investigating the radical renewal of visual and narrative form, as well as the shifting registers of spatio-social portrayals and critiques in Estonian cinema.

Form: Image, Narrative, Space

According to Peeter Linnap, the “dynamism and expressivity of the formal language” of Tooming’s films resembles first and foremost the ambiance of the works of the French *nouvelle vague* directors (Jean-Luc Godard and many others) as well as that of the kindred styles adopted at the beginning of the 1960s by many filmmakers in the Eastern bloc (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary) and Soviet Russia (Linnap 2002: 62; see also Kärk 1996). Among those, the Polish and Czechoslovakian influences were especially pertinent to the Estonian (film) culture in general and to Tooming’s development as an author in particular. The Polish connection, that is the influence of the Polish School of film (see e.g. Falkowska 2007: 35) had been strong from the late 1950s onward, making a lasting impression on the so-called first generation of (Soviet) Estonian filmmakers of the 1960s in particular, and Estonian culture in general (one of the most direct and pertinent examples would be Eino Tamberg’s ballet *Joanna tentata* (1970), which was directly inspired by Jerzy Kawalerowicz’s 1961 film *Mother Joan of Angels* (*Matka Joanna od Aniołów*); see Körver 2004; also Kärk 2008; Sobolewski 2008; Post 2008). Moreover, the Polish theater, especially the work of Jerzy Grotowski, had a profound, although to a large extent indirect, effect on Estonian theatrical innovations of the 1960s and 1970s (see Ramp 1969; Laasik 2005; Unt 2004; Vahing 1997; Epner, Unt and Vahing 2002; Epner 2006: 2439–40 etc.), a process where Tooming played a central part, as outlined above. Additionally, the works of Czechoslovakian filmmakers and theatre directors became a constant source of admiration and stimulation for their Estonian

colleagues. For example, the thriving Czechoslovakian theatre, especially the productions of the small, “democratically attuned” production companies in Prague, encouraged Evald Hermaküla to use projections of filmic images in his play *Midsummer 1941* (*Südasuvi 1941*, 1970) (Laasik 2004: 45; Unt [1972] 1997: 143-4). In the context of film production, Lennart Meri’s seminal article from 1968, “The great loner,” reveals a fair amount of professional jealousy towards the achievements of Czechoslovakian directors. In particular, he mentions Jiří Menzel and his film *Closely Observed Trains* (*Ostře sledované vlaky*, 1966), as an example of remarkable talent (Meri 1968). Perhaps it is also relevant to mention that Jaan Tooming visited Czechoslovakia in the spring of 1967 and was so excited by the “joy and hope boiling in the youth there” that he decided to learn the Czech language and subscribed to various Czechoslovakian cultural and theatre magazines (e.g. *Divadlo*) (Neimar and Visnap 1988: 70). Finally, among the photographers, a number of whom also worked as cinematographers, the ideas distributed via the Czechoslovakian magazine *Revue Fotografie* and the Polish *Fotografia* gained immense popularity (Linnap 2000: 82; Tooming 1995: 29), encouraging them in the mid-1960s to shoot “back yards, gutters, puddles, old doors and windows, crumbling plaster etc.” (Tooming 1995: 40).

Linnap’s eloquent and persuasive analysis of the formal structure of Tooming’s films concentrates mainly on the characteristic aspects of their cinematography, carried out by the directors of photography such as Rein Maran (*Colorful Dreams*), Andres Sööt (*The Misadventures of the New Satan*) and Jaan Tooming’s brother, the “emblematic documentary filmmaker and photographer,” Peeter Tooming (*Endless Day, Man and Pine Tree*), who, according to Linnap, belonged to the “avant-garde generation.” Linnap discusses the shift apparent in these films, from the “classical” mode of filmmaking, which applied the so-called passive, observational optics, to the modernist approach of “active optics,” which “emphasized the ‘ways of making’” of the shot/frame, “turning the camera into a human-camera: the cinematographer and thus the spectator do not stand idly outside the action of the shot, but rather are participants in its very essence” (Linnap 2002: 63; cf. Unt 1965). In the subsequent section I would like to build upon Linnap’s review and take a closer look at the narrative and visual form of Tooming’s films in a wider sense, mapping some of its cinematic kinships and, finally, scrutinize the (spatial) relations and aberrations between Tooming’s works and the mainstream (Soviet/Estonian) cinema.

It seems to me that, rather than drawing on comparisons to the French or any other Eastern European/Soviet versions of early new waves (that is, from the late 1950s to the early 1960s), Tooming’s *oeuvre* should be situated within the conceptual territory and formal framework of the experimental filmmaking in a broader sense. The experimental,

or avant-garde cinema, which is an umbrella term covering an extremely diverse array of cinematic practices, and in general indicates artistic activities “that challeng[e] institutionalised cultural forms” (Butler 2007: 89) and designates “politically conscious, antibourgeois, activist art movements” (Kovács 2007: 14), is—according to its broadest definition—associated with the following formal/stylistic features: the rejection of traditional (linear) narrative; the use of abstracting visual devices; and unconventional treatment of the soundtrack. All of these characteristics indeed apply to Tooming’s works, although to a varying degree and in somewhat different renditions in each case.

First, neither *Endless Day*, nor *Colorful Dreams* or *Man and Pine Tree* tell stories in the conventional sense. Dramaturgically they clearly stand apart from the cause-effect narratives modeled on the psychologically “realist” example of the 19th-century novel and theater, which—according to Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (2008: 101ff)—were linear, purposive, oedipal and “tended towards a happy or, failing that, a redemptive end.” Rather, the narrative models in Tooming’s films constitute a continuation of the process of narrative “shrinkage,” which in Estonian cinema begun in the second half of the 1960s, when the chain of events in Kaljo Kiisk’s *Midday Ferry* (*Keskpäevane praam*, 1967), radiating an air of nonchalant, cool indifference (although still linear in its chronological design) demonstrated a strong sense of casualness. Naturally, the context of theatrical “revolution” has to be taken into account as well, which, as suggested above by Mati Unt, demonstrated a strong distaste towards the “literary” (Unt 2002). Tooming’s *Endless Day*, revealing in its title the inclination towards a cyclical rather than linear approach, brings this route to radical fragmentation, disintegration and the multiplication of plot-lines, provoking a sense of perpetuality and insolubility, openness and randomness.

Secondly, the pictorial worlds of these films include an abundance of visual devices, which evoke a whole array of parallels from different discourses of avant-garde filmmaking. For example, the editing techniques of *Endless Day*, which are characterized by an intermittent rhythm of sometimes extremely fast-paced montage sequences and those cut more slowly and/or shot in long takes, seem to be a fair step towards a greater degree of extremeness compared to many of the digressions from the normative—that is from Hollywood studio-style, patterns of cutting (e.g. violation of the 180° axis, rapid changes of scenes etc.)—made by French filmmakers a dozen years earlier. Moreover, some of the images, visual juxtapositions and constellations in Tooming’s works in general, but specifically in *Endless Day*, reveal strong surrealist undercurrents à la Luis Buñuel. Additionally, and perhaps even more importantly, one must not dismiss the deeply-rooted absurdist-surrealist-grotesque tendencies in the neighboring Czechoslovakian and Polish (film) cultures (see Kovács 2007: 326; Richardson 2006: 107; Coates 1996). Also, some frames in *Endless Day* bear a close resemblance to early avant-garde

films, such as Fernand Léger's *Ballet mécanique* or René Clair's *Entr'acte* (both 1924). In the context of historical avant-garde filmmaking, however, *Endless Day*, and even more so *Colorful Dreams* and *Man and Pine Tree* (albeit thoroughly experimental) do not resonate with the branch of avant-garde cinema of the 1920s which grew out of the "pure experiments with form," mainly associated with authors whose background is in fine arts (e.g. Hans Richter, Viking Eggeling, Oskar Fischinger), but rather share common ground and similar (social) sensibilities with filmmakers like Sergei Eisenstein and Dziga Vertov who, according to Peter Wollen, "recogni[z]ed that a new type of content, a new realm of signifieds, demands formal innovation, on the level of the signifier, for its expression" (Wollen 2004: 132). In terms of narrative, however, not all of Tooming's films can be associated with the characteristic tendency in Eisenstein's approach, according to which "The most clearly avant-garde passages and episodes in Eisenstein's films (experiments in intellectual montage) remain[ed] passages and episodes, which appear[ed] as interpolations within an otherwise homogeneous and classical narrative" (Wollen 2004: 131). Instead, as suggested above, Tooming's inclinations tend towards a uniquely fractured and spastic narrative style, which is further emphasised by his idiosyncratic pictorial universe. Furthermore, in *Endless Day*, another layer of visual patterning is constituted by the *cinéma vérité* techniques, an approach which gained significant ground across European cinemas, including those of the Eastern bloc (e.g. Hames 2005: 106ff; Cunningham 2004: 102), and which—according to some authors—had influenced Estonian filmmaking since the early 1960s (Ansip 2007: 151-2). In this respect, the context of Estonian Television, where *Endless Day* was conceived and then suffocated in the embryonic stage, has to be evoked too. In the history of Estonian Television the brief period between 1965 and 1969 has been considered a high point of TV-journalism and documentary filmmaking, an era of a true "documentary explosion" (Elmanovič 1984: 32), which had been characterized, among other things, by on-the-spot reportages and staged set-ups, using the hidden cameras and other devices of the *cinéma vérité* style (see, e.g. Unt 2005; Šein 2005: 28). Although *Endless Day* is not a documentary (on the other hand, neither is it a fiction film in the mainstream sense), it does employ extensively hidden camera, as testified by Tooming's co-director Virve Aruoja (1992: 10). Additionally, the filmmaker—that is, Jaan Tooming who was both the (co-)director and the actor playing the leading role of the nameless Man—interacts with ordinary people on the streets, provoking situations and stimulating spontaneous reactions. Most importantly, however, one of the main goals of the film, and probably the major cause for its ban, was a desire to reveal something about society, something deeply disturbing about the truth(s)—as in *cinéma vérité*—of the (Soviet) system and the effects of its ideological apparatus.

Finally, the experimental leanings of Tooming's work are also defined by the distinctive treatment of the sonic architecture. In *Endless Day* this is constituted through a complete absence of diegetic sound; instead, the forceful songs (composed and performed by Tõnu Tepandi, another legendary member of the contemporary theatrical innovation, and written, along with the screenplay, by Paul-Eerik Rummo, one of the central figures of this intellectual and artistic rejuvenation of theater) haunt the listener throughout the film, providing voice—sometimes sad, sometimes ironic, sometimes excited or anxious, sometimes triumphant—to the Man who roams and traverses the city in a frenzy. In *Colorful Dreams* the improvised dialogue and specific aural design lends a sense of spontaneity and incidental nature to the film, as if the spectators were secretly listening in on children playing in the countryside, on Kati's dialogues with her parents, and on her unfeigned and playful musings. In *Man and Pine Tree* the imaginary voice-over dialogues between the eponymous Man and Pine Tree alternate with diegetic sequences of people talking to the Man, with aural flashbacks and the Man's melancholic inner monologues about the miserable decline in human morality and poeticism of masonry. In all these cases, both the image- and the sound-track serve to alienate audiences from the "normative" experience of reception and spectatorship.

Having said all that, it is still unavoidable to make a brief reference to the corresponding outlines of the filmmaking practices stemming from the tenets of the French *nouvelle vague* (as well as the East European/Soviet versions of their French counterparts) and Tooming's filmic output: both camps rely heavily on existential and, even more importantly, decidedly everyday subject matters (e.g. Hames 2005: 78); both were the result of (relatively) low-budget productions shot on location (cf. e.g. Cowie 2004: 142); and both place a strong emphasis on improvised actions and dialogue (e.g. Woll 2000: 195), as exemplified by *Colorful Dreams* where the camera records children's largely un-programmed interaction. Finally, the fragmentation of the narrative, another overarching characteristic (e.g. Nowell-Smith 2008: 171; Mazierska 2008: 26), is especially striking in *Endless Day*, whereas *Colorful Dreams* and *Man and Pine Tree* adhere to a somewhat more linear, although still erratic and thus certainly non-conventional mode of storytelling.

The final part of this section is informed by a somewhat unconventional coupling of certain cinematic structures on the one hand, and conceptual frameworks borrowed from an architectural/spatial theory on the other hand. I will use the concepts of "abstract space" and "differential space" as discussed by Henri Lefebvre in his seminal study on the production of space (see Lefebvre 1991: 49ff) in order to establish the fundamental disparity between mainstream (narrative) cinema and experimental modes of filmmaking as appropriated by Jaan Tooming in his directorial efforts. As indicated by Andy

Merrifield, Lefebvre's notion of abstract space is closely linked to Marx's conception of abstract labor: both reduce the (possible) diversity of (labor) activities and practices of a (social) system "to one quantitative measure: money" (Merrifield 2000: 175). "Formal and quantitative, it erases distinctions," maintains Lefebvre (1991: 49) in his theorization of abstract space. It "tends towards homogeneity, towards the elimination of existing differences or peculiarities" (Lefebvre 1991: 52). Furthermore, abstract space is "the repressive economic and political space of the bourgeoisie" (Merrifield 2000: 175), that is, by extension, of the dominant authority and ideology:

The dominant form of space, that of the centres of wealth and power, endeavours to mould the spaces it dominates (i.e. peripheral spaces), and it seeks, often by violent means, to reduce the obstacles and resistance it encounters there. Differences, for their part, are forced into the symbolic forms of an art that is itself abstract. (Lefebvre 1991: 49)

The "differential space," on the other hand, which the abstract space "carries within itself and which seeks to emerge from it" (Lefebvre 1991: 50), strives towards and honors distinctiveness, variation, diversity. As such, it poses a real threat to the stability and perseverance of the abstract space, which thus struggles to cancel it, or at least to disguise or delimit and confine it.

In the cinematic framework, the juxtaposition of mainstream/dominant mode of filmic operation and production practices of a more experimental nature, such as implemented by Jaan Tooming, both in terms of industrial infrastructure and protocols of representation, can be codified within the Lefebvre's model of abstract versus differential space. In this layout, Hollywood-Mosfilm's (as described by Godard; see Butler 2007: 92) "zero point of cinematic style" (Burch 1973: 17) functions as, and produces, abstract space: it prescribes a set of firmly established (visual) rules, most prominently the system of continuity editing, which is also extremely relevant in terms of spatial representation, creating a highly abstract diegetic space, which conceals from the spectator, or renders invisible (thus the designation of "invisible style"), the mechanics of the production, "the production apparatus of the cinema (camera, film-stock, lens, lighting, processing)" (Drummond 1979: 9), the utterly illusionary essence, as well as the manipulative and carefully controlled construction of this cinematic space. In narrative terms, the domain of abstract cinematic space also subscribes to a certain cluster of narrative codes, which—in the Soviet (Estonian) case—include, for example, the doctrine of socialist realism (even if the precise meaning and content of this might have changed over time). The synergy of these visual and narrative agents served to establish a cinematic form

which was, above all, ideologically suitable for the dominant power, but also (relatively) easily marketable to mass audiences. In the Soviet Union, the official policies of the 1970s “promoted a model of filmmaking that combined ideological orthodoxy with entertainment qualities” and the decade “also saw an attempt to address at least the industry’s long-standing failure to produce films of mass entertainment,” related to the fact “that a Soviet leadership striving, in Brezhnev’s immortal words, to “make the economy more economical,” was reluctant to see the substantial revenues generated by cinema ticket sales reduced” (due to the gradually widening “spread of television ownership”) (Faraday 2000: 87, 89; cf. Golovskoy 1986: 143). Evoking Lefebvre’s formulations, what else is this than a system “reduced to one quantitative measure,” its logic having “no *real* interest in qualitative difference?” Although at first glance the intentions of these policies may appear twofold (or possibly even conflicting)—first, the earning of profits, and secondly, the ideological indoctrination with communist/socialist tenets—the closer inspection reveals that, in fact, they were the two sides of the same coin, that is, they served to maintain and buttress the (ideological) hegemony of the existing regime, which resulted in the (re)production of an abstract space of social interaction, whether cinematic or “real.”

Tooming’s experimental works, on the other hand, are an expression of the Lefebvrian differential space, exhibiting the “true concrete qualitative space,” which “celebrates particularity—both bodily and experiential [...] True differential space is a burden. It cannot, must not, be allowed to flourish by the powers that be. It places unacceptable demands of accumulation and growth” (Merrifield 2000: 176). In terms of the mode of production, experimental cinema is never profit-seeking, as was also the case with Tooming’s films, three of which (*Endless Day*, although ultimately banned, *Misadventures of the New Satan* and *Man and Pine Tree*) were produced for television screens only, never intended for theatrical release; and while TV-films and programs were often also sold to central Soviet and foreign stations (mainly countries in the Soviet sphere of influence), Tooming’s works were much too eccentric to be considered as lucrative export articles. In visual terms, the differentiability (of their spatial configuration) translates into an audio-visual matrix of disruption and fragmentation, which challenges the human perception (e.g. the incredibly fast-paced montage sequences in *Endless Day*, the vertiginous, fish-eye cinematography of *Colorful Dreams* and *Man and Pine Tree*, the claustrophobic frame compositions of *The Misadventures of the New Satan*) and, in contrast to the easily readable generic formulas of the dominant cinema, places rather high demands on the audience in terms of (narrative) comprehension. Finally, the protagonists of Tooming’s films, too, demonstrate a remarkable deviation from commonly/ideologically accepted norms regarding characters and attributes of conventional filmic heroes: for instance,

the Man in *Endless Day* is an aimless wanderer “with no clear purpose” (Nowell-Smith 2008: 104), not unlike the characters, for example, in Michelangelo Antonioni’s films, and apparently without a proper professional position. Moreover, since unemployment was seen as a social practice of an outright contemptible nature, utterly undermining Soviet society, the Man comes across as a true Soviet antihero. Comparably, the Man in *Man and Pine Tree* is a potential vagabond, an ex-construction worker with a poetic mind, disillusioned by the Soviet version of massive modernist building methods, who embarks on a journey with no discernible destination, traversing the physical and mnemonic space, haunted by social trivialities and futile people.

In Lefebvre’s conceptual framework, the differential space “doesn’t look superficially different, but is different, different [from the abstract space] to its very core” (Merrifield 2000: 176). In the juxtaposition outlined above, however, the two modes of filmmaking, corresponding, as proposed, to Lefebvre’s theoretical pair, appear extremely different on the surface. Yet the comparison seems still valid and revealing, not least because the basic apparatus of filmmaking, the specific infrastructural configurations in the particular Soviet-Estonian context were not so different after all; perhaps to the greatest extent only in terms of the scale of the system of production/exhibition/distribution, but these two—the mainstream filmic output and the more experimental approach to filmmaking—still functioned in the same overall conditions (the official studios and their Artistic Councils, the system of censorship etc.), in the same social order, using the same fundamental cinematic tools and devices (35mm film-stock, professional equipment, knowhow and manpower etc.).

Spaces and Places: From Stalinist Fantasy to Experimental Ferment

Although *Endless Day*, as well as the rest of Tooming’s cinematic work, clearly stands out from Estonian film production in general and that of the 1970s in particular, for a multitude of reasons (the exhausting account and analysis of which remains beyond the scope of this article), it is undoubtedly appropriate to suggest that among these reasons Tooming’s approach to the portrayal of spaces and places holds a special position. *Endless Day*, which was shot in 1971 on location in Tallinn, is diametrically opposed to the spatial discourse that dominated Estonian narrative cinema in the 1950s and 1960s, as does the whole corpus of Tooming’s filmic output. In the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s, the newly-established film industry of the Estonian SSR had been governed by (mostly Russian-speaking) directors appointed to this peripheral studio by the central film authorities in Moscow, especially during the 1950s, as a leftover manpower of the so-called era of “film-famine” (*malokartin’e* in Russian; cf. Elmanovič 1987; Liehm and Liehm 1977: 68; Kenez 2001: 188). Often they belonged to the less talented ranks

of these “creative forces,” yet were still deemed sufficiently experienced, and, even more importantly, unquestionably loyal to the Soviet ideological project, to serve as “cinematic ambassadors” to jump-start the republican industry on the periphery. As a rule, they followed the socialist realist mode of representation, which resulted in airbrushed pictures of immaculate and presentable cityscapes that revealed no evidence of the deep scars left on Tallinn’s urban fabric by World War II, or equally unrealistic depictions of the glory, wealth and prosperity of the recently constituted collective farms, showing the local countryside as opulent, with fertile fields and prolific pastures (for more detail, see Näripea 2008). In contrast to these audiovisual products of the so-called tourist gaze (see Urry 1990; Widdis 2003: 138-9), the new generation of Estonian filmmakers who graduated from VGIK (the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography in Moscow) in the early 1960s (and who were predominantly ethnic Estonians) introduced a considerably more locally bound vision of spaces and places, which relied heavily on nostalgic images of the so-called national landscapes, creating a cinematic nation-space at a time when the nation-state seemed to be a political entity irretrievably lost in the turmoil of history. These idealized filmic portrayals of the Estonian countryside were, in fact, on many occasions just as far off from the reality as their Stalinist predecessors, only while the latter had been sweepingly grand visions of an imaginary communist future, the former functioned as mnemonic aids for commemorating the past, that is, the intimate and comforting farm-scapes of pre-war national independence. Moreover, they also served as quasi-subconscious tokens of the latent persistence of the nation-state despite the imposed Soviet regime. Modern urban environments and contemporary settings had little space in this national imaginary and during the 1960s their filmic depictions in the context of narrative cinema remained an exception rather than a rule. The frantically fragmented urban space and frenzied rhythms of Tooming’s *Endless Day* stand in absolute contrast to these somewhat romanticized and often comparatively composed and serene rural scenes, whose veiled allusions to nationally centered ambitions are altogether something else than the air of arrogance and provocatively biting criticism of the Soviet system offered by Tooming. The spatial domain of *Colorful Dreams* is defined by a stark contrast between the countryside and the city, which is a relatively new topic in the Estonian context, although an archetypical one in the history of Western (European) culture in general, and cinema (e.g. F. W. Murnau’s *Sunrise: A Song of Two Humans*, 1927) in particular. Seen through the eyes of a little girl, these juxtapositions take on almost “pre-cultural” connotations, revealing Tooming’s fundamental uneasiness towards the ways and workings not only of Soviet realities (his immediate socio-political surroundings), but also towards the paths taken by the urbanized, commodified and institutionalized civilization, whether capitalist or socialist. This tendency is further intensified in his last

film, *Man and Pine Tree*, where the protagonist's escape from his suburban home and the journey through the "agro-urbanized" (Maandi 2005: 180) Estonian countryside communicate a sense of complete hopelessness, demonstrating the author's desperate discovery that even the wilderness, represented by the eponymous pine tree, might not provide a viable alternative to the utterly corrupted existence of humankind and to the artificial environment created by it. In the following I shall analyze in depth the particular spatio-representational regime of *Endless Day*. Drawing on this, as well as Tooming's other films, I will also argue that they reveal a relatively distinctive attitude towards issues of (national) identity(-ies) as compared to the conceptual perspectives embodied, whether overtly or covertly, in the mainstream of Estonian narrative cinema of the 1960s and 1970s.

Endless Day: The Expansion of Tallinn on Film

The lion's share of *Endless Day* is shot in the Old Town of Tallinn, which was and still is a unique urban setting in its well-preserved integrity of historical atmosphere and medieval structure. Since the times of the inter-war Estonian Republic (see Paas 1982), throughout the Soviet period (Näripea 2005) and up to the post-socialist years of re-established statehood, the "official" matrix of spatial representations of the Old Town has remained surprisingly constant, exploiting its potential as a desirable tourist attraction and rendering it a perfect product of the so-called society of the spectacle (Debord [1967] 1995). Its romanticized medieval imagery became especially popularized in the second half of the 1960s, materializing "in countless articles of consumer goods, numerous interior designs and in a whole range of films" (Näripea 2004). The nature of these images, however, is far from uniform or monotonous, and the sanitized, beautified, and de-contextualized imagery of some of these products, cinematic or otherwise, signified only one, even though heavily dominant and officially sanctioned representational model. In cinema, this blatantly touristic protocol was applied to a whole generic range of productions: first, historical adventures/costume dramas, such as *The Last Relic* (*Viimne reliikvia*, directed by Grigori Kromanov, 1969), a Union-wide blockbuster produced by Tallinnfilm, *Stone of Blood* (*Verekiivi*, directed by Madis Ojamaa, 1972), the former's pallid clone, or *Between Three Plagues* (*Kolme katku vahel*, directed by Virve Aruoja, 1970), a more serious and art-house film produced, unlike the first two, by Estonian Television Film, and, notably, with Tooming as a member of the cast; secondly, feature-length musicals, such as *Old Thomas was Stolen* (*Varastati Vana Toomas*, dir. Semjon Shkolnikov, 1970) or *Don Juan in Tallinn* (*Don Juan Tallinmas*, dir. Arvo Kruusement, 1971), as well as shorter concert programs for TV-broadcasting; and, finally, numerous touristic scenery/travel films promoting Tallinn as a charming

holiday destination. Besides, a few more controversial shorts, following the generic patterns of city symphonies and revealing a somewhat different, that is, more experientially grounded point of view, were made in the second half of the 1960s, including *Pikk Street* (*Pikk tänav*, directed by Hans Roosipuu, 1966) and *Secrets of Tallinn* (*Tallinna saladused*, directed by Ülo Tambek, 1967).

Tooming's *Endless Day* evokes intriguing dialogues with these traditions and films on various levels, commenting on these orders of representations, quoting and criticizing, occasionally even ridiculing them. For instance, an entire sequence dedicated to satirizing established norms and conventions is set in the central Town Hall Square, which is used by Tooming as a stage for the simultaneous shooting of three different films.² During his wanderings in the city, the main character, the nameless Man, stumbles upon and, in a rather comical manner, becomes involved in the filming of, first, a scenic/documentary about Estonian national culture featuring people in folk costumes, then, an historical adventure presenting a duel between men clad in Three-Musketeers'-like garb, and, finally, an action film entailing kidnappings and fist-fights, explosions and gunfire. This short sequence is abundant with a multitude of references to the above-mentioned productions, criticizing, above all, three partly overlapping tendencies. First, the scene with the folk dancers and singers caricatures the socialist realist formula of "national in form, socialist in content," which hand-picked certain elements of local tradition(s) and turned them into icons of transnational Soviet culture. Alongside the scenic vistas of the Old Town, this folkloric imagery formed an essential part of the touristic mode of representation, which was recycled again and again, film after film. Meanwhile, it is also possible that Tooming's criticism addresses the conservative, sentimental and, most importantly, normative and institutionalized construct of national identity, stemming initially from the period of national awakening in the late 19th century, which first became established as an official norm during the inter-war period of independent statehood, and managed to retain popular relevance even after being semantically colonized by the Soviet

² It is also noteworthy that *Endless Day* is one of the very few Estonian self-reflexive films, that is, films concentrating on or revealing the cinematic industry and apparatus. In fact, from the Soviet period only one other example comes to mind: *Man and Woman*, a short mock-documentary by Mark Soosaar (*Mees ja naine*, 1972), which belongs, too, to the category of experimental cinema and presents a truly stylish "reportage," mimicking the jargon of Soviet news-stories, from an imaginary film festival (the title of the film and of the festival alludes to Claude Lelouch's award-winning film *Un homme et une femme* from 1966, which had been "immensely popular and influential" everywhere in the Eastern bloc (see Jordanova 2003: 95)). A number of filmmakers whose names resemble actual authors (e.g. the Estonian directors Silgo Niisk/Kaljo Kiisk and Gregor Kormoranoff/Grigori Kromanov, as well as internationally acclaimed authors, such as Bonarrotti Antonini/Michelangelo Antonioni, Kaltazanov & Surowski/Kalatozov & Uruzevskii, and, most amazingly, Albert Cuntcock/Alfred Hitchcock) compete at this festival with entries aping their respective styles, all starring "John Wedding" (played by the legendary Estonian actor and poet Juhan Viiding) and "Linda-Linda" (portrayed by Ada Lundver, a famous Estonian actress and a veritable "sex-bomb").

representational regime. In the Soviet era, this fundamentally paradoxical and innately antithetical version of the national imaginary became most clearly manifest in the form of the much-celebrated dance and song festivals, but also found expression in the aforementioned nation-spaces of narrative cinema of the 1960s. Tooming's work, on the other hand, as also testified by his theatrical "experiments with folk poetry" (O'Connor 2006: 194; see also Rähesoo, [1994] 1995: 304), and the use of music (mainly in his later films) reminiscent of ancient folk songs, which have been dubbed "Kalevala songs," "runic or runo songs" or "folksongs in the *regivärss* meter" (see Ross and Lehiste 2001: 7), seems to reject this standardized and fixed concept of national(ity/identity), both in its official and popular, "underground" manifestations, endorsing instead ancient, mythological and perhaps, at least in the case of *Endless Day*, also multiplied form(s) of (pre)national/group/personal identities. The narrative framework of *Endless Day*, as an example of the "jumbled, fragmented, multiplied or reversed" form of story-telling, characteristic of many post-war European new wave films, can be "interpreted as an expression of the difficulty of narrating national identity" (Martin-Jones 2008: 1). By mocking the major icons and narratives of (national) history, as exemplified by this brief episode with folk singers and dancers, Tooming "offer[s] a ... critique of the pedagogical time of the nation" (ibid.: 37), which establishes a conceptual hegemony, erasing margins, silencing minorities, masking ruptures, digressions and gaps. Secondly, the fragment with the historical adventure film, refers not only to its Estonian generic cousins, but also to the fact that Tallinn was systematically exploited as a ready-made set for countless Soviet productions in search of a "European-looking" environment (including, perhaps most famously, the (later) Soviet version of Dumas's *Three Musketeers*, a three-part television miniseries/musical *D'Artagnan i tri mushketera*, dir. Georgii Iungval'd-Khil'kevich, 1978). Thus, Tallinn and its Old Town was "neutered," as argued by Ewa Mazierska elsewhere in this issue, and perhaps, paradoxically, even turned into a faceless "non-place" (Augé 1995; see also Relph 1976), "where people do not belong to but engage instrumentally in scripted performances" (Coleman and Crang 2002: 2). It became a mere picturesque backdrop for random, essentially unconnected and thus de-territorialised (historical) actions, losing its particularity precisely due to its specific, that is, "medieval" / "Western" character. Thirdly, the action-film sequence refers explicitly to a scene from an earlier film, *Old Thomas was Stolen*, and by association to numerous other (audiovisual) products of the touristic "place-marketing," which signify not only the commodified nature of particular practices related to the Old Town and tourism, but also to a broader spectrum of the fundamentally petit-bourgeois mindset, the monetary/consumerist ambitions, of the formally egalitarian and "communist" Soviet society. In this respect, Tooming's critique is perfectly in sync with a fairly wide-spread contemporary attitude among the

local intellectuals who condemned and satirized the parvenu-mentality of the bureaucratic/commercial elite. According to Rudolf Rimmel, for example, “the single eye of the upstart Cyclops stares at things, it has no second eye for seeing the other values of life. Nobleness, spiritual purity and love in its authentic form are suffocated by mental degeneration, the prevailing of material interests and the ego striving towards the top of a junk-pile.” (Rimmel 1973) Meanwhile, these critics themselves tended to forget that they, too, profited from the institutional structures set up by the Soviet system in service of the creative intelligentsia (in the cinematic context see Faraday 2000: 87ff). Indeed, it is somewhat paradoxical, perhaps even ironical, that both Tooming and Hermaküla were granted the title of “Merited Artist” in 1976.

In contrast to the firmly established representational modes which concentrate cinematic imagery around particular iconic objects and perspectives, the camera in *Endless Day* carefully avoids overused views and vistas, roaming restlessly about the small and peripheral streets, dilapidated back yards, neglected corners and ramshackle passages. At first glance, the film seems to share at least part of its (spatial) sensibilities with the city symphonies indicated above, which focus mainly on the imaginary viewpoint of a local, native inhabitant, rather than a passing traveler (or perhaps a Soviet immigrant). Even more importantly, the representational protocols of *Endless Day* correspond to a certain extent to the conceptual impetus behind many of the initial products of the genre from the 1920s, that is, “the conviction that [...] a city is first and foremost a way of life” (Sorlin 2005: 33), and not merely an architectural ensemble. Furthermore, there are moments when the nodal points of actions in *Endless Day* coincide with elements belonging to the deep structure of these classic city symphonies. For example, the chain of events apparently begins in the morning and unwinds, even though somewhat fragmentally and with numerous digressions, ellipses and loops, throughout the day. Also, the latter part of the film concentrates on different leisure activities (such as choral singing and ballroom dancing, chess and skating, dining and napping). Finally, the themes of existential cyclicity, youth and death, *Eros* and *Thanatos*, have a strong presence throughout the film. Nevertheless, on closer inspection it becomes apparent that *Endless Day*, unlike earlier Estonian versions of city symphonies, is *not* a story about a city as a built environment *per se*; instead, it is very much a story, or rather a meditation, about the Man, about his personal relationship with the surrounding space—physical, mental and social. More broadly, it is also a meditation about multiple networks of social relations. In this respect, at least to a degree, Tooming’s view of city spaces approximates that of a whole mass of post-war European films, according to which, as proposed by Sorlin (2005: 35), “Towns gain life from the expansion of human exchanges; they are nothing but the relationships that exist between their inhabitants.” Moreover, unlike

the officially endorsed productions—and these include the Estonian versions of city symphonies from the late 1960s—*Endless Day* broadens the scope of spatial depictions significantly, introducing to Tallinn's cinematic image not only the pictures of a different kind of Old Town, but also portrayals of pre-Soviet housing districts, the wooden slums, which were left to decay and destined for demolition by the local authorities. Most of them, however, stayed intact throughout the Soviet period, in a miserable and increasing state of deterioration, providing lodging for a diverse range of residents: the underdogs and the unfortunate on the one hand, the non-conformist intellectuals and artists on the other. Until the late 1970s, these slums were entirely off-limits for cinematic representation in any contemporary context and they were tolerated to a small extent only as part of portrayals of the exploitation of the working class in the pre-Soviet capitalist society. Tooming's *Endless Day* breaks this ultimate taboo and shows the grim reality without much poetry or lyricism.

Haptic Spaces, Dialogic Selves

As already indicated, Tooming's interest in places does not focus on specific architectural features, although he uses them as indicators of certain conditions and concepts. Rather, he treats the places as expressive *loci* of human thought, identity and (inter)action. In fact, in close relation to and stemming from the latter, central to all Tooming's films is a strong sense of body and the bodily experience, as was the case with his theatrical productions (Unt 2002). The respective spatial experiences of the Man in *Endless Day* and the Man in *Man and Pine Tree* are framed and presented not only as visual experiences; the sensory specter of their communications with the surroundings also encompasses the senses of smell and, most importantly, touch. In *Colorful Dreams* the world seen through a child's eyes is not only visual, the images evoke forcefully the warmth of the sun, the wetness of the water, the softness of the kitten's fur, the elegant odor of the urbane mother's perfume etc. Moreover, in all of these films, the presence of a certain "inner eye," capable of sensing the imperceptible, is clearly recognizable. Nevertheless, in relation to the spatial sensibilities of these works, the tactile qualities hold a special position, emphasizing the centrality of the bodily sphere. Their manifestations and connotations may perhaps be best explained through two intertwining concepts: textures and movement.

First, the textures of various surfaces, even though presented by the optical apparatus of the film camera, acquire a particular tangibility through extreme close-ups of walls and pavements, of the bark of the pine tree, of the human skin, of the caterpillar discovering the "landscape" of a girl's face. In *Endless Day*, but equally in *Man and Pine Tree*, the accentuation of textures serves a specific critical function: it draws attention to the

deterioration of the urban and built environments. Whereas in the city symphonies of the 1960s the coarse and rustic surfaces of limestone walls, the expanses of red tiled roofs, the picturesque façades covered with a rough and sometimes slightly crumbled coat of plaster and faded colors, and uneven cobblestone pavement of the winding streets never challenged or crossed the officially tolerated limit of “romantically aged features,” in *Endless Day* the crumbling and cracked walls, rotten fences, piles of garbage and bumpy asphalt lay bare the dirty Soviet reality, connoting simultaneously the morally declining face of this society. The close-ups of rickety and slapdash brickwork of newly erected constructions and the miserably dilapidated masonry of old buildings in *Man and Pine Tree* similarly speak of the inevitably and increasingly degenerating state of the Soviet system.

Besides this architectural tactility, however, the bodily contacts between humans are even more important to Tooming, as exemplified in extreme by what was probably seen by the members of the Artistic Council of the Estonian Television Film as the most scandalous sequence in *Endless Day* and undoubtedly played a crucial role in the eventual banning of the film, namely, the random sex scene involving the Man and a woman who seems to run an illegal private nursery in her tiny slum-house apartment. Although not at all explicit by today’s standards, its apparent casual and prosaic nature still comes across as somewhat disquieting, even more so considering the immediate historical context of this representation. The surroundings and the furnishings of the apartment, which unmistakably point towards an educated and humanitarian owner (a type-writer and a copy of the literary journal *Looming* on the table, a wall full of rather disarrayed bookshelves etc.), as well as the crowd of children crammed next door, and an odd hamster running around on the loose, all accompanied by the jovial tunes of the sound-track, merge into one conceptual potpourri, creating a bizarrely festive atmosphere of uncontrollable fertility, both bodily and intellectual, which in the Soviet context was most likely read as an unambiguous and thus inadmissible attempt of ideological subversion, as “socialist ideology was hostile towards spontaneous festivity” (Mazierska 2008: 104), and, for that matter, any spontaneous activities.

This scene, and *Endless Day* on the whole, invites consideration of the Bakhtinian notion of the carnivalesque. According to Bakhtin, the carnival “challenged the utterances of ‘official culture’” (Holloway and Kneale 2000: 80), and

celebrated temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order: it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions. (Bakhtin 1984a: 10)

Importantly, the carnivalesque or grotesque body is “open to the outside world,” especially through the “material lower bodily stratum,” including genitalia and breasts; it is “not a closed, complete unit: it is unfinished, outgrows itself, transgresses its own limits” (Bakhtin 1984a: 26). Bakhtin’s carnival, then, belongs to Lefebvre’s above-mentioned space of differentiability, which rebels against the dominating tendencies of the abstract space that “erases distinctions ... which originate in the body (age, sex, ethnicity) [and] denies the sensual and the sexual” (Lefebvre 1991: 49-50). I will return to these ideas in the following discussion of questions related to the changing concept of (national) identity(-ies) in Tooming’s films. For now, suffice it to say that the overall ambience of *Endless Day* was indeed somewhat carnivalesque, resembling a hectic Brownian movement, a chaos of dynamic bodies, challenging both the physical and conceptual perception of the viewers and problematising “hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions.”

Movement, the second major characteristic of these “haptic spaces of bodily experience,” is manifested in Tooming’s films through the constant mobility of the respective protagonists in *Endless Day* and *Man and Pine Tree* and the children running about and away in *Colorful Dreams* on the one hand, and through the restlessly roaming camera—the “active optics,” as described by Linnap—on the other. Both articulate further the human body as a predominant element of the spatial order of these films. Linnap argues that the “optical turbulence” of Tooming’s works is an expression of a “social nausea,” and that *Endless Day* is an extreme example of his approach to the concepts of (national/personal) independence and freedom, which chooses “a naïve escape” instead of active rebellion or resistance. According to Linnap (2002: 68), “Jaan Tooming’s four films cover a territory where the (historical) naïve Western notion of individual freedom can be recognized, along with the typical refuges that go with it: the so-called pristine wilderness (*Man and Pine Tree*), the pre-cultural wise savage (*The Misadventures of the New Satan*), the dream (*Colorful Dreams*) and, finally, I Myself [*Endless Day*].” While I agree with Linnap’s diagnosis of Tooming’s films as expressions of “social nausea,” I doubt his view about the “naïve escape,” or rather I believe that this argument needs further elaboration. In *Endless Day*, the “active optics,” the agitated camera movements, turbulent rhythms of cutting, and, most notably, the anxious and impatient dynamism, both spatial and mental, of the Man himself, his fevered interactions with the surrounding spaces and people, clearly speak of an extrovert, rather than inward-looking or autistic frame of mind. It becomes apparent from the very beginning of the film that, instead of withdrawing from society, which he obviously regards as less than perfect, he engages quite actively with it, running around in the city, talking to strangers on the street, getting involved in different activities. He does not observe his environment passively, but is rather “open

to the outside world,” busy with the production of the lived space in Lefebvre’s terms, evoking the “essentially qualitative, fluid and dynamic” representational space (Lefebvre 1991: 42). As such, *Endless Day* stands very close to the simultaneous creative urban practices of the young Estonian avant-garde artists, designers and architects (cf. Linnap 2002: 62), who, as has been pointed out by Andres Kurg (2004: 141), produced in their work “autobiographical [and multi-layered] urban landscape[s]” by “encountering and rediscovering” “town districts and courtyards,” “uniquely perceived wooden houses, fragments captured in passing and details which surprised the idle stroller” on their “walks through the city.” By doing that, they, and Tooming likewise, did not cut themselves off from the surroundings but rather adopted their own point of view and reclaimed, in a way, the urban spaces abandoned by the official discourse of Lefebvre’s conceived space. Instead of just retreating to the private sphere and creating their own escapist cell of existence, they appropriated the public space by making use of the tactics available to them (see also Laanemets 2005; Allas 2008). Both Tooming’s films and the artists involved in those “happenings, games and walks in Tallinn in the 1970s” (Laanemets 2005; see also Epner 2004) ultimately attempted to provoke and seize “[m]oments’ of revelation, emotional clarity and self-presence as the basis for becoming more self-fulfilled,” which could be seen as acts of rebellion, “against the banality” of the *quotidieneté* (Lefebvre, cit. Shields 2004: 209), against the everyday life which is “in thrall to abstract space” and denotes “programmed consumption” (Lefebvre 1991: 59, 89). As modern-day *flâneurs*, their drifting in the city space was “opposed to the established rhythm of life, to the rational organization of time” (Laanemets 2005: 164).

The notion of bodily experienced and lived space, which seems to underlie the “spatial politics” of *Endless Day*, as well as the Man’s visibly open and active attitude towards his surroundings, calls for an investigation of Tooming’s approach(es) towards personal and social identities. While Linnap sees the Man of *Endless Day* as an ultimate manifestation of the artistic ego (and Tooming’s *alter ego*), who believes uncritically in the possibility of a naïve escape from the hostile conditions of the surrounding social reality and is simultaneously convinced that some kind of refuge can indeed be found, I argue that the Man in *Endless Day*, and his relationship with the world, can, in fact, be described and understood in terms of Bakhtin’s concept of the dialogic self, which ultimately denies any possibility of encapsulation. According to Bakhtin,

I am conscious of myself and become myself only while revealing myself for another, through another, and with the help of another. The most important acts constituting self-consciousness are determined by a relationship toward another consciousness (toward *a thou*) [...] The very being of man (both external and internal) is

the *deepest communion*. To *be* means to *communicate* [...] To be means to be for another, and through the other for oneself. A person has no internal sovereign territory, he is wholly and always on the boundary: looking inside himself, he looks *into the eyes of another or with the eyes of another* [...] I cannot manage without another, I cannot become myself without another. (Bakhtin 1984b: 287; emphasis in the original)

As proposed by Julian Holloway and James Kneale (2004: 75), “the Bakhtinian Self is [...] characteristically open and in a constant state of Becoming,” it “will never be brought into stasis and fixity.” The Man in *Endless Day*, taking on different tasks, roles and positions, shifting constantly between a multitude of activities, places and spaces, is precisely the incarnation of this self in a constant state of flux, “open to the outside world” as was the aforementioned carnivalesque or grotesque body. Meanwhile, Tooming’s various critiques—towards the bourgeois, consumerist mentalities, towards the fixed, normative and standardized mode of “national” identity—as well as two brief scenes in the film which seem to indicate the possibility of a homosexual identity, can perhaps be also read as a criticism of both a single and static Self and a single (personal or national) Identity, be it that of *homo soveticus* or some(one) else (not surprisingly, though, his outlook is still dominated by relative masculinity, leaving little room for contemplating female identities). Indeed, as described by Rein Veidemann, the mentality of the so-called sixties’ generation promoted dialogism, openness to new knowledge and fresh experiences, they valued “communicative interaction, mutually activating generational dialogues, truth-seeking” (Veidemann 1991). Additionally, the extremely suggestive soundtrack of *Endless Day* switches effortlessly between lyrics in Estonian, German, Finnish, English, French, Russian and Italian. This presence of different cultural/linguistic spaces (notably without excluding Russian) communicates a radical expansion of mental territory, maybe indicating the infinitely rich potential of intellectual, emotional and creative exchange, and opens thus up the Estonian filmic space to an unprecedented extent. Compared to the identities and spaces represented in mainstream narrative cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, *Endless Day* thus proposes an entirely new, more extensive, diverse and controversial spatiotemporal matrix.

Retreat

Tooming’s subsequent films, along with his theatrical productions, however, channel these multifarious and apparently rather undogmatic inclinations into a more clearly and narrowly defined conceptual watercourse. *Man and Pine Tree*, made eight years later, retains the “active optics” and spatial mobility (as a narrative form borrowed from

road-movies/travel films), yet, unlike in *Endless Day*, the protagonist is in an inextricable conflict with and irretrievably alienated from the surrounding physical, ideological and mental environment. The (morally) disfigured nature of this environment is emphasized both by the distorted visual language of the image-track filmed in color with an extremely wide-angle lens, and the woebegone, archaic chant of the soundtrack, contrasting with the colorful imagery, yet also complementing its alienating fisheye effect. The sound-track plays with the tradition of runic folksongs, which “can hardly be considered ‘singing’ in the traditional sense of the word. It is more like a mixture of recitative and calling, with some melodic features as well. The runic song might well be described as a kind of drama including both the initiation of sounds from nature, and mime” (Jan Ling, cited in Ross and Lehiste 2001: 9; see also Jirgens 2006: 64). Instead of the previous orientation towards differentiability, ambiguity and perhaps even hybridity, the momentum behind *Man and Pine Tree* seems to be a purist striving towards mythical “beginnings” or “roots.” However, it is equally important to emphasize that this surge apparently overleaps the sentiments of the inter-war nation-state, as well as those of the 19th-century national awakening, and is evidently directed towards, and maybe even beyond, the deepest layers of history, testifying thus that Tooming apparently subscribes to the Herderian, that is “essentialist” or “primordialist” understanding of ethnicity and nationality, as well as the genesis and nature of the nation.³ The film’s protagonist, as summarized above, leaves behind his job as a bricklayer and his home in the suburbia, which has been taken over by petty and consumerist neighbors who are enclosed in their narrow personal universes: he takes to the road, in search of a refuge. In the beginning of the film, he seems to be fairly confident that nature, the “untamed wilderness,” as termed by Linnap, will provide a comforting alternative to the utterly corrupt (sub)urbanized society, perhaps even a domain of personal freedom for thought and mind. His journey takes him through Estonian territory, and the spectators see towns and villages, landscapes and cityscapes through his eyes. Here, Tooming’s criticism extends to the “Sovietised” Estonian terrain, but especially acute is his denigration of the “agro-urbanized” countryside and of the bourgeois lifestyle of the so-called agrocracy who commissioned pompous kolkhoz-centers and erected middle-class private housing. Equally, though, the protagonist is unhappy with the simple-minded common villagers, represented by an elderly woman who has finally been allocated a new apartment in town and cannot hide her utter delight of escaping the “uncomfortable” (yet traditional) life in an old farmhouse. The man sees the whole of Estonia as being gradually taken over by corrupt—presumably Soviet but equally consumerist—mentality. Finally, however,

³ See e.g. the so-called Warwick Debate on the nature of nationalism between Ernest Gellner and Anthony D. Smith (<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/gellner/Warwick0.html>, accessed 6 March 2010), and Brubaker et al. 2004, as well as Kivimaa 2009: 159-160.

he discovers that no “untamed wilderness” actually exists any more: in the woods, the ghosts from his past—a treacherous friend and a demanding wife—haunt him mercilessly, shaped as sonic and visual flashbacks. Thus, the potential coupling with the nature offers no retreat, no way out. At the same time, the film still seems to endorse a clearly pantheist *Weltanschauung*, suggesting that if nature perishes, so will the human race. In the end, then, the only possible escape route appears to lead to pure metaphysics, to religion perhaps, yet not to the institutionalized kind, rather to a pre-cultural, simple spirituality, or certain pagan practices (cf. Rähesoo [1994] 1995: 304, 307; Rähesoo 2007: 249; Tooming 1976). The endorsement of an archaic, almost mythic, pre-national world becomes even more apparent from the film’s sonic design, as the runic folksong tradition on which Tooming builds his musical architecture dates probably “from the last millennium BCE when the Balto-Finnic tribes had not separated, and spoke the same Balto-Finnic protolanguage” (Ingrid Rüütel, cit. by Ross and Lehiste 2001: 9). Even more importantly, the practice of runic songs was forced into decline by an organized religious movement, the Moravian Brethren in the 18th century (Ross and Lehiste 2001: 9). Thus Tooming seems to promote a (re)turn to some kind of “pure indigeneous culture,” “a culture defined as an organic totality, fixed in a place” (Coleman and Crang 2002: 6; cf. Rähesoo [1994] 1995: 307-9). Indeed, as testified by Irena Veisaitė, Tooming was extremely thrilled by the similarity of certain motifs of folk poetry of different nations, arguing (apparently under the influence of Uku Masing, an Estonian poet, theologian and ethnologist; see Rähesoo [1994] 1995: 308-9) that this provides convincing proof that “the human civilization is not composed of hostile tribes, but is rather unified in its base” (Veisaitė [1979] 2002: 199). Hence, Tooming rejects the possibility of the forking and multiple identities suggested in *Endless Day*, and offers instead a much more rigid standpoint regarding the supposedly “true” nature of a single national identity, even though he is thoroughly pessimistic in terms of its realization in the present time. In conclusion, then, the message of *Man and Pine Tree* retains Tooming’s previous suspicion towards institutionalized and normalized identities, whether personal or national, religious or political, bourgeois or Soviet, capitalist or communist, but it also speaks of the permanent state of entrapment, providing no positive and viable program of its own. In this respect, Linnap’s interpretation of the escapist surge behind Tooming’s *oeuvre* is indeed partly accurate, pertaining mainly to his later filmic works.

Conclusion

The brief episode of experimental filmmaking in Estonian cinema, as represented by Jaan Tooming’s filmic output, added a significant thread—although marginal in its exposure and limited in its effect—to the fabric of spatial representations. Tooming’s innovative

and extremely expressive renderings of filmic form, both visual and narrative, introduced an unprecedented (and largely inimitable) regime of depiction, which promoted, at least in its initial articulation, a greater openness and variety of city-, land- and mindscapes. His (spatial) critiques were equally bold and penetrating towards both the inadequacies of the “official” Soviet system and the “unofficial” or “underground,” yet still normative and ossified constructions of national identity. While the fluid bravado of his earlier, decisively recalcitrant works, especially that of *Endless Day*, froze into more stable, and perhaps even conservative standpoints in his later films, his productions continued to offer alternatives to mainstream cinematic space and provided for the audiences a conceptual place for contemplation, a refuge of sorts, which, however, failed to afford consolation and instead functioned as a constant and uncomfortable reminder of the present socio-cultural deficiencies.

Acknowledgement

The paper was written with the support of the targeted financed research project no. SF0030054s08 *Rhetorical Patterns of Mimesis and Estonian Textual Culture*.

Works Cited

- Allas, A. (2008) “Tagasipöördumine ja taktika. Mängu idee 1960. aastate eesti kultuuris ja *happening* ‘Mannekeeni matmine,’” / “Return and tactics: The idea of play in the Estonian culture of the 1960s and the happening ‘The Burial of a Mannequin,’” *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi / Studies on Art and Architecture* 17.4, pp. 9-30.
- Ansip, K. (2007) “Sissevaateid Eesti dokumentaalfilmi III,” *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 9, pp. 144-55.
- Aruoja-Hellström, V. (1992) “Vastab Virve Aruoja-Hellström,” *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 8, pp. 5-13.
- Augé, M. (1995) *Non-places: Introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity*, London, New York: Verso.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984a) *Rabelais and his world*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984b) *Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetics*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Brubaker, R., Loveman, M and Stamatov, P. (2004) “Ethnicity as cognition,” *Theory and Society* 33, pp. 31-64.
- Burch, N. (1973) *Theory of film practice*, London: Secker & Warburg.
- Butler, A. (2007) “Avant-garde and counter-cinema,” in Cook, P. (ed.) *The cinema book*, London: British Film Institute, pp. 89-96.

- Coates, P. (1996) "Forms of the Polish intellectual's self-criticism: Revisiting ashes and diamonds with Andrzejewski and Wajda," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 38.3-4, pp. 287-303.
- Coleman, S. and Crang, M. (2002) "Grounded tourists, travelling theory," in Coleman, S. and Crang, M. (eds.) *Tourism: Between place and performance*, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1-17.
- Cowie, P. (2004) *Revolution! The explosion of world cinema in the 60s*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Cunningham, J. (2004) *Hungarian cinema: From coffee house to multiplex*, London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Debord, G. (1995) *The society of spectacle*, New York: Zone Books.
- Drummond, P. (1979) "Notions of avant-garde cinema," in *Film as film: Formal experiment in film 1910-1975*, London: The Arts Council of Great Britain, pp. 9-16.
- Elmanoviš, T. (1984) "Eesti filmikunsti žanrijooni I," *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 10, pp. 19-32.
- Elmanoviš, T. (1987) "Väljamurd üksildusest. Kaotused ja võidud," *Sirp ja Vasar*, 6 November.
- Epner, E. (2004) "Ära pane, isa!," in Saro, A. and Karja, S. (eds.) *Teatrielu 2003*, Tallinn: Eesti Teatriliit, pp. 254-82.
- Epner, L. (2002) "Kaks visandit Hermaküla teatrist," in Epner, L., Unt, M. and Vahing, V. (eds.) *Hermaküla*, Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 436-46.
- Epner, L. (2006) "Murrang teatriesteetikas ja Evald Hermaküla (1969-1971)," *Akadeemia* 11, pp. 2438-48.
- Epner, L., Unt, M. and Vahing, V. (eds.) (2002) *Hermaküla*, Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Falkowska, J. (2007) *Andrzej Wajda: History, politics, and nostalgia in Polish cinema*, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Faraday, G. (2000) *Revolt of the filmmakers: The struggle for artistic autonomy and the fall of the Soviet film industry*, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Golovskoy, V. S. (1986) *Behind the Soviet screen: The motion-picture industry in the USSR, 1972-1982*, Ann Arbor: Ardis.
- Hames, P. (2005) *The Czechoslovak new wave*, London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Hermaküla, E. (1992) "Vastab Evald Hermaküla," *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 2, pp. 5-13.
- Hermaküla, E. (2002) "Katkendeid Evald Hermaküla kirjadest Kaarel Irdile," in Epner, L., Unt, M. and Vahing, V. (eds.) *Hermaküla*, Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 33-8.
- Holloway, J. and Kneale, J. (2000) "Mikhail Bakhtin: Dialogics of space," in Crang, M. and Thrift, N. (eds.) *Thinking space*, London, New York: Routledge, pp. 71-88.
- Iho, A. (1991) "Oli ja on. Muutusi ja hetkeseise Eesti filmis," *Sirp*, 25 January.
- Iordanova, D. (2003) *Cinema of the other Europe: The industry and artistry of East Central European film*, London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Jirgens, K. E. (2006) "Fusions of discourse: Postcolonial/postmodern horizons in Baltic culture," in Kelertas, V. (ed.) *Baltic postcolonialism*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, pp. 45-81.

- Karja, S. (2001) "Paul-Eerik Rummo – Evald Hermaküla "Tuhkatriinumäng", 1969," in Neimar, R. (ed.) *Teatrielu '99*, Tallinn: Eesti Teatriliiit, pp. 359-87.
- Kenez, P. (2001) *Cinema and Soviet society from the revolution to the death of Stalin*, London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Kirt, L. (1980) "Eesti nõukogude filmikunst tõusuteel," *Küsimused ja Vastused* 8 (April), pp. 33-6.
- Kivimaa, K. (2009) *Rahvuslik ja modernne naiselikkus eesti kunstis 1850-2000*, Tallinn, Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Kovács, A. B. (2007) *Screening modernism: European art cinema, 1950-1980*, Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Kurg, A. (2004) "Almanahh "Kunst ja Kodu" 1973–1980," *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi / Studies on Art and Architecture* 13.2, pp. 110-42.
- Körver, K. (2004) "Eino Tambergi balletid ja nende roll Eesti balletielus 1960. aastatel II," *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 3, pp. 72-84.
- Kärk, L. (1995) "Mida oleks hea teada ajaloost? Eesti filmiloo lühikonspekt," *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 8/9, pp. 114-23.
- Kärk, L. (1996) "Laske ma näitan – Jaan Toominga filmid," *Kultuurileht*, 29 March.
- Kärk, L. (2008) "Poola koolkond: tasub teada," *Postimees*, 19 April.
- Laanemets, M. (2005) "Pilk sotsialistliku linna tühermaadele ja tagahoovidesse: *happening*'id, mängud ja jalutuskäigud Tallinnas 1970. aastatel," / "A glance at the wastelands and back yards of a socialist city: Happenings, games and walks in Tallinn in the 1970s," *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi / Studies on Art and Architecture* 14.4, pp. 139-78.
- Laasik, A. (2005) *Kaks teatriutoopiat. 1960. ja 1970. aastate teatriuudendus Eestis ja Soomes – kaks paralleelset kultuuriilmingut*, unpublished MA Thesis, Tartu: Tartu Ülikool.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The production of space*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Liehm, M. and Liehm, A. J. (1977) *The most important art: Eastern European film after 1945*, Berkeley, London: University of California Press.
- Linnap, P. (2000) "Modernity in Estonian photography (1960s–1980s). Part 1," *kunst.ee* 1, pp. 80-4.
- Linnap, P. (2002) "Astu parteisse ja nõua! Jaan Toominga ekspressionistlikud *resistance*-filmid ENSVs," *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 1, pp. 62-70.
- Maandi, P. (2005) *Change and persistence in a reformed landscape: A geographical analysis of land reforms and landscape change in Muhu and Rapla municipalities, Estonia, c. 1840 to 2003*, Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Martin-Jones, D. (2008) *Deleuze, cinema and national identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mazierska, E. (2008) *Masculinities in Polish, Czech and Slovak cinema: Black Peters and men of marble*, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

- Meri, L. (1968) "Suur üksiklane," *Sirp ja Vasar*, 9 February.
- Merrifield, A. (2000) "Henri Lefebvre: A socialist in space," in Crang, M. and Thrift, N. (eds.) *Thinking space*, London, New York: Routledge, pp. 167-83.
- Neimar, R. and Visnap, M. (eds.) (1988) "Lõikuskuu 1968," *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 8, pp. 70-4.
- Nowell-Smith, G. (2008) *Making waves: New cinemas of the 1960s*, New York, London: Continuum.
- Näripea, E. (2004) "Medieval socialist realism: Representations of Tallinn Old Town in Soviet Estonian feature films, 1969–1972," *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics* IV, pp. 121-44, http://www.eki.ee/km/place/pdf/kp4_07_naripea.pdf (accessed 6 March 2010).
- Näripea, E. (2005) *Tallinna vanalinna representatsioonid Eesti NSV filmikunstis 1960.–1970. aastail*, unpublished MA thesis, Tallinn: Eesti Kunstiakadeemia.
- Näripea, E. (2008) "A view from the periphery. Spatial discourse of the Soviet Estonian feature film: The 1940s and 1950s," in Näripea, E. and Trossek, A. (eds.) *Via transversa: Lost cinema of the former Eastern Bloc*. Special issue of *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics* VII, pp. 193-210.
- O'Connor, K. (2006) *Culture and customs of the Baltic states*, Westport: Greenwood; Oxford: Harcourt Education.
- Orav, Ö. (2003) *Tallinnfilm I. Mängufilmid 1947–1976*, Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus.
- Paas, V. (1982) "Varasemaid vaatefilme Eestist: märkmeid ühe žanri kujunemisest," *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 2, pp. 63-7.
- Post, E. (2008) "Andrzej Wajda: maailm küll teadis, aga ei hoolinud," *Eesti Päevaleht*, 16 February.
- Ramp, Ü. [Tormis, L.] (1969) "Teatrikihermeid," *Noorus* 1, p. 46.
- Relph, E. (1976) *Place and placelessness*, London: Pion.
- Richardson, M. (2006) *Surrealism and cinema*, Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Rimmel, R. (1973) "Tapja nimi on tõusik," *Sirp ja Vasar*, 17 August.
- Ross, J. and Lehiste, I. (2001) *The temporal structure of Estonian runic songs*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rähesoo, J. [1976] (1995) "Hermaküla ja Tooming," in Rähesoo, J. *Hecuba pärast. Kirjutisi teatrist ja draamast 1969–1994*, Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 62-74.
- Rähesoo, J. [1994] (1995) "Tagasivaade: kraamimispäev," in Rähesoo, J. *Hecuba pärast. Kirjutisi teatrist ja draamast 1969–1994*, Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 267-312.
- Rähesoo, J. (1997) "Eessõna," in Vahing, V. (ed.) *Thespis. Meie teatriuueendused 1972/1973*, Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 9-21.
- Rähesoo, J. (2002) "Mõtisklus Hermaküläst," in Epner, L., Unt, M. and Vahing, V. (eds.) *Hermaküla*, Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 447-51.
- Rähesoo, J. (2003) *Estonian theatre*, Tallinn: Estonian Theatre Union.

- Rähesoo, J. (2007) "Estonian theater loosens the Soviet straightjacket," in Cornis-Pope, M. and Neubauer, J. (eds.) *History of the literary cultures of East-Central Europe. Volume III, The making and remaking of literary institutions: Junctures and disjunctures in the 19th and 20th centuries*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 247-50.
- Sang, J. (1986) "Peatnägija tunnistus," *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 12, pp. 64-74.
- Šein, H. (2005) *Suur teleraamat. 50 aastat televisiooni Eestis 1955–2005*, Tallinn: TEA Kirjastus.
- Shields, R. (2004) "Henri Lefebvre," in Hubbard, P., Kitchin, R. and Valentine G. (eds.) *Key thinkers on space and place*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage, pp. 208-13.
- Sobolewski, T. (2008) "Poola filmikunsti kuldsed aastad," *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 11, pp. 118-25.
- Sorlin, P. (2005) "Urban space in European cinema," in Everett, W. E. and Goodbody, A. (eds.) *Revisiting space: Space and place in European cinema*, Oxford: Peter Lang, pp. 25-36.
- Tooming, J. (1976) "Kõnelus Jaan Toomingaga," *Kultuur ja Elu* 3, pp. 23-4.
- Tooming, P. (1995) *Ikka fotost*, Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Unt, A. (2005) "Televisioon Eestis," Estonian Broadcasting Museum, <http://www.rhmuuseum.ee/?page=61> (accessed 6 March 2010).
- Unt, M. (1965) "Mis suunas areneb kaasaegne kinokunst?," *Küsimused ja vastused* 4, pp. 35-8.
- Unt, M. (1968) "Kiri teatri kohta," *Noorus* 11, November, pp. 61-2.
- Unt, M. (1972) "Teater: siin ja praegu," in *Teatrimärkmik 1968/69*, Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, pp. 128-36.
- Unt, M. [1972] (1997) "Minu teatriglossarium," in Vahing, V. (ed.) *Thespis. Meie teatriuendused 1972/1973*, Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 117-58.
- Unt, M. (2002) "Teatriuenduse algusest Nõukogude Eestis," *Sirp*, 25 January.
- Unt, M. (2004) *Theatrum mundi*, Epner, L. (ed.), Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Urry, J. (1990) *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*, London: Sage.
- Vahing, V. (ed.) (1997) *Thespis. Meie teatriuendused 1972/1973*, Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Valgemäe, M. (1995) *Linn ja teater. Lavamärkmeid mitmelt maalt*, Tallinn: Vagabund.
- Veidemann, R. (1991) "Kuuekümnendate põlvkond Eesti kultuuris ja ühiskonnas," *Sirp*, 16 August.
- Veisaitė, I. [1979] (2002) "Otsingute teel. Eesti režissööride noor põlvkond," in Epner, L., Unt, M. and Vahing, V. (eds.) *Hermaküla*, Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 198-9.
- Velsker, M. (1999) "Mis on kuuekümnendad eesti kirjanduses?," *Looming* 8, pp. 1210-6.
- Widdis, E. (2003) *Visions of a new land: Soviet film from the revolution to the Second World War*, New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
- Woll, J. (2000) *Real images: Soviet cinema and the Thaw*, London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Wollen, P. (2004) "The two avant-gardes," in Simpson, P., Utternson, A. and Shepherdson, K. J. (eds.) *Film theory: Critical concepts in media and cultural studies*, London: Routledge, pp. 127-37.

Aliens and
Time Travellers:
Recycling
National Space
in Estonian
Science-Fiction
Cinema

A facsimile of an article published in

Studies in Eastern European Cinema,
vol. 1 (2), 2010, pp. 167–182

Studies in Eastern European Cinema
Volume 1 Number 2

© 2010 Intellect Ltd Article. English language. doi: 10.1386/seec.1.2.167_1

EVA NÄRIPEA

Estonian Academy of Arts/Estonian Literary Museum

Aliens and time travellers: Recycling national space in Estonian science-fiction cinema

ABSTRACT

An enduring interest in science-fiction cinema has produced numerous studies on both seminal examples and less-known specimens of western origin, yet academic research into Eastern European incarnations of this genre has remained rather scarce. This article constitutes an attempt to supplement this limited, yet slowly growing body of works with a piece on Soviet Estonian science fiction. Using Estonian filmmaker Raul Tammet's short films Solo (1979) and Wedding Picture (1980) as case studies, and informed by the Bakhtinian notion of chronotope, the following discussion explores how popular cinema engages with narratives of national history and identity. Concentrating on spatial representations, it situates the films in the local field of intertextual reference on the one hand, and in a much wider web of sociocultural and generic affinity on the other.

KEYWORDS

Estonian cinema
science fiction
postmodernism
national space
chronotope

The period around the late 1970s and early 1980s has usually been celebrated by Estonian film critics and historians as a time of newfound cinematic potency, propelled by the fresh creative energies of young authors

1. *The Test of Pilot Pirx* won the Grand Prix (Golden Asteroid) at the 27th International Science Fiction Film Festival in Trieste (Italy) in 1979, and *Dead Mountaineer Hotel* fell only a little short of this achievement, being awarded with a Silver Asteroid the following year.
2. This was particularly the case in the Soviet Union and East Germany (see Lowenstein 2006, Soldovieri 1998, Fritzsche 2006, Radynski 2009), although occasionally films of this type were also (co)produced in Czechoslovakia and Poland. It is also interesting that, evidently, the audiences in the GDR were particularly keen on films revolving around interplanetary journeys, and as the domestic production of this kind was on the meagre side, a considerable amount of Soviet films found their way to East German screens. In fact, the demand has apparently survived to this date, as Germans have released a rather large number of Soviet sci-fi films on DVD for their domestic market (dubbed into German and without subtitles).

with a vibrantly auteurist vision, such as Peeter Simm, Peeter Urbla, Olav Neuland and Mark Soosaar (see Kärk 2010). Indeed, it is difficult to overrate the achievements of these film-makers as both innovators and custodians of the local cinematic field in general and of filmic 'nationscapes' in particular. On the other hand, these years were also defined by an intensified official endorsement of genre cinema all over the Soviet Union: an impulse that in addition to a number of rather modest detective and adventure stories managed to induce a short, yet memorable cycle of Estonian science-fiction films, concentrated between 1978 and 1981. The cycle consisted of six pieces: two full-length productions, *Test Pilota Pirxa/Navigaator Pirx/The Test of Pilot Pirx* (Marek Piestrak, 1978), a Polish-Estonian co-production based on Stanisław Lem's short story (see Mazierska 2010 and Närripea 2010b), and '*Hukkunud Alpinisti' hotell/Dead Mountaineer Hotel* (Grigori Kromanov, 1979), based on an obscure novel of the same title by Arkadii and Boris Strugatskii; a two-part television film, *31. osakonna hukkl/Murder on the Thirty-First Floor* (Peeter Urbla, 1979–1980), made on a commission of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, produced in Tallinnfilm and based on a novel *Mord på 31:a våningen* by Swedish author Per Wahlöö; a short hand-drawn animation *Klaabu kosmoses/Klaabu in Outer Space* (Avo Paistik, 1981); and two short films by Raul Tammet, *Soolo/Solo* (1979) and *Pulmapilt/A potom oglyanulsya/Wedding Picture* (1980). The following discussion concentrates on Tammet's films for two reasons: first, while Piestrak's and Kromanov's films have been very popular with local audiences, generating an enduring cult following and earning some recognition abroad,¹ Tammet's works, which received extremely limited exposure upon their release (see Kulo 1981, Mikk 1983), have also had quite a remarkable afterlife. To date they have circulated among successive generations of young audiences (see Viitung 2007), despite the fact that only *Wedding Picture* was recently released on DVD (see Remsu 2009, Paljasmaa 2009, Tomberg 2009, Teinema 2009), and thus deserve long overdue critical attention. Secondly, as opposed to Piestrak's films, *Solo* and *Wedding Picture* present pronouncedly local and, even more importantly, rural settings, which tie them closely with discourses on national spaces, historical narratives and collective identities; these themes were also inherent in the many works of Tammet's contemporaries, the above-mentioned new-wave directors, a connection usually overlooked by local critics. Furthermore, commentators on Eastern European cinema, too, have rarely recognized the intimate links between national concerns and popular genres as a field for critical inquiry.

Although in the 1950s many of the classical Hollywood B-movies of the sci-fi variety utilized small town locales and desert landscapes, mainly for obvious budgetary reasons (see Sobchack 1987: 108ff), over the following two decades the western science-fiction cinema tended to be envisioned more frequently as a site of urban, high-tech culture, where inhabitants of skyscraper-populated metropolises undertake intergalactic journeys into inky expanses of endless deep space. Similarly, between the late 1950s and the end of 1970s the far less prolific (and to this date generally under-researched) arena of Eastern European and Soviet science-fiction films gravitated towards the production of space exploration narratives² – a trend which, on the one hand, was evidently fuelled by the accomplishments of the space race between the Soviet Union and United States, and which, on the other, can be framed as an extension of the colonial drive to 'conquer' new territories (see e.g. Widdis 2003) – in sync with the genre's essence as the

'continuation of Western expansion after the victory of the colonial project on the planetary scale' (Radynski 2009; see also Rieder 2008). Thus, East European and Soviet science-fiction narratives are only rarely set in rural environments, and if this happens to be the case, it is frequently the disturbing setting of post-apocalyptic future, as, for example, in Czechoslovakian film *Konec srpna v hotelu Ozon/The End of August at the Hotel Ozone* (Jan Schmid, 1966; see Pospíšil 2008), in Polish production *Seksmisja/Sexmission* (Juliusz Machulski, 1984; see Mazierska 2004) or in Andrei Tarkovskii's much-celebrated *Stalker* (1979; see Dempsey 1981; Salvestroni 1987; Petric 1989–90; Kluger 2004).

Raul Tammet's science-fiction films, then, stand out against this context for their somewhat unusual spatio-temporal framework. Both *Solo* and *Wedding Picture* employ a *contemporary* rural setting. It is probably safe to assume that the main reasons for his choice of earth-bound and relatively restricted locations were first and foremost tied to the small scale of the productions, as both *Solo* and *Wedding Picture* were works of apprenticeship: the former being Tammet's diploma film at the two-year 'Higher' course for scenario-writers and film directors in Moscow (supervised by Nikita Mikhalkov) and the latter produced under the auspices of Mosfilm Experimental Creative Association³ as a 'masterwork' for earning full rights to work as a film director. Tammet's work constitutes the first filmic attempt to crossbreed the generic features of science fiction with a recognizably Estonian setting. Even though a considerable part of *Stalker* had also been shot on location in and around Tallinn, the capital of Estonia, the extra-diegetic reality of specific places held no importance in terms of either the narrative content or Tarkovskii's directorial intentions. Tammet's pieces, on the other hand, are intimately related to manifestly Estonian spaces, even if it is not possible to pinpoint particular locations down to the details of geographic coordinates and even if this connection is perhaps best diagnosed by native audiences. I propose that both *Solo* and *Wedding Picture* demonstrate strong connections with spaces of the 'imagined national community' as portrayed in Estonian cinema; each film comments on the spatial representations characteristic to Estonian films since the 1960s, problematizes dominant historical narratives (whether official or oppositional), deconstructs collective and individual identities (both Soviet and national), addresses common concerns, doubts and anxieties of the time, and interrogates contemporary social codes and procedures. At the same time, however, Tammet's films are far from being completely provincial, as many of the issues tackled by him correspond closely with matters of interest across the contemporary generic field of science fiction (on both sides of the Iron Curtain), relating also to the broader cultural discourse of postmodernism.

In addition to a refreshing remarriage of certain generic faculties and particular spatio-temporal arrangements, Tammet also attempts to remodel narrative conventions with notable experimental zest. Both *Solo* and *Wedding Picture*, in one way or another, deviate from the common patterns of cinematic narrative form. *Solo*, despite the linear structure of its storyline, leaves narrative threads untied, refusing to provide rational explanations to enigmatic events and puzzling phenomena, denying an impression of closure, or even evading attempts to summarize the main points of the plot, and thus generating in its audiences a sense of irresolvable confusion and mystery. The opening sequence introduces a modest sitting room of a small, sparsely decorated house, where an older man, Aat, who works as a barge-bridge operator in this isolated rural location, literally in the middle of nowhere, and a young woman,

3. Mosfilm Experimental Creative Association was an offspring of the Experimental Creative Studio, which had been established in 1963 by film director Grigorii Chukhrai (artistic director), writer Konstantin Simonov (script department), and former diplomat Vladimir Pozner, Sr. (executive director). The unit became famous for its creative independence and the immense popularity of its productions. According to Anna Lawton, the ECS was also economically successful: 'Productivity rose sharply, waste was cut dramatically, the profits were astronomical in comparison with the average state-subsidized production' (Lawton 1992b: 77). However, in 1967 several of the studio's controversial films were shelved for political reasons and the unit ran into serious problems. Filipp Ermash, the new head of Goskino, closed it down in 1972; its descendant, ECA, was, in effect, fully subjugated to the central administrative jurisdiction of the Soviet film industry.

Minna, who is most likely his wife, spend what feels like a lazy Sunday afternoon: Minna's gaze firmly fixed on a television set and Aat lying idly on a bed. The tranquil, almost lifelessly inert atmosphere of this scene is suddenly disrupted by the voice of a young woman calling for Aat, who, after a moment of contemplation, grabs his shotgun and runs out onto the bridge. He steers the barge bridge halfway over the river, and, after the voice has called his name again, reaches for the gun, but then suddenly falls down, paralysed. Next we learn that a new operator has been instated to fill in for the bedridden Aat. In the course of the film, this young man, whose real name is never revealed (he asks to be called by the same name as the old bridge-keeper, Aat), undergoes a series of apparently quite quotidian and unremarkable and yet deeply unsettling situations: all of which seem to be somehow connected with a strange group of three people, a woman and two men, who cross the river on several occasions in an old jeep and whose stiff postures and laconic manners come across as intensely disquieting, as well as with the ethereal voice of a young woman calling out (and sometimes also whispering seductively) for Aat, and, finally, with a nearby electrical distribution substation, emitting an eerie hum. Meanwhile, Minna takes a liking for 'new' Aat, flirting with him at every opportunity. Ultimately her efforts begin to pay off, but just as the couple are caressing each other in his modest makeshift quarters upstairs, the voice of the woman interrupts them, first murmuring and then shouting with increasing desperation, 'Aat!' just as 'young' Aat rushes out. Guided by the cries, and haunted by the mysterious electrical buzz, he crosses the river, follows a path between the tall rushes, wrapped in a thick, milky blanket of fog, until he discovers a flying saucer, floating low above the rushes and glowing in a blinding crown of light. Nearby stands the old jeep, abandoned, with the familiar pair of men and a woman sitting in it – but now these are only defunct dummies, empty shells, and not living people. Whispering softly and seductively, the female voice then urges the young man to approach the spacecraft, which he finally does, ascending the steps and disappearing into the radiant light.

Compared with *Solo*, which creates more questions than it bothers to answer, *Wedding Picture* stands out for the clarity of its story and mode of narration. This time, however, the linearity of the narrative is ruptured by numerous loops, introducing an element of cyclicity, and the flow of time is disrupted by means of a diegetic device – a time machine called chronotron, which only permits moving back in time. One night, an old man, Ants, a retired sailor and a healer who lives alone in his shabby bachelor house near the coastline of an island, is woken by loud noises. Investigating the matter, he discovers that some sort of vehicle has crashed into the forest near his house. Amongst the burning pile of debris he finds a badly injured pilot wearing a peculiar, glittering light-blue jumpsuit, and carries him home. When the man finally regains consciousness, it turns out that due to the failure of his time machine he has jumped back in time by two centuries, instead of six months as initially planned, and has to wait to be found by his contemporaries because the chronotron, as indicated above, can only take him backwards in time, and not into the future. When Ants hears about this time-travelling gadget, he asks to be taken back to September of 1939, to his wedding day, as due to a misunderstanding he thought that his bride had betrayed him and had thus abandoned her even before the wedding party was over. Neither he nor his fiancée ever spoke to each other again, even though both of them remained single. Having pondered all his life over whether his decision had been justified after all, and what could have happened 'if only', he now learns

that indeed it had been an unfortunate misunderstanding, but is prevented by Lembit, the man from the future, from doing anything, because, as Lembit explains, every small alternation can cause a paradox, and lead to unpredictable, potentially catastrophic consequences of global scale. Even so, they still do not manage to escape from appearing on the wedding picture, which, however, will not entail any serious effects. In the end, Ants and Lembit return to Ants's present (indeed, an inconsistency!) and discover that Lembit has been finally tracked down by his contemporaries, and can go back home. However, Lembit now decides that he will not use the chronotron ever again, as 'No time machine can mend the past' and because time travelling has a negative effect on people and their relationships.

As these short plot summaries clearly demonstrate, time and space indeed play a significant part in Tammet's films, constituting a multi-level frame of reference, in the core of which lies the notion of national space. By choosing the rural settings, which are 'frequently cast as the site of cultural tradition and heritage' (Fowler and Helfield 2006: 2), for tackling narrative content closely related to the present and future, Tammet's work becomes susceptible to readings that, on the one hand, revolve around the changing orders of local historical narratives and collective identities, and, on the other, invite reflections not only upon the shifting modes of imagining and (re)producing this 'space of the nation', but also upon transforming conditions of current social realities. Since Tammet appears to seek dialogue with the 'nation-space' as represented in Estonian cinema since the 1960s, I will first sketch the main features of the cinescapes of this 'golden' decade, showing how Tammet later reworks them, jumbling the main chains of reference, casting doubts on an entire field of collective values and shuffling established patterns of representation. My discussion is principally informed by the chronotopic mode of analysis, as developed by Mikhail Bakhtin, mainly in his famous essay 'Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel' (Bakhtin 1981). Bakhtin defines the chronotope as 'the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature' (Bakhtin 1981: 84), although, as Robert Stam argues, the concept of chronotope 'seems in some ways even more appropriate to film than to literature, for [...] the cinematic chronotope is quite literal, splayed out concretely across a screen with specific dimensions and unfolding in literal time (usually 24 frames a second)' (Stam 1992: 11). According to Sue Vice:

The chronotope operates on three levels: first as the means by which a text represents history; second, as the relation between images of time and space in the novel, out of which any representation of history must be constructed; and third, as a way of discussing the formal properties of the text itself, its plot, narrator, and relation to other texts.

(Vice 1997: 201–02)

Correspondingly, I will examine in detail the specific chronotopes Tammet constructs in his films and explore how his works are informed by and engage in negotiations with discourses on national spaces, stories and identities. Besides spatio-temporal articulations and their interaction with history – '[t]ime, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history' (Bakhtin 1981: 84) –, the characters who people these fictional domains hold a special place in Bakhtinian chronotopic investigation, since

4. Anthony Smith defines ethnoscapes as '[...] andscapes endowed with poetic ethnic meaning through the historicisation of nature and the territorialisation of ethnic memories' (Smith 1999: 16).

'[t]he chronotope as a formally constitutive category determines to a significant degree the image of man in literature [...] The image of man is always intrinsically chronotopic' (Bakhtin 1981: 85). Furthermore, taking a closer look at how Tammet employs and reconfigures certain characteristics of science-fiction cinema, I will finally try to give some indication of the critical position of his ideas in relation to the Soviet social arena of the period on the one hand and in connection to the broader field of the science-fiction genre on the other.

BETWEEN MODERNIST MNEMOSCAPES AND POSTMODERNIST MYTHOSCAPES

It is striking to what extent rural and small-town settings of either a recent or more distant past dominated Soviet Estonian narrative cinema of the 1960s; especially if one is to consider both the prominence of the rhetoric of the so-called scientific and technological revolution, sweeping all over the Soviet Union, and the consistent insistence of the central cinema authorities on creating more and more films on contemporary topics. Of the feature-length narrative films produced in Tallinnfilm and Eesti Telefilm between 1962 (the year commonly recognized in Estonian cinema as the watershed separating the Stalinist era from the (re)birth of the 'national school') and 1969, totalling about thirty titles, only circa a quarter presented bigger urban centres as their settings, and the majority of the most highly regarded films portrayed events occurring before the beginning of the Soviet period. But Estonian cinema was not unique in preferring villages and towns to metropolitan environs; film-makers across the whole Soviet bloc were inclined towards small-scale spatial settings and provincial locales (see Iordanova 2003: 177, Hendrykowski 1996: 633). During Khrushchev's 'thaw', the emphasis shifted from large centres to peripheries in major Russian productions (Prokhorov 2007: 127), but presumably in Eastern Europe as well as in the non-Russian republics of the Soviet Union (see First 2008) it came to underline manifestly *local* concerns, as opposed to unifying the inter- or post-nationalism (see Martin 2001: 432ff) of Soviet culture, which was seen as the incarnation of the oppressive politics of the Soviet Union and its (Russian) administrators. Perhaps even more importantly, Estonian film-makers frequently relied on 'classic' literary works by local authors, thus divorcing the chronotopes of their films from the contemporary Soviet context and building an imaginary bridge to the past, resurrecting and commemorating – albeit more often than not in a covert manner – the inter-war independent statehood of the Estonian Republic. It is also crucial to emphasize that although Estonian cinema was deeply interwoven within a complex web of transnational determinants of both Eastern/Soviet and Western/European origin in terms of film form and the main ideological purport of the narratives, as well as with regard to the industrial apparatus in the broadest sense (for more detail, see Närïpea, in press), it is actually the dominant mode of spatial representations that reveals the specifically national concerns of these productions. The scope, purpose and limits of this article prevent me from going into further detail on the matter; however, suffice to say that by demonstrating obvious indifference to contemporary Soviet 'everyday' and by avoiding, as much as possible, portrayals of the 'momentous events of the revolutionary past' – that is, episodes from the Sovietized version of the grand historical narrative – film-makers in Estonia regularly conjured up bygone eras and places: apparitions of mnemo- or ethnoscapes,⁴

which helped to sustain national identities, stories and myths in danger of fading away. It is still important to stress that, even though often essentially nostalgic, the spatial discourse of the 1960s was much more dynamic than the Stalinist cinescapes of the previous decade, and demonstrated an inclination towards liminality, variety and openness. Thus, chronotopically, the cinema of the 1960s took a firm step away from the relative encapsulation of the filmic spaces of the 1950s, which had exhibited a strong drive towards the idyllic (Bakhtin 1981: 224ff), relying instead on chronotopic structures connected with change and diversification (e.g. road and threshold).

Tammet's films, in their turn, offer a hybrid set of chronotopes, containing traces of idyllic, closed settings, and conveying a remarkable sense of liminality. They also present close encounters with otherworldly spheres, and exhibit perhaps what Bakhtin called the chronotope of threshold:

[I]t can be combined with the motif of encounter, but its most fundamental instance is as the chronotope of *crisis* and *break* in life. [...] In this chronotope, time is essentially instantaneous; it is as if it has no duration [...] these moments of decision become part of the great all-embracing chronotopes of *mystery*- and carnival time.

(Bakhtin 1981: 248–249, original emphasis)

Indeed, both *Solo* and *Wedding Picture* evoke multiple spatio-temporal orders that, on occasion, simultaneously collapse into each other, and this creates complex and sometimes enigmatic narrative domains.

In *Solo*, the barge-bridge keeper's dwelling, apparently unchanged for decades, stands in an isolated location near a river. The anachronistic means for crossing the waterway characterizes the place as backwoods, but perhaps also indicates the underdeveloped state of social conditions in general. Black and white images of the film, especially those depicting the riverside's nature, often betray a shade of poeticism, which is further accentuated by the romantic tone of the accompanying music, instilling the scene with obviously picturesque qualities and lending it an aura of somewhat idyllic tranquillity. Yet, the location – near a constantly flowing stream of water and on a crossroad – suggests from the beginning that the surface of this seeming placidity is about to crack and crumble. In addition, from the very first shot the prominent presence of elements of modern infrastructure and communications – the television set in the living room emitting jaded vibes of Soviet ideology, and the electrical distribution substation behind the house, scarring the rustic landscape with industrial paraphernalia – signal the contemporary world beyond this secluded rural corner. Similarly, the central chronotope of *Wedding Picture* – an island with its closed community, surrounded by sea, the natural separator – betrays a strong resemblance to the idyllic world as described by Bakhtin: '[A] familiar territory with all its nooks and crannies, its familiar mountains, valleys, fields, rivers and forests, and one's own home' (Bakhtin 1981: 225). In both films, however, the sense of a closed and stable place is only there initially, in order to underline the shock of change brought about by the bizarre visitors, and perhaps also to stress the overwhelming feeling of alienation, imprisonment and loneliness of the people who inhabit it. Importantly, in *Solo*, the riverfront location underlines the pervading theme of transformation, while the sea surrounding the island in *Wedding Picture* becomes an enclosing border, signifying standstill and solitude. In *Wedding Picture*, the sense of an idyllic calmness, invoked by the opening shots of a charming coastal landscape, immersed in

the golden light of evening sun and accompanied by a nostalgic-melancholic tune, is quickly interrupted by the crash of the futuristic aircraft and the arrival of its pilot, Lembit. The film is saturated with movements in both time and space: viewers learn that Ants, the old man who looks after Lembit, has sailed many seas before he returned to his ancestral home on the island and started to heal people with herbal medicines; Lembit, on the other hand, traverses the cosmic space at the speed of light and roams the 'sea of time' at his will, with the help of his time machine. Combining static (idyll) and dynamic (road) elements, the main moral of *Wedding Picture* eventually asserts that history is a closed chapter, and one has to learn to live in the present with the outcomes of the previously made decisions and the provisions of one's destiny. In connecting the local countryside with an unmistakably contemporary temporal framework and future-looking (or outward-looking) narrative content, and in suggesting that the past is essentially inaccessible, even by means of time travel, Tammet decisively abandons the nostalgic longing for the pre-war past, perhaps also proposing that the essentially modernist 'nationescapes' of the 1960s were engaged in an act of escapism. By doing this, he becomes an agent of the 'cultural logic of late socialism', as so aptly put by Epp Annus (2000). By the beginning of 1980s, the national project had 'ceased to develop, achieving indeed its perfection, its completion – albeit retrospectively, in the *past*. Modernity was recuperated in the nation's nostalgic memories as a perfect state of affairs, the very image of perfection' (Annus and Hughes 2004: 63, original emphasis). Furthermore:

Those writers who turned to postmodernist practices did not adopt antinational [sic] positions nor did they avoid national thematics. Postmodern authors started to exploit the national mythology. They mixed the desire for national freedom with irony and constructed mythical spaces, while at the same time expressing an awareness of their mythical, constructed nature. In this way, a double discourse of national mythology was created: on one level, a nostalgic narrative carried by a longing for the perfect past, on another level, a questioning of the first, a conscious acknowledgement that this harmonious past is but a myth and has never existed as reality.

(Annus and Hughes 2004: 63)

Here, it is appropriate to point out that *Solo* is in fact an adaptation of, or rather based loosely on, a short story by Peet Vallak, *Lodjavahi surm/Death of the Barge Bridge Keeper* (1925). In his rendition, Tammet kept the rural setting, but changed the chronic context, transposing chosen elements of the story from the 1920s to the 1970s, and infusing what was left of the initial narrative content with a few, dramatically effective, generic details of science fiction. This temporal leap (and generic enrichment) is testament to Tammet's keen interest in contemporary matters, as well as to his opinion that the historical totality of the past has become fundamentally inaccessible. Furthermore, it is also significant that contrary to Estonian film-makers of the 1960s, who in their most influential adaptations had relied on the pivotal works of literary classics, mainly representative of the realist tradition, Tammet found inspiration in Vallak, who belonged to the ranks of a younger generation of innovators of the 1920s. Vallak's 'unique style' and 'colourful characters' (Laak 2000) brought a fresh breeze to the local literary scene of his time (similarly to Tammet himself, whose work invigorated the local cinematic stage). It is

also noteworthy that on several occasions Vallak's texts provided the basis for unconventional theatre productions of a postmodernist flavour, both during the Soviet period and in post-socialist years (see Eprner 2007).

In addition to reworking inter-war literary material, in *Solo* Tammet also revisits one of the most significant national myths: the legend of the white ship. In general, the phrase 'waiting for the white ship' has become synonymous with waiting for something in vain. More specifically, however, this expression harks back to a particular historical event from the nineteenth century. Stirred by a popular 'prophet' Maltsvelt, who belonged to the Pietist Herrnhuter movement⁵ and who preached about a quasi-mythical Promised Land in central Russia and the Crimea, in the summer of 1861 large groups of people gathered in various places along the northern coast of Estonia and waited for the arrival of a special ship which would bring them to this Promised Land (Hinrikus 2008: 231–32). The work of numerous Estonian writers, starting from Eduard Vilde, who published the novel *Prohvet Maltsvelt/Prophet Maltsvelt* (1905–1908) at the beginning of the twentieth century, and including authors like Aino Kallas, Friedebert Tuglas, Uku Masing, Hando Runnel etc., has embedded this symbol – a localized version of the biblical arc – firmly into the national psyche. After the Estonian state tragically lost its independence in the turmoil of World War II, the metaphor of the white ship became invested with another, political, layer of meaning as 'the embodiment of a real saviour' in the form of a western warship (Hinrikus 2008: 237, 239); and as late as the 1950s many people still believed that Americans would soon arrive and liberate the unjustly occupied country (Hinrikus 2003: 39, 75, 288). In response, the Soviet ideological architects hijacked the image in order to expose and demystify it. Most notably, in 1971, *Valge laev/The White Ship* (Kalju Komissarov), a political adventure film, was produced in Tallinnfilm. This film attempted to persuade its audiences (in the form of rather blatant propaganda) that Soviet 'world order' was imperishable and that waiting for any change, i.e. the eponymous white ship, would be a hopeless venture.

It is not difficult to read the alien spaceship, the most prominent element of sci-fi 'iconography' in *Solo*, as a revamped version of the white ship, or the post-war western warship, manned with the ally saviours (i.e. the aliens). On the one hand this reinforces the popular endurance of the collective myth, despite the continued attempts by the Soviet authorities to abolish it. On the other hand, however, in this reading it seems that Tammet's diagnosis overlaps to some extent with the 'official' stance, in providing an ironic, post-modernist commentary of this solemn allegory: the chance that the white ship arrives (i.e. Soviet power ceases to exist) is as slim as the chance of an extraterrestrial encounter. Yet, as the protagonist, the nameless young bridge keeper, decides to climb aboard the alien spacecraft and thus leaves behind the stale, foggy and claustrophobic setting of his workstation, as well as his past life, in favour of an unknown, although certainly exciting, future, the film (ending on an open and clearly optimistic note) also seems to communicate a need to look forward, and, most importantly, beyond the stereotypical 'bright Communist future'. Conjointly, this finale accentuates once more the necessity of leaving the past, and any other grand narratives, behind, thus demonstrating, as has been argued by Annus and Hughes, that by the late 1970s, '[t]hrough the looking-glass of the Soviet simulacrum, the preceding times were presented as closed, happy, and finished' (Annus and Hughes 2004: 63). Moreover, the reworking of this myth, in the unexpected form of a generic device, also becomes a part of Tammet's postmodern strategy to recycle

5. This religious movement had spread to Estonia from Germany in the beginning of the eighteenth century, attracting the interest of poor Estonian peasants, who, after being freed from serfdom by 1820, dreamed of achieving independence from the economic supremacy of the Baltic German landowners by acquiring a plot of land of their own. As Rutt Hinrikus describes, 'Since land was not to be had in the homeland, the longing for an unknown country, which does not exist in this life, took stranger and more uncanny forms; on the one hand it spurred the search for a new homeland, on the other, it was transformed into a longing for a land that once was, but had been lost long ago. Thus utopia was filled with nostalgia, since it was a special form of the nostalgic longing for lost happiness' (Hinrikus 2008: 230).

6. Most significantly, Arvo Pärt composed music for *The Test of Pilot Pirx*, and Sven Grünberg wrote the scores for *Klaabu in Outer Space* and *Dead Mountaineer Hotel*, both of which continue to fascinate listeners home and abroad; a track from *Dead Mountaineer Hotel* was recently reused by Veiko Õunpuu in his first international success, *Autumn Ball/Sügisball* (2007).
7. In Vallak's short story the voice belongs to Aat's mistress, the mother of his two children; in the film, the ending connects the voice firmly with the aliens.

former discourses, in a manner similar to the one he had used to approach inter-war literary sources and nostalgic landscapes. By subscribing to the project of postmodernist reworkings, he also problematizes the validity of any absolute truths, as further evidenced, for example, by the numerous doublings of diegetic elements/agents, as well as the blurred narrative contours of *Solo*, and by the confusion of spatio-temporal linearity in *Wedding Picture*. Last not least, by undertaking these manoeuvres, Tammet succeeded in achieving an acute sense of contemporaneity, and escaping the established, rather vapid and trite (socialist realist) cinematic pattern of conveying present-day Soviet realities.

Besides the diegetic devices and narrative moves of sci-fi origin, the characteristic sonic design is certainly one of the most powerful elements of Tammet's work, similarly to the musical scores of other representatives of this local generic cycle.⁶ Combined together, these factors have undoubtedly played a major role in securing the enduring fascination of several successive generations of young spectators. From the viewpoint of the current discussion the soundtracks of his films, and especially that of *Solo*, also become important as additional markers of contemporaneity, and, even more notably, as signifiers and (re)producers of changing collective identities. The audioscapes of both films are punctuated by funky jazz and soul tracks, composed by Gunnar Graps, who also appeared in *Solo* as one of the aliens, and performed by his group Magnetic Band. This Estonian metal-rock and jazz-rock band, whose style is seasoned with elements of blues and funk, formed in 1976 and became one of the most popular heavy metal groups across the Soviet Union in the 1980s – making its charismatic leader, Graps, a true all-Union superstar. The soundtrack of *Wedding Picture* is more restrained and nostalgically dreamy in its tone, expressing Ants's feeling of isolation and loneliness, and his realization that he has suffered an irretrievable loss and a missed life with his fiancée; more innovatively, musical instruments are also used to create sound effects, without concealing the extra-diegetic nature of their source, such as a drum solo 'portraying' the crash of the spaceship. The exceptionally cool rhythms and funky tunes of upbeat music in *Solo* are also related to the mysterious aspects of the film: the ethereal voice of the woman and the alien trio. By choosing to include a strikingly modern style of performance by an immensely popular band, and by connecting this with the appearance of narrative agents of an otherworldly origin, the film addresses a whole range of questions related to the dramatic changes of collective and personal identities.

Most obviously, the inclusion of modern western pop music signals identity of an unmistakably contemporary nature: that of Tammet's own post-war generation, which lacked direct contact with the pre-Soviet world and grew up under the influence of a western youth culture that infiltrated the porous Baltic hem of the Iron Curtain via Finnish television, among other channels, accessible to the population of Northern Estonia. Moreover, by filling the plot of *Solo* with numerous doubles (indeed, an ironic juxtaposition of title and content in itself) – old Aat and his young successor (who asks to be called by the name of his elderly colleague), Aat's wife Minna who appears to be jealous of the disembodied female voice calling out for her husband⁷ and the alien woman, 'new' Aat and one of the alien men (played by Gunnar Graps) who wears very similar clothes, old Aat and the older one of the alien men whose jackets look exactly the same – Tammet draws attention to the instability and blurriness of contemporary identities, and their essentially postmodern structure, in which, according to Annette Kuhn, '[t]he self loses the coherence of the humanist "I",

becomes split, fragmented, schizophrenic' (Kuhn 1990a: 180). The aliens, then, might not stand (only) for an outside Other (whether Soviet or western in nature), but can also be understood as *alter egos* of Us, even more so as young Aat, the central character of the film with whom spectators are perhaps invited to identify the most, is not afraid of the extraterrestrial/supernatural beings (he follows their calls and accepts their invitation to board the flying saucer), while their influence on old Aat is literally petrifying. In the end both films seem to celebrate, or at least tend towards preferring fluidity of mind, capability for change and willingness to discard nostalgic sentiments: the old and narrow-minded, like Aat (and, to lesser extent, also Minna) in *Solo*, and Ants in *Wedding Picture*, are deprived of active agency – they are unable to change their lives and remain lonely, isolated from the world like solitary islands in the midst of the sea of life, as the central spatial metaphor in *Wedding Picture* appears to suggest. These characters become literally and symbolically paralysed, unable to move away from their closed surroundings, like Aat in *Solo*, precisely because they are too attached to the past. In contrast, the 'new' Aat and Lembit, the younger characters,⁸ act according to their own will, moving flexibly forwards through time and space, embracing challenges without fear of unfamiliar situations, and being prepared to adjust to new circumstances.

ALIENS AND TIME TRAVELLERS: A CRITIQUE OF LATE SOCIALISM

By choosing not to stress the visible scars of Sovietization in the form of desolate and ugly landscapes as a critique of the current socio-political condition,⁹ Tammet refuses to participate in a narrative of self-victimization, subscribing instead to postmodern and ironic revisions of national landscapes, collective myths and communal identities, ultimately not only representing the changes, but also participating in the production of these cultural shifts. Having laid out some of the issues tackled by Tammet in relation to the nation and its history, it is now important to elaborate on his critique of contemporary socialist realities, which often run in parallel with particular features of generic, i.e. sci-fi, origin. Although the idyllic aspects of Tammet's cinematic landscapes might provide a case for arguing that he performed an act of normalizing the current state of Soviet society, the generic structure overrides this impression, providing a voice for critically minded utterances.

As indicated by numerous commentators, science fiction was one of those entertainment genres – alongside melodrama, musical, detective story and adventure film – that became preferable for the Soviet cinema authorities due to the potential for considerable commercial success (Golovskoy 1986: 142; 1992: 264, Lawton 1989: 6; 1992a: 8 etc.), and that arguably 'supported the status quo' (Lawton 1989: 2) of the stagnated Soviet society throughout the 1970s and first half of the 1980s. At the same time, however, it is also commonly acknowledged that '[f]ew things reveal so sharply as science fiction the wishes, hopes, fears, inner stresses and tensions of an era, or define its limitations with such exactness' (H. L. Gold, quoted in Kuhn 1990b: 15). Soviet science fiction, whether literary (e.g. McGuire 1985) or cinematic, was not an exception to this observation, and Tammet's films offer a good case in point, using a number of quintessential sci-fi tropes for communicating a critique of current social conditions and prevailing mindsets. Furthermore, as already indicated above, on many occasions the central topics, themes and strategies of his films are also closely tied with broader horizons of postmodernist culture, which, in their turn, are inseparably intertwined with some of the

8. Representations of women – in *Solo* they are either disembodied (the voice), completely silenced (the female alien), or sly and revengeful seducers, in *Wedding Picture* they remain passive and secondary to male characters – provide substantial food for thought, but a detailed analysis of Tammet's gender policies remains, regrettably, beyond the scope of this article.
9. Most notably, this option was preferable to Jaan Tooming, a rather radical theatre-director-turned-film-maker, whose experimental works of the 1970s connected (with increasing intensity) images of 'rape' of the local environment with the repressions suffered by its native inhabitants; this reached an apex with the extremely gloomy *Man and Pine Tree in 1979* (in parallel with Tammet's first film (see Närripea 2010a)).

major issues in the heart of contemporary science-fiction cinema, both in the West and in the Soviet sphere.

The most conspicuous elements of science fiction are, of course, the aliens and their spacecraft in *Solo*, and the facility of time travelling in *Wedding Picture*. Although many science-fiction narratives of the 1950s and 1960s, drawing on the context of the cold war, interpreted aliens, the age-old motif of sci-fi genre, rather naively as symbols of respective political enemies, in the course of the following decades the image of the alien form took on a set of complex connotations, which, most importantly, included realization that the Other is not only external (to earth, to a society etc.), but instead very much in and among Us; that the border between human and non-human existence is essentially blurry (see Sardar and Cubitt 2002). In *Solo* the aliens have appropriated human bodies (in the manner of the 'pod-people' in *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1956, 1978)), lingering thus in an in-between form of existence and seeking similarities with, rather than differences from, the human state of being – an impression which is furthermore confirmed by the numerous parallels between them and the 'true' human characters of the film. First of all, there are three aliens and three humans, in both cases two men and a woman, between whom, as demonstrated above, multiple connections are established. In fact, the whole film is criss-crossed with references to doubles and copies, indicating simultaneously the postmodernist/late-socialist fragmentation of personal and collective identities, as well as the rise of simulacral regimes in both Soviet and Western societies at the time. In Aat's paralysis, and the stiff movements and emotionless, mask-like appearances of the alien characters, as well as Minna's coldness, even cruelty, towards Aat and her calculated seduction of 'new' Aat, there is a noticeable lack of warmth in human relations and an absence of meaningful communication which is not difficult to recognize as an allegory of stagnated Soviet society (but also, as suggested above, the similarity with its counterpart behind the Iron Curtain, with the postmodern world in general). This stagnation, as the film concludes, can be overcome only by escape, and complete transposition; yet the nature of this alternative, presumably better future, of an 'otherspace', remains unknown. In *Wedding Picture*, the rather excessive dialogue informs the viewers of a technologically advanced future civilization, in which technology has apparently not managed to change the fundamentals of human nature nor bring eternal happiness to mankind (although perhaps world peace, or even a completely unified world order – the ultimate aim of numerous utopias – has been achieved after all). Importantly, the mobility of the time traveller and his relative freedom of choice and movement are in sharp contrast with Ants's world on the island. Even though there is no sign of explicit social criticism, the central spatial metaphor of the film – 'every man is an island' – still refers to the postmodern/late-socialist 'sense of shattering and fragmentation in social life' (Harvey 1990: 311) with an obviously negative tinge, just as the reasons behind the failure of Ants's marriage might be read as standing for broader deficiencies of public communication. The cyclicity of the narrative in *Wedding Picture* creates a sense of entrapment; Ants's painful realization that he cannot change the past (or thus control the future) leads to a sense of resignation, in parallel with the contemporary realities of the dominant social atmosphere. In both films, contacts with worlds beyond the initial timespace function to underline the closed nature of the latter, thus evoking social claustrophobia and the severely suppressed personal sphere of contemporary Soviet society.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is important to underline that popular genres are indeed potent containers of national and social concerns, both in their historical and their contemporary dimension, and this is a relationship which deserves further critical inquiry by scholars of Eastern European cinema. As Tammet's films demonstrate, the interlaced configurations of local elements (stories, myths, collective identities etc.) on the one hand and transnational currents (generic frameworks, regional and global ideologies and general sociocultural conditions etc.) on the other, invest popular cinema with the capacity to address matters and communicate ideas profoundly relevant to audiences across geographical, cultural and social borders and generational divisions. Their complex interconnections of time and space, history and narrative, plot and characters, upon which the Bakhtinian chronotope should have shed some light, are just as rich and intriguing as any auteurist creations. In the Estonian context in particular, further mappings of the local terrain of popular cinema should explore the position of different (both auteurist and genre) films and (generic) cycles in relation to each other and to their immediate social, cultural and political surroundings, as well as to wider regional and global networks of image-making regimes and storytelling procedures.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Research for this article was supported by the Archimedes Foundation and the European Social Fund.

REFERENCES

- Annus, Epp (2000), 'Postmodernism: The Cultural Logic of Late Socialism', in J. Angermüller et al. (eds), *Hybrid Spaces, Theory, Culture, Economy*, New York: Transaction; Münster: LIT Verlag, pp. 25–36.
- Annus, Epp and Hughes, Robert (2004), 'Reversals of the Postmodern and the Late Soviet Simulacrum in the Baltic Countries – With Exemplifications from Estonian Literature', in Marcel Cornis-Pope (ed.), *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe, Volume 1: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 54–65.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981), 'Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel', in M. Holquist (ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 84–258.
- Dempsey, Michael (1981), 'Lost Harmony: Tarkovsky's "The Mirror" and "The Stalker"', *Film Quarterly*, 35: 1, pp. 12–17.
- Epner, Luule (2007), 'Director as Playwright in Postdramatic Theatre', *Interlitteraria*, 12, pp. 210–224.
- First, Joshua J. (2008), 'Scenes of Belonging: Cinema and the Nationality Question in Soviet Ukraine during the Long 1960s', Ph.D. thesis, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Fowler, Catherine and Helfield, Gillian (2006), 'Introduction', in C. Fowler and G. Helfield (eds), *Representing the Rural: Space, Place, and Identity in Films about the Land*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, pp. 1–14.
- Fritzsche, Sonja (2006), 'East Germany's "Werkstatt Zukunft": Futurology and the Science Fiction Films of "defa-futurum"', *German Studies Review*, 29: 2, pp. 367–386.

- Golovskoy, Val S. (1986), *Behind the Soviet Screen: The Motion-Picture Industry in the USSR 1972–1982*, Ann Arbor: Ardis.
- Golovskoy, Val (1992), 'Art and Propaganda in the Soviet Union, 1980–1985', in A. Lawton (ed.), *The Red Screen: Politics, Society and Art in Soviet Union*, London: Routledge, pp. 264–282.
- Harvey, David (1990), *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Cambridge and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hendrykowski, Marek (1996), 'Changing States in East Central Europe', in G. Nowell-Smith (ed.), *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 632–635.
- Hinrikus, Rutt (ed.) (2003), *Eesti rahva elulood. III osa/Life Stories of Estonians. 3rd Part*, Tallinn: Tänapäev.
- Hinrikus, Rutt (2008), 'The Journey of the White Ship', *Interlitteraria*, 13, pp. 229–241.
- Iordanova, Dina (2003), *Cinema of the Other Europe: The Industry and Artistry of East Central European Film*, London and New York: Wallflower.
- Kärk, Lauri (2010), 'Estonian Film: From Bear Hunt to Autumn Ball. Notes on Estonian Film History', *KinoKultura: New Russian Cinema*, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/kark.shtml>. Accessed 5 May 2010.
- Kaufman, Philip (1978), *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, Los Angeles: United Artists.
- Komissarov, Kalju (1971), *Valge laev/The White Ship*, Tallinn: Tallinnfilm.
- Kluger, Daniel (2004), 'Fables of Desire', *Science Fiction Studies*, 31: 3, pp. 415–417.
- Kromanov, Grigori (1979), 'Hukunud Alpinisti' hotell/Dead Mountaineer Hotel, Tallinn: Tallinnfilm.
- Kuhn, Annette (1990a), 'Intertexts', in A. Kuhn (ed.), *Alien Zone: Cultural Theory and Contemporary Science Fiction Cinema*, London and New York: Verso, pp. 177–182.
- Kuhn, Annette (ed.) (1990b), *Alien Zone: Cultural Theory and Contemporary Science Fiction Cinema*, London and New York: Verso.
- Kulo, Helle (1981), '90 minutit/'90 minutes', *Noorte Hääl/Voice of Youth*, 23 April.
- Laak, Marin (2000), 'Estonian Literature in the 1920s and 1930s', *Estonian Literary Magazine*, 11, <http://elm.einst.ee/issue/11/estonian-literature-1920s-and-1930s/>. Accessed 5 May 2010.
- Lawton, Anna (1989), 'Toward a New Openness in Soviet Cinema, 1976–1987', in D. J. Goulding (ed.), *Post New Wave Cinema in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 1–50.
- Lawton, Anna (1992a), 'Introduction: An Interpretive Survey', in A. Lawton (ed.), *The Red Screen: Politics, Society and Art in Soviet Union*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–15.
- Lawton, Anna (1992b), *Kinoglasnost: Soviet Cinema in Our Time*, Cambridge, New York and Victoria: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenstein, Adam (2006), 'From the Tsars to the Stars: A Journey through Russian Fantastik Cinema', *KinoKultura: New Russian Cinema*, 14, <http://www.kinokultura.com/2006/14-lowenstein.shtml>. Accessed 5 May 2010.
- Machulski, Juliusz (1984), *Seksmisja/Sexmission*, Warsaw: Zespół Filmowy KADR.
- Martin, Terry (2001), *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Mazierska, Ewa (2004), 'Polish Cinematic Dystopias', *Kinema: A Journal for Film and Audiovisual Media*, Fall, 2004, <http://www.kinema.uwaterloo.ca/article.php?id=77&feature>. Accessed 5 May 2010.
- Mazierska, Ewa (2010), 'My Great Estonian Adventure: An Interview with Marek Piestrak', *KinoKultura: New Russian Cinema*, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/pirx-interview.shtml>. Accessed 5 May 2010.
- McGuire, Patrick L. (1985), *Red Stars: Political Aspects of Soviet Science Fiction*, Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press.
- Mikk, M. (1983), 'Pühapäevane filmielamus'/'Sunday film experience', *TRÜ/State University of Tartu*, 25 November.
- Näripea, Eva (2010a), 'New Waves, New Spaces: Estonian Experimental Cinema of the 1970s', *KinoKultura: New Russian Cinema*, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/naripea.shtml>. Accessed 5 May 2010.
- Näripea, Eva (2010b), 'Transnational Spaces of Science Fiction: An Estonian-Polish co-production *The Test of Pilot Pirx (Test pilota Pirxa/Navigaator Pirx, 1978)*', *KinoKultura: New Russian Cinema*, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/pirx-naripea.shtml>. Accessed 5 May 2010.
- Näripea, Eva (in press), 'National Space, (Trans)National Cinema: Estonian Film in the 1960s', in A. Imre (ed.), *A Companion to Eastern European Cinema*, Malden and Oxford: Blackwell. (Accepted for publication in November 2009.)
- Paistik, Avo (1981), *Klaabu kosmoses/Klaabu in Outer Space*, Tallinn: Tallinnfilm.
- Paljasmaa, Aivo (2009), 'Raul Tammet – filmimees, kes selja pööras'/'Raul Tammet – the filmmaker who quit', *Lääne Elu/Lääne Life*, 25 April.
- Petric, Vlada (1989–1990), 'Tarkovsky's Dream Imagery', *Film Quarterly*, 43: 2, pp. 28–34.
- Piestrak, Marek (1978), *Test Pilota Pirxa/Navigaator Pirx/Test of Pilot Pirx*, Tallinn: Tallinnfilm and Zespoty Filmowe.
- Pospíšil, Tomáš (2008), 'The Bomb, the Cold War and the Czech Film', *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, 6: 2, pp. 142–147.
- Prokhorov, Alexander (2007), 'The Adolescent and the Child in the Cinema of the Thaw', *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 1: 2, pp. 115–130.
- Radynski, Oleksiy (2009), 'The Corman Effect: A Give-and-take between Soviet and American Cold War Science-Fiction Film', *KinoKultura: New Russian Cinema*, Special Issue 9: Ukrainian Cinema, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/9/ukrainian.shtml>. Accessed 5 May 2010.
- Remsu, Olev (2009), '"Kogu" Tammet'/'"Entire" Tammet', *Teater. Muusika. Kino/Theater. Music. Cinema*, 2, pp. 102–113.
- Rieder, John (2008), *Colonialism and the Emergence of Science Fiction*, Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Salvesroni, Simonetta (1987), 'The Science-Fiction Films of Andrei Tarkovsky', *Science Fiction Studies*, 14: 3, pp. 294–306.
- Sardar, Ziauddin and Cubitt, Sean (2002), *Aliens R Us: The Other in Science Fiction Cinema*, London and Sterling: Pluto Press.
- Schmidt, Jan (1966), *Konec srpna v hotelu Ozon/The End of August at the Hotel Ozon*, Prague: Československý armádní film.
- Siegel, Don (1956), *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, Los Angeles: Walter Wanger Productions.

- Smith, Anthony (1999), *Myths and Memories of the Nation*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sobchack, Vivian (1987), *Screening Space: The American Science Fiction Film*, second, enlarged edition, New York: Ungar.
- Soldovieri, Stefan (1998), 'Socialists in Outer Space: East German film's Venusian Adventure', *Film History*, 10, pp. 382–398.
- Stam, Robert (1992), *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film*, Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Tammet, Raul (1979), *Soolo/Solo*, Tallinn: Tallinnfilm.
- Tammet, Raul (1980), *Pulmapilt/A potom oglyanulsya/Wedding Picture*, Moscow: Mosfilm.
- Tarkovskii, Andrei (1979), *Stalker*, Moscow: Mosfilm.
- Teinemaa, Sulev (2009), 'Unustatud vana hõbe. Esimene valik eesti lühimängufilme DVD-l'/'Forgotten old silver. The first selection of Estonian shorts on DVD', *Teater. Muusika. Kino/Theater. Music. Cinema*, 8/9, pp. 142–156.
- Tomberg, Donald (2009), 'Väljumine kapist või siis riulist'/'Out of closet or of shelf', *Sirp/Sickle*, 11 September.
- Urbla, Peeter (1979–1980), *31. osakonna hukk/Murder on the Thirty-First Floor*, Tallinn: Tallinnfilm.
- Vallak, Peet (2005), 'Lodjavahi surm'/'Death of the Barge Bridge Keeper', in I. Hargla (ed.), *Õudne Eesti. Valimik eesti õudusjutte/Scary Estonia: A Selection of Estonian Horror Stories*, Tallinn: Varrak, pp. 159–169.
- Vice, Sue (1997), *Introducing Bakhtin*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Viitung, Raul (2007), 'UFO-eri: "Soolo" (Tallinnfilm, 1979), "Pulmapilt" (Mosfilm, 1981) ja "Hukkunud Alpinisti Hotell" (Tallinnfilm, 1979)'/'UFO special: *Solo* (Tallinnfilm, 1979), *Wedding Picture* (Mosfilm, 1981) and *Dead Mountaineer Hotel* (Tallinnfilm, 1979)', *Eesti filmid/Estonian Films*, 8 October, <http://eestifilmid.blogspot.com/search/label/UFO-eri>. Accessed 5 May 2010.
- Widdis, Emma (2003), 'To Explore or Conquer? Mobile Perspectives on the Soviet Cultural Revolution', in E. Dobrenko and E. Naiman (eds), *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, pp. 219–240.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Näripea, E. (2010), 'Aliens and time travellers: Recycling national space in Estonian science-fiction cinema', *Studies in Eastern European Cinema* 1: 2, pp. 167–182, doi: 10.1386/seec.1.2.167_1

CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

Eva Näripea is a doctoral student at the Institute of Art History, Estonian Academy of Arts, working on her dissertation on representations of (urban) spaces in Estonian narrative cinema after World War II. She has published a number of articles on representations of city and landscapes in Soviet Estonian cinema in various Estonian and international publications. She has co-edited *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc* (2008, with Andreas Trossek) and a special issue on Estonian cinema in *Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema* (2010, with Ewa Mazierska and Mari Laaniste).

Contact: Estonian Academy of Arts, Tartu mnt 1, 10145 Tallinn, Estonia.
E-mail: evanaripea@gmail.com

Postcolonial
Heterotopias
in Marek Piestrak's
Estonian
Co-productions:
A Paracinematic
Reading

Forthcoming in

Beyond Borders: Polish Cinema
in an International Context.

Eds. Ewa Mazierska, Michael Goddard.
Rochester: University of Rochester Press

Although Polish film culture in general was held in high esteem in Soviet Estonia, and many Estonian directors admired the works and successes of their Polish colleagues with a tinge of jealousy, the tangible cinematic link between the two countries, both belonging to the Soviet sphere of influence, was limited. The only Polish-Estonian co-productions were those directed by Marek Piestrak, who made three films in collaboration with Estonian filmmakers: a science fiction film, *The Test of Pilot Pirx* (*Test pilota Pirxa / Navigaator Pirx*, 1978),¹ a fantasy adventure, *Curse of Snakes Valley* (*Kłątwa Doliny Węży / Madude oru needus*, 1988)² and, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, a horror/detective film, *The Tear of the Prince of Darkness* (*Łza księcia ciemności / Saatana pisar*, 1992).³ The film “establishments” of both countries, mainly oriented in a highly modernist manner towards *auteur* cinema, have rather unsurprisingly rejected these and other works by Piestrak, the true *enfant terrible* of Polish cinema, or the “Ed Wood of Eastern Europe”, preferring to exclude him from the pantheons of their respective national cinemas. The documentation kept in the Estonian Film Archive testifies clearly to the fact that the higher ranks of Estonian filmmakers (directors, scriptwriters, cinematographers) regarded the first co-production (and quite likely also the following collaborations) as a worthless and embarrassing project imposed upon them by the central Russian authorities.⁴ Thus only the “secondary” specialists (as well as some local actors and extras)⁵ were involved in the actual co-productive process, and quite likely even they considered it hackwork.

The elitist stance of the Polish side is witnessed by the fact that as recently as 2002 *Curse of Snakes Valley* was voted by the Polish film critics one of ten of the worst Polish films of all times—the ultimate expression of an attitude that was also reflected in reactions to my talk on *The Test of Pilot Pirx* at the conference *Polish Cinema in an International Context* in Manchester in 2009.⁶ This elitism can also be seen on the Estonian side in the responses of older Estonian filmmakers to the special issue on Estonian cinema

¹ Produced by PRF “Zespoly Filmowe” and Tallinnfilm.

² Produced by Zespół Filmowy “Oko” and Tallinnfilm.

³ Produced by Zespół Filmowy “Oko”, Tallinnfilm and Eskomfilm.

⁴ It is indeed true that the initiative of collaboration came from above, as Piestrak used the typical institutional channels in his search for partners, rather than direct relations with fellow filmmakers.

⁵ In *The Test of Pilot Pirx*, the Estonian crew included art directors Aleksander Peek and Priit Vaher, costume designer Helve Halla, first assistant director Airi Kasera and producer Karl Levoll. In addition, the original score was created by Arvo Pärt, probably the most famous contemporary Estonian composer for whom this was the last original score to write (see Tuumalu 2008) (even though subsequently his pre-existing compositions have been used by such world-renowned directors as Jean-Luc Godard, Leos Carax, Michael Moore, Gus Van Sant, Tom Tykwer, and François Ozon, see, Maimets-Volt 2009).

⁶ Polish film historian Krzysztof Loska has termed *The Test of Pilot Pirx* “an unfortunate adaptation of Lem’s work (Loska 2006, 160), dedicating only two paragraphs of his article to the analysis of the film’s plot.

for the online journal *KinoKultura* (www.kinokultura.com), which included a review of *Pirx* (Näripea 2010) and an interview with Piestrak (Mazierska 2010). Meanwhile, the audience reaction has been diametrically different: upon its release, *Pirx* was seen by millions of people across the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc, it was sold to more than twenty countries and continues to be broadcast regularly on Polish and Estonian television, both by public channels (in Estonia) and commercial ones (in Poland), while *Curse of Snakes Valley* attracted more than 32 million viewers in the Soviet Union. Moreover, *Pirx* was awarded the Golden Asteroid, the Grand Prix of the 27th International Science Fiction Film Festival in Trieste (Italy) in 1979, beating Ridley Scott's *Alien* (1979), which only came in second, winning the Silver Asteroid; the film also received favorable reviews in both *Variety* and the Italian press. Somewhat ironically, RUSCICO (Russian Cinema Council), a commercial association restoring and distributing globally the best Soviet and Russian films on DVD, has chosen to include all of Piestrak's Tallinnfilm co-productions in its series "Best Films of Tallinnfilm Studio", even if only in an subtitled version aimed at the Russian domestic market. Finally, in 2008, the 30th anniversary of *Pirx* was celebrated in Estonia with a special screening at the Haapsalu Horror and Fantasy Film Festival, followed by an open Q&A session with its director.

This continued interest in Piestrak's oeuvre, recently perhaps more "subcultural" than mainstream, gives an opportunity to consider his films as cult productions or examples of "paracinema." According to Jeffrey Sconce, "[p]aracinema is ... less a distinct group of films than a particular reading protocol, a counter-aesthetic turned subcultural sensibility devoted to all manner of cultural detritus. In short, the explicit manifesto of paracinematic culture is to valorize all forms of cinematic 'trash', whether such films have been either explicitly rejected or simply ignored by legitimate film culture" (Sconce 2004, 535). It is important to emphasize that most paracinema is not made deliberately as such, and often "deviate[s] from Hollywood classicism not necessarily by artistic intentionality, but by the effects of material poverty and technical ineptitude" (Ibid., 546). As already noted, in addition to films themselves, Sconce's paper grants ample attention to the way these films are observed, thus providing useful methodological guidelines. Although I do not consider myself part of a paracinematic audience proper (I do not read fanzines and my interest in, and knowledge of, "bad cinema" is much more limited than those of true "*paracinephiles*"), I will use the paracinematic reading strategy in what follows, in the sense that "[b]y concentrating on a film's formal bizarreness and stylistic eccentricity, the paracinematic audience, much like the viewer attuned to the innovations of Godard or capable of attending to the patterns of parametric narration described by Bordwell, foregrounds structures of cinematic discourse and artifice so that the material identity of the film ceases to be a structure made invisible in the service of

the diegesis, but becomes instead the primary focus of textual attention" (Ibid., 547). The primary focus of my reading will be the representation of space in *Pirx* and *Curse of Snakes Valley*, as, I believe, foregrounding the spatial discourse of these two films, which in many respects function as the *alter egos* of each other—the reverse sides of the same coin—allows regarding these popular and low-brow, at times even trivial, productions as articulating broader, trans- or post-national and cross-Soviet, social, political, and cultural mores and values, desires and dreads, because, as Sconce concludes, the "recognition of a narrative's artifice ... is the first step in examining a field of structures within the culture as a whole, a passageway into engaging a larger field of contextual issues surrounding the film as a socially and historically specific document." (Ibid., 552–3). In my investigation of Piestrak's "spatial universe" I will mostly rely on Michel Foucault's theory of heterotopias, make some use of Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the chronotope, and draw to an extent on the framework of postcolonial thought.

Socialist Science Fiction and Postmodern Heterotopias

In a broader context, all the films, but especially the production of *Pirx*, coincided with a burgeoning generic trend which saw a true explosion of interest in science fiction cinema in the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc. This, in turn, had undoubtedly been affected by "a sudden and radical shift in generic attitude and a popular renaissance of the SF film" (Sobchack 2004, 221) in Hollywood, around and after the 1977 release of George Lucas's *Star Wars* and Steven Spielberg's *Close Encounters of the Third Kind*. Science fiction films had occasionally been made throughout the Soviet bloc since the late 1950s, some of them, notably, as co-productions, and some gaining rather wide popularity and professional significance even beyond the socialist hemisphere.⁷ It was only in the late 1970s, however, that the genre overcame, to an extent, its reputation as one of the "seven

⁷ The authors of the book *Miracles on the Screen (Na ekrane—chudo)*, for instance, claim that the Soviet "space opera" *The Planet of Storms (Planeta bur)*, 1961 belongs to the curriculum of many American film schools because of its stunning Venusian sets and outstanding cinematography (see Kharitonov and Shcherbak-Zhukov 2003, 192). Also, the Czechoslovakian film by Jindřich Polák, *Icarus XB 1 (Ikarije XB 1)*, 1963, bought and re-released in an altered, English-dubbed version in the U.S. (under the title *Voyage to the End of the Universe*) by American International Pictures, was among a number of Eastern European and Soviet science fiction films that reached the American market; in addition, the East German-Polish co-production, Kurt Maetzig's *Der schweigende Stern (Milcząca Gwiazda)* in Polish) from 1960, was released in the U.S. as *First Spaceship on Venus*, a shortened and English dubbed version of the original, by Crown International Pictures (Soldovieri 1998); similarly, the Ukrainian film by Mikhail Kariukov and Oleksandr Kozyr, *Sky Calls (Nebo klyche)*, 1959, was bought in 1962 by the "King of the B-movies", Roger Corman, and distributed in the U.S. under the title *Battle beyond the Sun* (adapted for American audiences by a UCLA film school student Francis Ford Coppola) (Radynski 2009). In fact, the relationship of mutual enrichment and influence between the "Eastern" and the "Western" science fiction cinema is a complex and severely under-researched topic which deserves a much greater academic attention.

deadly sins” of Soviet cinema (First 2008, 318) as the Soviet film industry, alongside other film industries of the socialist sphere, took a firm course towards the “politics of mass entertainment” during the 1970s, which “saw an officially sponsored campaign for the production of more entertainment-oriented films” (Faraday 2000, 57; see also Golovskoy 1992, 264).⁸

Although, in narrative terms, they are rather unsurprising, perhaps even bordering on banal examples of (postmodern) science fiction, Piestrak’s *The Test of Pilot Pirx* and *Curse of Snakes Valley* form a fascinating cinematic diptych of socialist science fiction in several respects, the most notable of which, in my opinion, are connected with the interrelated issues of spatial representations, trans- or post-national cultural identities, and colonial discourse. *Pirx* is an adaptation of the short story “Trial” (*Rozprawa*, 1967) from Stanisław Lem’s so-called Pirx cycle, *Tales of Pirx the Pilot* (*Opowieści o pilotach Pirxie*),⁹ which are set somewhere in the 21st and 22nd Centuries, in a futuristic Western hemisphere, unlike the utopian Communist world-to-come which provides the setting of some of his other novels. In this future, mankind has already thoroughly traversed much of the Solar System, it has a number of colonies on the Moon and Mars and has even begun to explore further parts of the galaxy. The plot revolves around a secret and nearly fatal experiment, in the course of which robots are tested as potential replacements of the human crew on intergalactic expeditions. During the “test mission”, on the spaceship quite tellingly called Goliath, for which Pirx is hired as the commanding officer, it is revealed that the seemingly perfect robots are flawed and ultimately weak precisely because of their utter rationality and total lack of emotion. The film, like Lem’s story, is set in a world that includes only some very general geographical references: for example, English language is used on the signs; the names of the companies (United Atomic Laboratories, Cybertronic, Inteltron, and Nortronics) indicate an Anglo-American origin, as does an aircraft bearing the logo of PAN-AM, and a billboard advertising Delta Airlines. Moreover, the architectural attributes, including an unmistakably American gridded cityscape with skyscrapers which was filmed in Chicago, a futuristic interior of an airport filmed at Charles de Gaulle airport, Paris, an eclectic historicist palace (filmed in Moszna, Upper Silesia, Poland), a Mediterranean villa, several high-rise curtain-walled slabs of international style, and numerous modern interiors, create an image of a generic West rather than of a particular locality. In this universe the historical buildings suggest a long lineage of past heritage and thus an advanced cultural consciousness, while the

⁸ A somewhat similar “boom” of science fiction films can also be detected in East German cinema (see Fritzsche 2006) and Polish cinema (see Mazierska 2004); in Czechoslovakia, the “normalization period” too, favoured mass entertainment (see Hanáková 2008).

⁹ This cycle was also adapted as a short TV-series in Hungary in 1972, under the title *Adventures of Pirx* (*Pirx kalandjai*), by the producer András Rajnai.

modern constructions exemplify the technologically sophisticated and cosmopolitan present and future. Interestingly enough, and in accordance with many other science fiction films, this is a projection of “an international unity” (Sontag 2004, 45), a world without the Iron Curtain or, for that matter, without any clearly discernible national boundaries, although not without lines of conflict.

While *Pirx* projects an all-encompassing Western, Anglo-American universe, *Curse of Snakes Valley*, on the other hand, is a “legendary adventure film” (Tuumalu 2008) set in the French speaking part of the world: both in France and the former French colonies in the Eastern hemisphere or, more precisely, French Indochina (Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam). The film was shot to a large extent on location in Paris and Vietnam. This time, the temporal structure is explicitly contemporary (stretching via a flashback from the mid-20th century to the last quarter of the century), and the spatial skeleton of the diegetic world includes some relatively easily identified locations: the French capital is introduced by means of the unmistakable Eiffel Tower, in correspondence with the long touristic tradition of establishing shots, supported by images of Parisian cafés and street-scapes, punctuated by the famous “spidery ferrovitreous” (Frampton 1992, 70) *art nouveau* entrance structures of the Paris Métro stations. In relation to this, Charles de Gaulle Airport, too, assumes a more concrete identity as a particular locale, in contrast with *Pirx* where it functioned to denote a technologically advanced future civilization.

As opposed to the relatively strong sense of “reality” in Paris, the Orient is still represented as an abstraction, using visual strategies in a way comparable to *Pirx*: the title of the opening shot places the following episode in a somewhat vague manner in “Indochina, 1954”, posing consequently, in a narratively significant move, the exact location of the Snakes Valley as an enigma. Instead of futuristic, urban(ized), high-tech Western world, then, *Curse of Snakes Valley* presents, on the one hand, the French-speaking heart of Europe as the old and dignified cultural and intellectual hub of the Western civilization and, on the other hand, the colonized Orient as its mysterious, dangerous, and anachronistic Other. The film focuses on an amphora, which conceals a substance of extraterrestrial origin, and which has been preserved as a relic in a temple of the Snakes Valley for centuries. According to a local monk, it was brought to the Earth by aliens and contains “pure evil”, which, when set free, will destroy the entire world. Despite the warning, one of the Western protagonists, a retired French soldier called Bernard Traven, who first discovered the temple and its riches in 1954, steals the amphora with the forced help of a Polish scholar of Oriental culture, Jan Tarnas, the only person in the Western hemisphere who can speak the local language. The amphora is brought to Paris and dissected in a secret laboratory where the emanating liquid turns one of the scientists into a monstrous, otherworldly creature, suggesting a primal allegory of

science fiction—that aliens are, in fact, us; the darker side of human nature. The beast is immediately exterminated and the amphora taken away from the city. Before it reaches its destination, however, the aircraft carrying it literally disappears into “thin air.”

In terms of space, whereas *Pirx* is visually more or less uniform, yet not without a narrative and ideological conflict, in *Curse of Snakes Valley* it is largely bipolarized between its two distinct locations. Nevertheless, both *Pirx* and *Curse of Snakes Valley* can be conceptualized as heterotopias, much like a number of other Western and Eastern science fiction films of the 1970s and 1980s, by which time, the Manichean utopian/dystopian formula prevalent in the “modernist” era had been replaced by a more hybrid, fragmented, and blurred, postmodern cultural logic of late capitalism/socialism (see Jameson 1991, Annus 2000). Michel Foucault, who introduced the subsequently influential notion of heterotopias in a lecture in 1967, designates them as “other spaces” or:

real places ... which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality. (Foucault 1986, 24).

He defines heterotopias in opposition to utopias, “sites with no real place” (24), and by way of six principles. Under the third principle, Foucault describes cinema, alongside theater and oriental gardens, as an example of heterotopia’s essential ability to bring together “several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible” (25), and also, as Giuliana Bruno has noted, “segments of ... diverse temporal histories” (Bruno 2002, 147). Importantly, Bruno draws additional parallels with Foucault’s second principle, under which he locates the heterotopia of the cemetery: according to Bruno, both “[f]ilm and the cemetery ... are sites without a geography, or rather without a fixed, univocal, geometric notion of geography. They inhabit multiple points in time and collapse multiple places into a single space” (147).

Although the respective diegetic universes of *Pirx* and *Curse of Snakes Valley* might, perhaps, seem smooth on the surface and unproblematically mono- or bi-structural at first glance, they are revealed as spatio-temporally multi-layered, as well as scarred by discordant ideological currents, if one digs deeper into their heterotopian substratum. Their heterotopias are defined by an accumulation of “several, incompatible sites”, in terms of first, how the particular spatial settings were created, and secondly, what is implied on the connotative level, both in relation to the fictional and the “real” world. In *Pirx*, a (somewhat indeterminate) distant future, ahead of the present by at least several

decades, is constructed to a large extent out of actually existing locations, buildings and artifacts, much like Jean-Luc Godard did in *Alphaville* (1965). This, if nothing else, gives an occasion to discuss the spaces in *Pirx* as “other spaces”, as real sites, “simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted”: the cityscape of Chicago, although recognizable to a knowing eye, is not presented *narratively* as such, nor is the palace of Moszna or the other locations in the film. They acquire significance and “locality” only in relation to the diegetic network of spaces and places. Additionally, it is important to emphasize that in order to achieve the image of futuristic, post-national, Anglo-American civilization, Piestrak stitches together, as pointed out by Ewa Mazierska (2011), “elements from different settings and cultural traditions”, from both the socialist East and the capitalist West. At the same time it downplays, on the level of the presented environments, the fundamental split between the two competitive “world orders”, the “Second World” of the Soviet sphere and the “First World” of the Western countries, which were confronting each other via political conflict, military tension, proxy wars, and the economic competition of the Cold War. *Curse of Snakes Valley*, contrary to *Pirx*, presents some unambiguously defined real geographical sites—as in the case of Paris—at a more or less determined point of time—the mid-1980s. Still, the city is heterotopian in a sense that it seems to function as a shorthand for “Western culture” in general which, notably, is not imagined as mononational. The Polish scholar of Oriental studies, Jan Tarnas, conducts research at Sorbonne with a scholarship from the Polish government; he is first introduced sitting in a café called L’Odessa; his image on the cover of *Paris Week* magazine, as well as the title of the feature article, informs the viewers of his “sensational” international fame. Furthermore, the Parisian streets are filled with people from various ethnic backgrounds. Still, to a large extent, the full heterotopic capacity of the film stems from the Eastern part of its spatial equation, where different levels of time and space get strangely collapsed into one another. The secret Snakes Valley, located in an isolated, almost impossibly unreachable, spot somewhere in Indochina, is the place where mysterious old wisdoms (held by the local monks) and even more enigmatic future possibilities and/or threats are stored, enclosed in the above-mentioned amphora and guarded by several obstacles, the cryptic “Khumans”, cosmic powers appearing in the form of snakes. It is the arena where the modern and rational West, the progress-led, technologically advanced offspring of the Enlightenment, struggles with the tradition-bound, seemingly illogical, and exotic East which is, on this occasion, closely related to an even bigger unknown, in the form of unidentified and perplexing cosmic powers. In this trans-civilizational heterotopia, the Western colonizers are forced to face their own vulnerability, their incapability of both controlling the presumed “lesser” nations and conquering the yet unmapped territories as, although the Earth is not destroyed just

yet, the disappearance of the aircraft carrying the contents of the mysterious amphora is controlled by “higher powers”, leaving a shadow of danger lingering over the planet. Thus, in both films the spatio-temporal bricolage stretches over long periods of time and vast expansions of space—Eastern and Western, earthbound and cosmic, physical and mental.

In addition to the heterotopias generated by the spatially and temporally multi-layered on-screen cinescapes and constructed plots, these films can be regarded heterotopian in a sense that their conceived messages, as well as the general atmospheres, are neither utopian nor dystopian. Foucault draws attention to the fact that, while “[u]topias afford consolation” by projecting a “fantastic, untroubled region”, by “open[ing] up cities with vast avenues, superbly planted gardens, countries where life is easy,” “[h]eterotopias are disturbing” because they “desiccate speech, stop words in their tracks, contest the very possibility of grammar at its source” (Foucault 2002, xix; emphasis original). In other words, while utopias (but also dystopias) are straightforward, forming a distinct and homogeneous pole of bipolar oppositions, such as optimistic/pessimistic or technophilic/technophobic, heterotopias are by nature heterogeneous and hybrid, dissonant and incoherent, engaging conflicting ideas and ambiguous stances.¹⁰ In connection to this, Umberto Eco’s well-known definition of cult cinema becomes relevant: “To become cult, a movie should not display a central idea but many. It should not exhibit a coherent philosophy of composition. It must live on in and because of its glorious incoherence” (Eco 1985, 4). In *Pirx*, for example, the connotative attributes of different architectural styles have not been deployed with much consistency, in a sense that both the negative and positive characters are connected with two contrasting types of built environments—historicist and modernist. However, in the case of the negative characters, the connotations are on both occasions totalitarian, while in the case of the positive protagonists they are unmistakably humanist. In the film’s narrative framework then, it seems that neither historicist nor modernist architectural style is uniformly connected with good or evil, thus downplaying, to an extent, the central conflict of the film and reinforcing the impression of a uniform, borderless world. In *Curse of Snakes Valley*, the world is rather clearly polarized (perhaps as a reflection of the changed political situation in the socialist bloc), yet it still seems that almost none of the characters or environments are presented as perfectly good or absolutely evil, rather they are “impure”, essentially dissonant, in one sense or another. For example, there is Christine Jaubert, a French journalist who gets involved in the story when mysterious snakes, appearing from the air-conditioning system, strangle a technician at the university to death, at first gives the impression of being a strong, empowered, and resourceful

¹⁰ See also <http://www.adamranson.plus.com/SFThemes.pdf> (accessed February 17, 2011).

woman, but she is soon revealed to be hysterical and weak, reacting to every situation of danger with neurotic shrieks and paralytic petrification. In the final twist of the plot she is portrayed as a true *femme fatale* who now goes under the name of Iwonne, and turns out to be working for the secret agency that conducted the unfortunate probing of the amphora. This time, her mission is to convince the intoxicated Tarnas that the entire case has, in fact, been a dream, a hallucination brought about by a severe illness, in combination with the mythical contents of his daily research work. Again, even though appearing as a strong woman, she takes her orders from men. Also, while it is true that Tarnas and Traven can be considered, respectively, as the positive and negative agents of the film's central conflict, their multifaceted (cultural) identities still makes it possible to frame them as "heterotopian", rather than "utopian" or "dystopian" characters. Similarly Paris, the heart of Western civilization, is contested by secret plans and alien presences (snakes, aliens), while the Orient, although savage and impenetrable, is a rich repository of ancient material wealth and moral virtues (the monks). Finally, on a more general level, both films leave the audiences with an uncomfortably uncanny feeling, which on the one hand is far from a utopian one, although the Western architecture in *Pirix* might be read as an emblem of a technically evolved welfare society of the future. On the other hand, neither is the effect entirely dystopian, even though in *Curse of Snakes Valley*, the Orient and the extraterrestrial secrets it hides is undoubtedly posited as dangerous, instilling the viewers with a certain sense of trepidation. Piestrak's attitude, then, seems to be fatalistic, rather than optimistic or pessimistic.

The heterotopia also extends to the connotative level of the narrative, especially in *Pirix*, where the ambiguity of the depicted built (and natural) environments also includes broader ideological issues. A set of fundamental conflicts arises from the tensions between meaning and connotation of the plot, on the one hand, and the constructed diegetic world, on the other hand. On the one hand, there is a whole array of moments which can be read as counter-ideological in terms of Soviet policies. For example, there is the unmistakably positive depiction of Western architectural reality, which in Soviet cinema would have been a representational taboo in any other framework than that of science fiction (which offered a certain freedom as a genre of the fantastic). The awe-inspiring Western built environments in this film, these images of sleek and chic modernist interiors and exteriors, very likely threw into relief, for the contemporary Soviet audiences, the inadequacy of the Soviet-style interpretations of modernist architecture. As such, they provided covert critique of immediate architectural realities—the Soviet Bloc blocks—and, by extension, of the socio-political circumstances. On the one hand, then, the film demonstrates an undisguised admiration of these beautiful buildings, caressing their smooth surfaces with fluid camera movements and flashy angles. On the

other hand, however, it forgets to even slightly question the fact that the international style in architecture was a direct expression of technophile aspirations and had widely been used in sci-fi as a generic staple signifying negatively technologically advanced societies, functioning often as a connotation of a threat to the safe “homeliness” of more “natural” existence which, on the contrary, was frequently represented by vernacular built environments. Blissfully ignorant of the contradiction created by the positive undertones attached uncritically to modernist architecture in *Pirx*, the film’s final, completely anti-technological image that presents rocky mountains covered with white virginal snow, functions as a metaphor for the purity of human society, seemingly uncorrupted by robotic presence, as well as an emblem of Pirx’s virtuous personality.

From an ideological perspective, the anti-technological rhetoric, stemming from the failure of the robot to benefit the human kind the way it was designed to, might perhaps be also read as an anti-Soviet rhetoric, as the advancement of communist society was in the official pronouncements of the Soviet authorities firmly connected with advancements in technology, especially space technology (the Space Race). Furthermore, the borderless, unified, maybe even mono-cultural (and definitely mono-racial), world of *Pirx*, also evoked by the monochrome stylization of the film’s visuals, can be seen as a metaphor of the unifying tendencies of Soviet national and cultural politics, which strove to amalgamate the diversity of its constituent ethnicities into a uniform Russo-Soviet blend. The critique of this “de-facing” impulse becomes literal in the shape of the faceless, presumably robotic “hit men” of the UAL, who can be interpreted as the faceless powers (of communism) forcing people into doing what they don’t want to or preventing them from acting according to their own will. At the same time, however, it is not entirely impossible that the obvious enthusiasm of the Soviet cinema authorities towards producing *Pirx* had something to do with the fact that the institutions involved in the film’s experiment are ultimately able to contain and prevent the possible disaster connected to the serial production of these android robots, not unlike the way the Soviet government was able to contain and extinguish the turmoil in Prague ten years earlier.

Postcolonial Critiques

The issue of real-life ideologies prompts us to draw on Mikhail Bakhtin’s well-known notion of the chronotope, which he first developed as a literary category designating “the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature” where “space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history” (Bakhtin 1981, 84). In Robert Stam’s words, “[t]he chronotope mediates between two orders of experience and discourse: the historical and the artistic, providing fictional environments where historically specific constellations of power are made visible” (Stam

1992, 11). On closer inspection, the chronotopes of *Pirx* and *Curse of Snakes Valley* too, seem to have a number of links with surrounding (political) realities, some of which were already discussed above. These ideological dissonances bring us to the very nexus of this discussion, which lies in the crucial fact that we are talking about films that were made by a Polish director, in cooperation with an Estonian production company, with a cast of film stars and lesser-known actors from several countries of the global network of the Soviet sphere, filmed in various places around the world and, most importantly, under the ideological conditions determined to a large extent by Soviet authorities and policies. Under these circumstances it is important to emphasize that on the narrative and visual level, the relations of these films with the respective nations, their cultures, history, and traditions, are apparently almost non-existent (in case of Estonia), or minimal (in case of Poland); although in *Curse of Snakes Valley* the protagonist is Polish, no part of the narrative is set in Poland.

First of all, this probably explains to a degree the exclusion of Piestrak's films from the "official" narratives of film history both in Estonia and in Poland. At the same time, this deployment of "post-national" strategies of representation by Piestrak is most likely also the main cause of the immense success of his films among the "transnational" audiences. Yet, the heterotopian chronotopes and post- or transnational narratives of these films contain a connotative level that can be described as "local" and perhaps even "national", namely the clearly discernible, if not explicit, critique of Soviet colonialism¹¹ (despite which, somewhat paradoxically, the films still managed to present themselves as politically correct according to Soviet tenets). Thus, the chronotopes of these films involve "other spaces" also in a sense that they provide a subversive voice to otherwise silenced discourses, in a way empowering the colonized subjects. In fact, the popular genre of science fiction was a perfect channel for expressing the anxiety of the colonized, as it has been commonly acknowledged that "[f]ew things reveal so sharply as science fiction the wishes, hopes, fears, inner stresses and tensions of an era, or define its limitations with such exactness" (H. L. Gold, quoted in Kuhn 1990, 15). Indeed, the eerie atmosphere of these films can be read as signaling the general frame of mind prevalent at the time in the colonized societies of the Soviet Union and its satellite states. More precisely, the somewhat uncritical admiration of Western material world in *Pirx*, as shown above, throws into relief the nostalgia of the colonized towards their hampered connections with what was throughout the Soviet period generally perceived as the "true" ground of their culture and identity—the Western Europe beyond the Iron Curtain.

While in *Pirx* the critique of the Soviet regime is rather subtle and indirect, in *Curse of Snakes Valley*, perhaps due to the changed political climate, Piestrak imagines a more

¹¹ On Soviet colonialism and its complicated relationship to the Western discourse of postcolonialism, see e.g. Smith *et al.* 1998: 3ff; Chioni Moore 2001; Kelertas 2006.

clearly polarized world, in which the capitalist colonizers of the Orient are portrayed as losers, in a reversal of actual colonial power relations. The French soldier, although in possession of advanced Western technologies, even if his helicopter, the symbol of these technologies is shown as broken down in the very beginning of the film, comes across as a ruthless and egocentric opportunist, who in the end pays for his sins with his life. Furthermore, the secret scientific agency based in Paris who tampers with the amphora loses a number of its employees and ultimately also the amphora, and, with it, symbolically, the ability to rule the world at least for the time being. On the other hand, the Orient, for which the Snakes Valley functions as an abbreviation, although deprived of the amphora, remains more or less intact and untouched by the Western attempts of conquest.

In this equation, Russia/the Soviet Union is present in both the Western world (in Paris in the form the Café L'Odessa, referring on an intertextual level to the Ukrainian port town, which has been firmly established in film history by Sergei Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin* (*Bronenosets Potjomkin*, 1925)), and in the colonial East. In the East, its presence is signaled, first, on the denotative, narrative level as the Russian friend of Tarnas, Andrei Buturlin (played by the Russian actor Sergei Desnitskii, the "Pirx" of *Pirx*), who lives in Vietnam, hosts the small "Western expedition" in his modest house, and provides them with a Russian invention, a kind of smoke bomb designed to paralyze snakes, which eventually saves the lives of Tarnas, Traven and Christine, and permits them to enter the underground temple of the Snakes Valley. Secondly, the Russian presence is referred to on the connotative level, as during that time the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, ravaged by the Vietnam War and its repercussions, relied heavily on Soviet economic and military aid. Thus, the confrontation could be easily read as one between the capitalist West and the socialist Soviet sphere. On the other hand, it could also be interpreted as an allegory of Soviet colonialism, in which the failure of the Western colonizers refers to the ultimate bankruptcy of the Soviet project, which was moving towards its inevitable collapse as the film was made. For example, in contrast to *Pirx*, the "dominant ideological establishment" in *Curse of Snakes Valley* is revealed as in a severe state of decline, unable to control and contain the enemy. Poland, embodied symbolically in the figure of Jan Tarnas, is portrayed as a liminal phenomenon, oscillating and also mediating between the East and the West. It is precisely in this in-between zone where the complex set of colonial relationships pushes to the surface of the film, cracking the neat surface of unambiguously bipolar oppositions and banal narrative patterns. The character of Tarnas, then, refers to a set of problems not explicitly tackled in the narrative, opening up an avenue of connotations, which leads to the field of real-life political and cultural struggles. In short, Piestrak's films form a part of a post-colonial discourse, in which, according to Homi K. Bhabha, the colonizer and the colonized are

engaged in a hybrid relationship of mutual dependency and domination, and whose subjects are both split, albeit with different consequences and significance. As proposed by Bhabha, the colonized is not merely a mute victim, but rather exercises a certain amount of power over the colonizer (see Annus and Peiker 2009, 921). From that perspective, Piestrak's films, and especially *Curse of Snakes Valley*, could be read as postcolonial critiques, which involve intricate negotiations between the colonized and the colonizer, simultaneously adapting with the rules set by the colonizer, and yet still undermining its dominion by means of subtle inversions and strategic shifts of signification.

That said, it should also be emphasized that both of Piestrak's films are exponents of cult cinema as defined by Eco, and thus incoherent and dissonant by nature. In the discussion above I described how in *Pirx* the director was blissfully unaware of the conceptual conflicts of the represented spaces and their intertextual networks of references. In *Curse of Snakes Valley* the discrepancies of the film's messages become especially clear when one is to consider the way the Vietnamese are represented. They are seen in a typically Orientalizing manner, reduced to stereotypes; then again, so are their Western colonizers. All in all, however, these discords are the very source of appeal of Piestrak's oeuvre, enriching rather than impoverishing it.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to return to an idea suggested by Jeffrey Sconce. Although it might appear too ambitious a statement, Piestrak's films indeed seem to confirm Sconce's proposal that "[p]erhaps paracinema has the potential, at long last, to answer Brecht's famous call for an anti-illusionist aesthetic by presenting a cinema so histrionic, anachronistic and excessive that it compels even the most casual viewer to engage it ironically, producing a relatively detached textual space in which to consider, if only superficially, the cultural, historical and aesthetic politics that shape cinematic representation" (Sconce 2004, 553). By speaking of colonialism in disguise of the capitalist West and the Orientalist East, Piestrak's films reveal a complex set of colonial relationships, which deserve to be scrutinized in much more detail than the limits of this paper have enabled. It is exactly in this sense that Piestrak's popular films can be seen as politically significant: even if unable to change the situation, they provided a potentially subversive reading of it by showing it in a peculiar carnivalesque mirror. It is precisely their "glorious incoherence", the fissures of their narrative and visual execution, the dissonances between the denotative and connotative levels, that create space for voices silenced in the process of colonization. Thus, the reasons for which these films have been considered worthless, provide, in fact, the strongest ground for reassessing their relevance, both as "national" and "transnational" productions.

Bibliography

- Annus, Epp. 2000. Postmodernism: The cultural logic of late socialism. In *Hybrid Spaces: Theory, Culture, Economy*, eds. J. Angermüller *et al.*, 25–36. New York: Transaction; Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Annus, Epp, and Piret Peiker. 2009. Homi K. Bhabha. In *20. sajandi mõttevoolud*, ed. Epp Annus, 918–30. Tallinn and Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel: Notes toward a historical poetics. In *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 84–258. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bruno, Giuliana. 2002. *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*. New York: Verso.
- Chioni Moore, David. 2001. Is the post- in postcolonial the post- in post-Soviet? Toward a global postcolonial critique. *PMLA* 116 (1): 111–128.
- Eco, Umberto. 1985. Casablanca: Cult movies and intertextual collage. *SubStance* 14 (2): 3–12.
- Faraday, Georges. 2000. *Revolt of the Filmmakers: The Struggle for Artistic Autonomy and the Fall of the Soviet Film Industry*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- First, Joshua. 2008. From spectator to ‘differentiated’ consumer. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 9: 317–44.
- Foucault, Michel. 1986. Of other spaces, translated by Jay Miskowic. *Diacritics* 16 (1) (Spring): 22–7.
- Foucault, Michel. 2002. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Frampton, Kenneth. 1992. *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*, third edition. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Fritzsche, Sonja. 2006. East Germany’s “Werkstatt Zukunft”: Futurology and the science fiction films of “defa-futurum.” *German Studies Review* 29 (2): 367–86.
- Golovskoy, Val. 1992. Art and Propaganda in the Soviet Union, 1980–5. In *The Red Screen: Politics, Society, Art in Soviet Cinema*, ed. Anna Lawton, 264–82. London: Routledge.
- Hanáková, Petra. 2008. “The films we are ashamed of:” Czech crazy comedy of the 1970s and 1980s. In *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*, eds. Eva Näripea and Andreas Trossek, 109–121. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts; Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Kelertas, Violeta (ed.). 2006. *Baltic Postcolonialism*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Kharitonov, Evgenii, and Andreii Shcherbak-Zhukov. 2003. *Na ekrane—chudo*. Moscow: NII Kinoiskusstvo.

- Kuhn, Annette (ed.). 1990. *Alien zone: Cultural Theory and Contemporary Science Fiction cinema*. London and New York: Verso.
- Loska, Krzysztof 2006. Lem on film. *The Art and Science of Stanislaw Lem*, ed. Peter Swirski, 153–71. Montréal, London: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Maimets-Volt, Kaire. 2008. *Mediating the 'Idea of One': Arvo Pärt's Pre-existing Music in Film*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre.
- Mazierska, Ewa. 2004. Polish cinematic dystopias: Metaphors of life under communism – and beyond. *Kinema: A Journal for Film and Audiovisual Media* Fall, <http://www.kinema.uwaterloo.ca/article.php?id=77&feature> (accessed October 27, 2010).
- Mazierska, Ewa. 2010. My great Estonian adventure: An interview with Marek Piestrak. *KinoKultura*, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema (March), <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/pirx-interview.shtml> (accessed October 7, 2010).
- Mazierska, Ewa. 2011. International co-productions as productions of heterotopias. In *A Companion to Eastern European Cinema*, ed. Anikó Imre. Malden, Oxford: Blackwell. Forthcoming.
- Näripea, Eva. 2010. Transnational spaces of science fiction: An Estonian-Polish co-production *The Test of Pilot Pirx (Test pilota Pirxa / Navigaator Pirx, 1978)*. *KinoKultura*, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema (March), <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/estonian.shtml> (accessed October 7, 2010).
- Radynski, Oleksiy. 2009. The Corman effect: A give-and-take between Soviet and American Cold-war science fiction film. *KinoKultura*, Special Issue 9: Ukrainian Cinema (December), <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/9/radynski-corman.shtml> (accessed October 27, 2010).
- Sconce, Jeffrey. 2004. “Trashing” the academy: Taste, excess, and an emerging politics of cinematic style. In *Film Theory and Criticism*, 6th edition, ed. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen, 534–53. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. Originally published in *Screen* 36 (Winter 1995).
- Smith, Graham *et al.* 1998. *Nation-building in the Post-Soviet Borderlands*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sobchack, Vivian. 2004. Post-futurism. In *Liquid Metal: The Science Fiction Film Reader*, ed. Sean Redmond, 220–7. London and New York: Wallflower Press. Originally published in Vivian Sobchack, *Screening Space: The American Science Fiction Film*, second edition (New York: Rutgers University Press, 1997).
- Soldovieri, Stefan. 1998. Socialists in outer space: East German film's Venusian adventure. *Film History* 10 (3): 382–98.
- Sontag, Susan. 2004. The imagination of disaster. In *Liquid Metal: The Science Fiction Film Reader*, ed. Sean Redmond, 40–7. London and New York: Wallflower Press. Originally published in Susan Sontag, *Against Interpretation* (London: Vintage Press, 1994).

Stam, Robert. 1992. *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tuumalu, Tiit. 2008. "Navigaator Pirx" — 30 aastat hiljem. *Postimees*, March 22, <http://blog.postimees.ee/300308/esileht/ak/319037.php?navigaator-pirx-30-aastat-hiljem> (accessed October 7, 2010).

From Nation-Scape to Nation-State: Reconfiguring Filmic Space in Post-Soviet Estonian Cinema

A facsimile of an article published in

Baltic Cinemas after the 90s:
Shifting (Hi)stories and (Id)entities.

Acta Academiae Artium

Vilnensis, no. 56.

Ed. Renata Šukaitytė.

Vilnius: Vilniaus dailės

akademijos leidykla,

2010, pp. 65–75

ACTA ACADEMIAE ARTIUM VILNENSIS / 56 2010

FROM NATION-SCAPE TO NATION-STATE: RECONFIGURING FILMIC SPACE IN POST-SOVIET ESTONIAN CINEMA

Eva Näripea

ESTONIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS / ESTONIAN LITERARY MUSEUM

Tartu mnt 1,

10145 Tallinn, Estonia

evanaripea@gmail.com

This essay is concerned with the shifting modalities of spatial representations in (Soviet) Estonian cinema in the transitional period between the late 1980s and early 1990s, as well as with the changing procedures of narrating the nation, negotiating its identities and histories. By taking a closer look at two films – Peeter Urbla's *I'm Not a Tourist, I Live Here* (*Ma pole turist, ma elan siin*, 1988) and Ilkka Järvilaturi's *Darkness in Tallinn* (*Tallinn pimeduses*, 1993) – this paper attempts to offer some insights into the dynamic process of reshaping the cinematic imaginary of urban environments, as well as the psyches, histories and experiences of their inhabitants, both individual and collective.

KEYWORDS: Estonian cinema, representations of space, representations of history, national identities.

INTRODUCTION

Mikhail Gorbachev's policies of glasnost (openness and freedom of speech) and perestroika (restructuring), as well as the subsequent abolishment of film censorship in the second half of the 1980s resulted in an entirely new take on representations of (urban) spaces in Soviet Estonian cinema, which was closely associated with the dynamic (re)surfacing of national narratives, local identities, and sharp criticism towards Soviet protocols, strategies and administration; this was witnessed, for instance, by films like *Please, Smile* (or *Games for Teenagers*, *Naerata ometi*, directed by Arvo Iho and Leida Laius, 1985), *Flamingo, the Bird of Fortune* (*Õnnelind flamingo*, directed by Tõnis Kask, 1986), *Circular Courtyard* (*Ringhoov*, directed by Tõnu Virve, 1987)

and *I'm Not a Tourist, I Live Here* (*Ma pole turist, ma elan siin*, directed by Peeter Urbla, 1988). All of them revealed a marked break with previous strategies and patterns of representation of built environments and communal identities, intertwined with gradually growing national sentiments and ever-increasing distaste with Soviet realities. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, however, these so-called nation-scapes lost relevance, step by step, as the nation-state ceased being merely a distant dream and desire, becoming an immediate, and sometimes rather laborious, prosaic and quotidian fact of life. In the 1990s and 2000s, the overtly patriotic sentiments and mawkish national icons became limited, on the one hand, to the vocabularies of exoticising productions shot on location in Estonia by film-makers from abroad, such as *Darkness*

in Tallinn aka *City Unplugged* (Tallinn pimeduses, directed by Ilkka Järvilaturi, 1993; theatrically released in Estonia in 2008), *Candles in the Dark* (directed by Maximilian Schell, 1993) or *Letters from the East* (directed by Andrew Grieve, 1996); and later, on the other hand, to the few locally-initiated (and often governmentally commissioned) films, such as *Names in Marble* (*Nimed marmortahvlil*, directed by Elmo Nüganen, 2002) or *December Heat* (*Detsembrikuumus*, Asko Kase, 2008). At the same time, the greater part of Estonian post-Soviet films tend to lean towards trans-national imaginary, demonstrating the preference of “neutered” spaces and universal(ised) stories/identities (as suggested by Ewa Mazierska¹), thus raising questions about the interrelationship and continuous negotiations between national and trans-national (spatial) narratives. This essay investigates the notable shifts in filmic space, the representation of (national) identities and (re)construction of historical narrative(s) in Estonian films of the perestroika period on the one hand and the immediate years upon the re-established state sovereignty on the other hand, illustrating these shifts with a comparative analysis of Urbla’s *I’m Not a Tourist*, *I Live Here* and Järvilaturi’s *Darkness in Tallinn*.

However, in order to understand the true scope and significance of the critical turn in spatial representations that completely changed the face of Estonian cinema in the middle of the 1980s, it is crucial to first map the general outlines of spatial matrixes dominating the Estonian film-landscape prior to these cataclysmic changes.

NEGOTIATING SPACE: SOVIET-SCAPE AND NATION-SCAPE

As in other Baltic countries, in the aftermath of the Second World War the Soviet authorities established in (or, rather, expanded to) Estonia a new,

completely state-subsidised and state-controlled system of film production and distribution, which, naturally, entailed a hitherto alien set of ideological instructions, thematic regulations, representational devices and spatial discourses.² The local cinematic scene of the 1940s and 1950s was dominated by Russian directors who were sent to cine-indoctrinate the Soviet periphery and who imported to the screens of the newly constituted Estonian SSR an imagery intensely imbued with the formulas of Stalinist socialist realism. The thematic plans, conceived and monitored by the Muscovite ideologists and (cinema) administrators, and intended for undeviating implementation throughout the Soviet Union, prescribed contemporary subjects and episodes from the Sovietised model of historical narrative; typical master plots³ based on the codes of the *Bildungsroman* were enforced, concentrating on the ideological amending of older (heretofore bourgeois) generations and raising and rearing the younger ranks of the “working people” in the communist spirit; thus favouring either the environments of newly established collective farms or urban settings invested with progressive socialist spirit. All in all, these filmic city-, land- and mindscapes constitute a domain of the so-called Soviet-landscape, i.e. Sovietised space.

By contrast, in the 1960s, as the first ethnically Estonian film-makers graduated from the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography (Всесоюзный государственный институт кинематографии, VGIK) in Moscow, a refreshing artistic breeze rushed through the Estonian filmic arena, giving the contemporary critics and latter-day commentators an occasion to talk about the (re)naissance of

¹ Ewa Mazierska, “Postcommunist Estonian Cinema as Transnational Cinema”, in: *Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema*, Special Issue: Estonian Cinema, Toim Eva Närepea, Ewa Mazierska, Mari Laaniste (eds), 2010, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/mazierska.shtml>.

² For more detail see Eva Närepea, “A View from the Periphery. Spatial Discourse of the Soviet Estonian Feature Film: The 1940s and 1950s”, in: *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics*, Nr. VII, Special Issue: Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc, 2008.

³ Katerina Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*, 3rd ed., Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2000.

Estonian national cinema. Although many of the ideological instructions did not lose too much of their relevance, a noticeable break on both narrative and spatial level was clearly discernible. First of all, with considerable consistency the film-makers of the local lineage (whether Estonian or Russian by ethnicity, and whether theatre- or film-related in training and background) attempted to avoid contemporary subject matters, kolkhoz settings, and the “nodal points” of the Sovietised historical timeline. Instead, they sought to construct what I would call a “nation-*scape*” or “nation-*space*”, often realised in the narrative framework of the Estonian literary classics, such as *The Misadventures of the New Satan* (*Põrgupõhja uus Vanapagan*, directed by Jüri Müür and Grigori Kromanov, 1964; based on Anton Hansen Tammsaare’s novel), *The Dairyman of Mäeküla* (*Mäeküla piimamees*, directed by Leida Laius, 1965; based on Eduard Vilde’s work), or *Werewolf* (*Libahunt*, directed by Leida Laius, 1968; adapted from August Kitzberg’s play). Even if presenting a contemporary chronotope, most films of the period lack accentuated socialist didactics, concentrating rather on the subjectivity of the character(s). This “nation-*scape*” consciously dissociates itself from the immediate Soviet surroundings and realities, generating a somewhat nostalgic, escapist atmosphere, where once and again the sense of longing and subtle sadness evoked by failed hopes, cancelled opportunities and inaccessible aspirations surfaces as an apparent, stubbornly enduring, although more often than not carefully veiled, surge. Instead of the spaces appropriated by mechanised and gargantuan Soviet “agrocra^{cy}”, they provide a mnemonic-*scape* of the pre-war countryside, intimate, tender and familiar.

When compared to the relatively clear-cut Stalinist 1950s, the overall cinematic terrain of the 1970s was much more vague and indistinct. During this decade, which perhaps extends all the way to the launch of perestroika, the cinematic “Soviet-*scape*” stands side by side with the “nation-*scape*”. The intellectually cramped political and cultural climate of the earlier years of the period was shaped in the aftermath of the events of the 1968, witnessing

a firmer ideological grip in terms of acceptable subject matters, practices and procedures. Interestingly enough, the cine-*scapes* were again dominated by urban locations. During the course of the period, however, rural environments gained prominence once more, and 1977 saw the emergence of an “Estonian new wave,” as a group of young directors decisively began to revamp the local filmic scenery, delving into the painful chapters of Estonian history and rethinking these events rather boldly from an unprecedented angle of native observers. In general, it seems that the films most often sympathetic to the local audiences and critics alike were yet again those that (at least apparently) separated themselves from the current socialist realities, sought cathartic contacts with historical traumas of the nation, representing them from a local point of view, and took place in relatively “closed,” and often also (semi)rural or peripheral, spatial arrangements – be it an island, a provincial town, a village community, a house or even a single room, probing the deepest layers of the characters’ inner universes. These choices of confined settings perhaps functioned as reflections of the state of mind characteristic to the late socialist mentality: the quiet, if reluctant, acceptance of the stagnated societal conditions.⁴ On the other hand, the local spectators also seemed to welcome those films that emphasised, in one way or another, the connection of Estonian existence with the world beyond the Iron Curtain, both on the temporal/historical axis and in terms contemporary spatial configurations.

FROM NATION-SCAPE TO NATION-STATE

Precisely against these backgrounds of alternating episodes of “Soviet-*scape*” and “nation-*scape*” the radical break of the mid-1980s should be examined and measured. In the broadest sense I would describe it as an opening up, broadening perspectives and expanding, perhaps even challenging, boundaries

⁴ Cf. Lilya Kaganovsky, “The Cultural Logic of Late Socialism”, in: *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, Nr. 2 (3), 2009.

and notions of ideology, history, nation and space. Previously forbidden topics, the seamy side of socialist everyday as well as the darkest chapters of history became to be, as George Faraday has noted, “pervasive feature[s] of most sectors of cultural production.”⁵ In films like *Please, Smile* and *Flamingo, the Bird of Fortune* the real and acute problems of Soviet Estonian youth, as well as the contemporary urban spaces contaminated by violence, drug abuse and perverted sexuality, but also perhaps enriched by various subcultures of mainly Western origin,⁶ make an arrogant and bold appearance. As Nicholas Galichenko has aptly observed, in typical perestroika (youth) films “[s]ocial maladjustment, lifestyles and attitudes outside the culturally accepted mainstream, even the dangers inherent in the state’s own ideology, are examined.”⁷ The contemporary Russian commentators labelled this general trend with a slang term *chernukha* (or “black wave” in Graham’s befitting translation⁸).⁹ It must be emphasised, however, that by no means was it an exclusively Russian phenomenon. Quite the contrary,

“one of the chief characteristics of perestroika-era *chernukha*: an all-encompassing sense of decay and hopelessness that permeates both society and environment”¹⁰ can be diagnosed in the film production of the era throughout the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, as Lynne Attwood has argued that “[g]lasnost’ and *perestroika* were interpreted in a distinctly nationalist form in the other republics,”¹¹ the focal points of the non-Russian films often tended to be slightly different,¹² even though these “chronicle[s] of social horror” invariably mapped “a movement away from the visible and the public to the hidden and undiscussed,”¹³ be it in a contemporary framework or from a historical perspective. In terms of general setting, Seth Graham summarises that the typical spaces of *chernukha* were “dirty and/or crowded apartments [...], littered courtyards (populated by feral dogs or cats), urban streets at night, beer bars or liquor stores, police stations or prisons, and hospitals.”¹⁴

In Estonia, then, the formerly somewhat introverted or at least escapist and often nostalgic “nation-scape” was filled with horrors of Soviet realities on the one hand, and torment, anguish and burden of the hitherto suppressed history(-ies) on the other hand. With only a couple of notable exceptions, most of the feature length narrative film production from the mid-1980s to the collapse of the socialist system regularly concentrated on the disturbing and sordid facets of both the contemporary and historical times, reflected upon the traumatised identities and scarred psyches, both

⁵ George Faraday, *Revolt of the Filmmakers: The Struggle for Artistic Autonomy and the Fall of the Soviet Film Industry*, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000, p. 174–175.

⁶ Cf. Lynne Attwood, “Woman, Cinema and Society”, in: *Red Women on the Silver Screen*, idem (ed.), London: Pandora Press, 1993, p. 103.

⁷ Nicholas Galichenko, *Glasnost – Soviet Cinema Responds*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991, p. 20.

⁸ Seth Graham, “*Chernukha* and Russian Film”, in: *Studies in Slavic Culture*, Nr. 1, 2000, p. 9.

⁹ Cf. Andrew Horton, “‘Nothing Worth Living For’: Soviet Youth and the Documentary Movement”, in: *Wide Angle*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1990; Andrew Horton, Michael Brashinsky, *The Zero Hour: Glasnost and Soviet Cinema in Transition*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992, p. 163; Alexandra Karriker, “Turmoil on the Screen: Shifting Perspectives”, in: *Soviet and Post-Communist Cinema*, Morgantown: West Virginia University, 1993; George Faraday, p. 159; Anna Lawton, *Before the Fall: Soviet Cinema in the Gorbachev Years*, Washington: New Academia Publishing, 2007, p. 183, etc.

¹⁰ Gerald McCausland, “Katia Shagalova: *Once Upon a Time in the Provinces (Odnazhdy v provintsii, 2008)*”, in: *Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema*, Nr. 24, <http://www.kinokultura.com/2009/24r-odnazhdy.shtml> [2009-09-26].

¹¹ Lynne Attwood, p. 102.

¹² Cf. Jean Radvanyi, “Cinema in the Soviet Republics”, in: *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

¹³ Emma Widdis, “An Unmappable System: The Collapse of Public Space in Late-Soviet Film”, in: *Film Criticism*, Nr. 2 (21), 1996, p. 13.

¹⁴ Seth Graham, p. 9.

individual and collective, and threw into cinematic relief the deformed souls and destinies caught between the cogwheel of epic historical events. The “liberated” history, unchained from the limitations of ideological shackles, burst with the vigour of a long-grown abscess, leaving no doubt about who and what was to blame for the misery of the violated and abused nation. The expansion mentioned above also implies that while the earlier Estonian cinema was very often concerned with private spheres, or retreated into some mythical (literary) past (admittedly, with some significant exceptions to this general rule), in many films of the mid- to late-1980s it re-establishes its presence in the public sphere, criticising the Soviet mode of existence and the public policies, which, notably, also have significant consequences in people’s private spheres and create “difficulties [of] living in a dehumanized environment.”¹⁵

Especially towards the end of the decade and immediately before the political disintegration of the Soviet Union, the excitement over the liberty of national expression becomes more and more noticeable in films, which are regularly adorned, sometimes to the verge of saturation, with countless signs of the Singing Revolution and iconic symbols of nationhood (such as the hitherto forbidden Estonian blue-black-white tricolour, national costumes, folk tunes and patriotic lyrics etc.). Alongside with this burgeoning re-building of (soon-to-be-state-supported) national imagery, however, a strong and steadily escalating sense of unease and apprehension can be detected, as the collective national psyche is increasingly troubled by the changing conditions of self-definition, existential grounding and identification.

The cinematic production of the immediate years after re-gaining independence, up to the mid-1990s, testifies to the fact which has been acknowledged by numerous commentators, namely that the re-establishment of the nation-state was followed by an anticlimax, a sudden bankruptcy of national ideals,¹⁶ at least in the shape they had been conceived thus far. According to Aare Pilv, “for a

considerable part of our history, a sovereign fatherland has been a distant image of a Messianic future, and once it has been actually attained, a threat of dissolving or devaluation of national unity emerges, as one of the foundations of the national sentiment has ceased to exist.”¹⁷ An entirely new project of reconstructing, rethinking and, perhaps most importantly, politically legitimising, collective national identity was initiated by the freshly instated political elite. While the cultural elite had been among the major agents of change in the collective effort of the Singing Revolution in the late 1980s, contributing a fair share to the “re-invention of national history”, in the post-1991 period they gradually left politics and the cultural and political public spheres became separated.¹⁸ Marju Lauristin has expertly demonstrated that

During the course of transition, the entire symbolic environment has changed. Striking changes characterize the usage of language, which was freed from ideological rhetoric, at first of the Communist ideology, but after the first years of patriotic excitement, from the rhetoric of national liberation as well.¹⁹

Between 1991 and 1995²⁰ the Estonian cinematic scene was remarkable in a sense that both visually and narratively it seemed to proceed along an almost uninterrupted path the beginnings of which lay in

¹⁶ Katrin Kivimaa, *Rahvuslik ja modernne naiselikkus eesti kunstis 1850–2000*, Tallinn, Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 2009, p. 34.

¹⁷ Aare Pilv, “‘Sa oled mul teine.’ Teisesusest eesti kultuuri analüüsis”, in: *Vikerkaar*, Nr. 3, 2007, p. 92.

¹⁸ Marju Lauristin, Peeter Vihalemm, “Recent Historical Developments in Estonia: Three Stages of Transition (1987–1997)”, in: *Return to the Western World: Cultural and Political Perspectives on the Estonian Post-Communist Transition*, Marju Lauristin et al. (eds), Tartu: Tartu University Press, 1997, p. 83.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

²⁰ Indeed, the year 1996 evidently marks a certain watershed. Quite symbolically, it was the year when not a single feature length narrative film was made in Estonia.

¹⁵ Andrew Horton, “‘Nothing Worth Living For...’”, p. 44.

the mid-1980s. Naturally, the economic environment had changed dramatically and the business of film-making had to be completely re-invented in every respect of the industrial conditions, but when it comes to subject matters and representations of spaces, identities and histories, the major political rupture of 1991 surprisingly had hardly any immediate impact. It appears that this radical change of political regime initially caused only rather mild shifts in the cinematic representations: the iconic signs and symbols of the nation-state acquired the role of occasional extras, exuberant bursts of patriotism disappeared almost completely and, as expected, no critical stances were taken in relation to the new government. At the same time, however, the extreme dreariness of subjects and spaces also faded away. Meanwhile, the film-makers seemed to be as if bemused after the cataclysmic events and confused in terms of positioning themselves, as the usual Other was suddenly gone and the long-desired capitalist West provided a dizzying range of new vistas. Additionally, the topic of historical wounds evidently lost a greater part of its former vigour. Most often, the films attempted to win the hearts and sympathy of the audiences with sentimental romances and scandalous stories (mostly without any political colour), frequently delving nostalgically into the interwar period, apparently seeking some sort of existential point of anchorage and emotional shelter. This trend of commercialisation resulted in a specific, "neutered" cine-scape, devoid of accentuated national and/or local elements, and dominated by universalised narratives, trans-national stories, plots and constructions of identities.²¹

In addition, it was also the year when the first class of young film-makers – directors of fiction films by speciality – graduated from the film programme recently set up at the Tallinn Pedagogical University in 1992 and supervised by Arvo Iho. This was the first time when professional training in film became available on Estonian territory, as in the Soviet times the only establishment of educating film professionals had been the VGIK in Moscow.

²¹ Cf. Ewa Mazierska, as well as her essay in this volume.

At the same time, in the early 1990s, several foreign directors were drawn to the post-Soviet republics, eager to discover their dramatic history and use it as a raw material for potential box-office hits. Ilkka Järvilaturi's *Darkness in Tallinn*, Maximilian Schell's *Candles in the Dark* and Andrew Grieve's *Letters from the East* comprise an incomplete list of these efforts to Westernise/colonise and cine-fictionalise the local (hi)stories, experiences and identities. In what follows I will try to compare and contrast the way (urban) spaces, identities and historical narratives were negotiated and constructed in two of the most remarkable films of the period stretching from the waning days of socialism to the first years of political independence and nascent capitalism: Peeter Urbla's *I'm Not a Tourist, I Live Here* on the one hand, and Ilkka Järvilaturi's *Darkness in Tallinn* on the other hand.

FROM TIME-IMAGE TO MOVEMENT-IMAGE: DRIFTERS AND MOBSTERS

Urbla's film, set mainly in Tallinn and shot on location between April 1987 and spring of 1988, concentrates on the engagements, affairs and soul-searches of two middle-aged Estonian men – an illegal estate agent of flat exchanges, Mart Kangur, and a failed stage actor, Felix Kramvolt. Although diametrically antithetic in their personalities – Mart being the proto-capitalist business shark *par excellence*, a shameless speculator, whereas Felix is a friendly, and slightly naïve idealist, a former flower child, now working as an operator of the central heating facility at the city's central Viru Hotel – their existential condition, as well as that of most of the other characters of the film, including Tallinn, perhaps the true protagonist, is strikingly similar and defined by a fundamental sense of homelessness, a longing for belonging and psychological security. Having been appropriately diagnosed as an "artistic analysis of a moment",²² the film is replete with numerous attributes of the era, including those related

²² Peeter Torop, "Mängufilmiaasta 1988", in: *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, Nr. 9, 1988, p. 28.

to the national liberation movement (Estonian national flags, the picket of students protesting against phosphate mines etc.).

Järvilauri's *Darkness in Tallinn* is similar in this respect: both its visual and sound-track are saturated with icons of national patriotism – from flags to national costumes and from the national anthem to the popular melodies of the Singing Revolution. Yet its narrative intent is of an entirely different register; it presents a partly fictional tale of a burlesque “parallel history”.

According to the English subtitles of the opening credits, “Estonia was independent for 11 years [*sic!*] between the World Wars, before the Nazis invaded it and the Soviet Union sucked it up. But the invaders couldn't get to the Baltic nation's treasury, worth \$970 million in gold. Luckily, it had been hidden away in Paris, where it's been kept for 50 years.”

The plot sets off on the eve the gold is returned to the Estonian Bank in Tallinn, and concentrates on the ultimately failed attempt of the (apparently Russian) mafia to rob it. The mobsters plan to execute their evil scheme by means of a total blackout of the city's entire electrical system. In addition to this main storyline, a parabolic, perhaps even somewhat Biblical scenario thread involves a young couple – Toivo, a slightly sapless Estonian fellow, an “everyday hero,” and Maria, his Roma fiancée – whose child is born after a complicated and nearly fatal delivery (notably assisted by a stereotypical Jewish obstetrician) during the night of the unsuccessful robbery and the subsequent riots around the city.

For theorising, comparing and contrasting the respective national and spatial narratives of the two films, I will employ Deleuze's concepts of movement-image and time-image. In the broadest sense, Deleuze invented these theoretical tools in order to analyse the different practices of editing in American and European cinema, distinguishing the movement-image of “unbroken, linear narrative, based upon the continuity editing rules established by the Hollywood studio system” and the time-image of “the cinemas of the new waves which experimented

with discontinuous narrative time.”²³ Connecting this distinction with the representations of national identities in films, David Martin-Jones has proposed that

A jumbled, fragmented, multiplied or reversed film narrative ... can be interpreted as an expression of the difficulty of narrating national identity at a time of historical crisis or transformation. Such narratives formally demonstrate a nation's exploration of its own ‘national narrative’, its examination of the national past, present and/or future in search of causes, and possible alternatives, to its current state of existence.²⁴

Borrowing from Homi K. Bhabha,²⁵ Martin-Jones further suggests that movement-image tends to be more or less pedagogical “in that it aimed to establish one dominant view of national history, and identity”, while the labyrinthine time-image reflects the potentially ungrounding “performative rethinking” of those notions,²⁶ “the people's habits and practices re-created anew on a daily bases, the diverse and dynamic process of life.”²⁷ At the same time, however, Martin-Jones also suggests that in many films the elements of movement- and time-image co-exist and intertwine, even though one or the other ultimately defines the overall “ideology” of narrating time and space, nation and history.

Accordingly, then, I would argue that Urbla's *Tourist* is dominated by time-image: its loosely tied narrative underlines the passing of time itself;

²³ David Martin-Jones, *Deleuze, Cinema and National Identity: Narrative Time in National Contexts*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006, p. 2.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

²⁵ Homi K. Bhabha, “DissemiNation”, in: *Nation and Narration*, idem., (ed.), London: Routledge, 1990.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

²⁷ Epp Annus, Piret Peiker, “Homi K. Bhabha”, in: *Kahäkümmenda sajandi mõttevoolud*, Epp Annus (ed.), Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 2009, p. 919–931, p. 928. Cf. Epp Annus, “National Mythology: Past and Present”, in: *Interlitteraria*, Nr. 5, 2000.

the characters, immersed into the flow of time, are largely deprived of the power to control the direction their lives assume, they become “dislocated from the linear continuity of spatialized time.”²⁸ The (spatial) processes are de-territorialized, that is, characterised by a strong drive for change and dynamism.²⁹ Indeed, the film was produced in the midst of the turmoil of history, chronicling events as they emerged, but also recording the atmosphere of profound uncertainty and anxiety.³⁰ Despite the abundance of national attributes, *Tourist* is permeated with considerable difficulties in narrating the nation(-space), which finds its clearest expression in the fact that the film’s protagonists, the natives of Tallinn, as well as the city itself, are haunted by a constant sense of dislocation, drifting and placelessness,³¹ dissolving the fixed fabric of national narrative into small and fragmented, complicated and unstable threads of personal experiences, intimate meditations, multiple and shifting identities, providing no clear conclusions. Furthermore, the loose narrative flow, divided in turn into multiple perspectives of narration (presenting the points-of-view of various characters), is suspended by numerous inner dialogues of the protagonists, which function to communicate the unhinged states of their mind, their spiritual drifting, much in the manner of the Flying Dutchman, as suggested by Urbla – this motif of a ghost ship occurring over and over again in the shape of Wagner’s famous opera.

Järvilaturi’s *Darkness*, on the other hand, is clearly a movement-image, set into the framework of certain generic rules (a combination of “post-

modernised” elements of *film noir*, gangster film and *chernukha*, designated as a “dark comedy” by a CNN reporter), and following the classical patterns of continuity editing and closed narrative structure.³² The characters and their psychological motives – their decisions, choices, desires, and personal traits – act as the narrative’s main causal agents. Järvilaturi compresses the post-socialist chaos into an easily graspable, simplified and concise configuration of almost formulaic readability. His Tallinn emerges as if from a comic book, as a city defined by the epic struggle between good and evil, light and darkness. It proposes a (pseudo)pedagogical narrative of history and nation, providing a fixed perspective of a “finished” history, and promoting a static and stable national identity based on the legitimised chain of events and established set of symbols. From a local’s point of view, a search for and a construction of a fake, exoticised “authenticity” targeted at inter- or trans-national audiences is clearly discernible. The film creates a grand and stylised narrative, monumentalising Estonian history, even though it is a mythological “fictional world.” The narrative of nation(-state) is clear-cut and coherent, the evil is defeated, and the law and history of the newly born state eventually triumph.

On the level of spatial representations, the two films again differ greatly in terms of their points of departure. Although both of them have been shot on location in Tallinn, Urbla has mapped the space of the city from the unmistakably local’s point of view, presenting and following real spatial configurations and trajectories. The narrative stream runs along truly existing spatial channels of the city, so to say: when Felix catches a bus to Lasnamäe, one of the latest, largest and ugliest achievements of Soviet-style residential housing, a “dormitory” district built for and mostly populated by masses

²⁸ David Martin-Jones, p. 26.

²⁹ Eik Hermann, “Gilles Deleuze”, in: *Kahekümnenda sajandi mõttevoolud*, p. 749.

³⁰ Peeter Urbla, “Teel ekraanile. Tallinnfilmi kaheseerialine mängufilm ‘Ma ei ole turist, ma elan siin’”, in: *Ekraan*, Nr. 12, 1988, p. 10

³¹ For more detail, see Eva Näripea, “Home and Away: Urban Representations in 1980s Soviet Estonian Cinema”, in: *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics*, Nr. III, 2003.

³² See e.g. David Bordwell, “The Classical Hollywood Style”, in: *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*, David Bordwell, Janet Staiger, Kristin Thompson (eds), London, Melbourne, Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985; idem, *Narration in the Fiction Film*, London: Routledge, 1985.

of “migrants” located to Estonia from distant Soviet republics in the Machiavellian scheme of the Soviet national policy, it evidently follows the route of the regular service; and when Mart hires a taxi to run his daily estate agent’s errands, the car travels along the clearly recognisable network of streets. Similarly, most of the neighbourhoods are as familiar and identifiable to the local audiences as they are to the film’s characters, and the buildings tend to serve their actual functions. On the other hand, the spatial patterns created by Järvilaturi distinctly reveal the perspective of an outsider: they are elliptically sutured together from separate and fragmented patches of places according to the particular narrative and/or generic intentions and in keeping with the laws of continuity editing. While this peculiarly semi-documentary approach to the spatial relations, and particularly the pictorial language of *Tourist* – especially the recurring aerial shots of the expansive labyrinthine cityscape of Tallinn, which, quite paradoxically, hamper the supposed “legibility” of the familiar space – reinforce the film’s underlying idea of complex and confused mindset of the era, also inviting comparison with the complicated process of repositioning identities and rethinking historical narratives, Järvilaturi’s choice to compose his image of Tallinn from isolated pieces of locations, stitched together arbitrarily and unconcerned with the actual geography of the city, as well as presented by means of an ostentatiously (pseudo)*film noir*-like pictorial vocabulary, on the contrary, generates a strongly fictional and generic space, which is at the same time simplified and reductive, supporting thus the stylised, straightforward and somewhat primitive portrayals of local identities and historical narratives. Perhaps it can even be argued that while Tallinn in *Tourist* is a definitive entity, in a sense that it would be nearly impossible to present the same narrative in a different city,³³ then in *Darkness in Tallinn* the particular locale plays a considerably less decisive role, and the same, or at least corresponding, story could be told under the title of, for example, *Darkness in Riga* or *Darkness in Vilnius*. Additionally, Urbla’s Tallinn is an almost anthropomorphic creature; the existential

condition of the city is intertwined with the psyches of the human protagonists who address the city in their inner monologues as if it was their *alter ego*. Järvilaturi, on the other hand, covers the city with a veil of deepest darkness, as if concealing its characteristic, idiosyncratic properties from the audience, undermining the particular setting and drawing instead attention to the (trans-nationally comprehensible) action-driven plot and (melo)dramatic relations between the characters.

Finally, however, a whole range of notable similarities connect Urbla’s and Järvilaturi’s films, of which I’d like to draw attention to a couple of perhaps the most relevant elements. First of all, on both occasions the narratives and spaces are populated by characters from multiple ethnic backgrounds. Mostly these are Estonian and Russian, but in *Tourist* also English, German and Finnish communities/cultures are introduced on a linguistic level (Felix sings “Oh, what a beautiful morning...”; and wears a T-shirt declaring in English “I’m Not a Tourist, I Live Here”; a production of Wagner’s opera *Der Fliegende Holländer* is broadcasted on Finnish TV in German with Finnish subtitles), while in *Darkness* Toivo’s fiancée Maria is apparently of Romany origin and the somewhat repulsive obstetrician is clearly Jewish. Yet, again, while in *Tourist* Urbla refuses to provide any unambiguous assessments or judgments in relation to the Russian population as a whole in Estonia (although the “migrants” from other Soviet republics are clearly seen as a threat), and comes across as rather suspicious of the hasty endorsement of “positive Westernisation,” Järvilaturi’s representations of different ethnicities usually confine themselves to somewhat naïve, rather limited and profoundly stereotyped protocols of diagnosis and evaluation.

The second parallel I’d like to highlight here is the fact that in both Urbla’s and Järvilaturi’s films a

³³ Although, admittedly similar topics have provided substance to numerous films taking place in other locations, one of the contemporary examples being Wim Wenders’s *Wings of Desire* (*Der Himmel über Berlin*, 1987), which Urbla himself has noted as being concerned with comparable subject matter and mentality.

central spatial point can be identified. In *Tourist* it is the Viru Hotel, indeed standing next to the actual urban centre of Tallinn. Built between 1969 and 1972 by Finnish constructors (although designed by Estonian architects Henno Sepmann and Mart Port),³⁴ it acquired the image of a “Western oasis” *par excellence* in the midst of the socialist desert, as it was designated to accommodate only foreign visitors. Especially in the 1980s, this status naturally encouraged various versions of shadow economy, and groups of black-marketeers conducting their shady speculations in its vicinity are also recorded in Urbla’s film. More importantly, however, the hotel serves in the film as a locus and signifier of a multinational community on the one hand, and another marker of the existential and overwhelming sense of homelessness and also temporality, some sort of constant in-between-ness, on the other hand. Despite standing in the centre of the city, it fails to provide existential core or anchoring shelter neither to the characters of the film, to the city itself or to the rest of its inhabitants. Quite the opposite – it is the ultimate symbol of a lack of home, a temporary station for drifters. In relation to this, it must be noted that however complex or confused the film’s narrations of nation/identity/history might seem, the ideals and ideas advocated in *Tourist* in fact appear as rather conservative by nature: the film clearly conveys an assumption that a point of time has existed in history where nation-space and national identity were solid and sound, constant and consolidated. In order to communicate this opinion, Urbla uses once more a potent architectural figure: in his inner monologues Mart utters repeatedly a dream about dwelling in a house built in the 1930s – only then could he truly “begin to live.”

While the Viru Hotel retains its initial, real-life function (as well as diverse connotations) in *Tourist*, the central building of *Darkness in Tallinn* – the fictional headquarters of the Estonian Bank – undergoes a rather interesting functional metamorphosis. The bank of the film is actually the building

of the National Library of Estonia, designed by Raine Karp and built between 1985 and 1993. Considering its solid volume and massive limestone walls it is indeed not surprising that the film-makers chose to appropriate it in this particular function. However, this choice entails an additional interpretative layer for those who are familiar with its initial function and conditions of construction. First, literature has always been considered the ultimate form and expression of Estonian culture, which thus makes the National Library one of the most sacred treasures of the national legacy and a significant container of national identity. Secondly, as the erection of the building coincided with the period of perestroika and the Singing Revolution, it also became an important signifier, and even an immediate agent, of the process of national liberation. It remains unknown if Järvilaturi was aware of these connections and references, but he indeed managed to choose a setting which, perhaps unexpectedly, resonates extremely well with his story of an epic struggle for national sovereignty and the right for self-determination, in this occasion aided and guaranteed by the ultimate capitalist instrument – pure gold.

In conclusion, I would like to underline that in cinematic terms the transition from nation-scape to nation-state was a gradual and subtle process, the full and comprehensive analysis of which remains beyond the scope of this essay. However, an initial inspection evidently suggests that the more radical break with previous modes of filmic expression and representational regimes related to spaces, identities and histories was in the post-Soviet era first introduced by film-makers from abroad, whose exoticising depictions of the newly discovered European “backstage” might seem naïve and trivial in their insights, yet nevertheless suggestive in their ability to notice and accentuate facets of local existence which can be uncomfortable to admit for the natives and therefore remain unnoticed and/or (deliberately) concealed.

NUO „TAUTOS-ERDVĖS“ IKI „TAUTOS-
VALSTYBĖS“: KINEMATOGRAFINĖS
ERDVĖS REKONSTRAVIMAS
POSOVIETINIAME ESTIJOS KINE

Eva Närripea

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: Estijos kinas, erdvės reprezentacijos, istorijos reprezentacijos, tautiniai identitetai.

SANTRAUKA

Michailo Gorbačiovo *glasnost* ir *perestroikos* politika bei kino cenzūros uždraudimas antroje 9-ojo dešimtmečio pusėje sąlygojo visiškai naują (miesto) erdvių vaizdavimą sovietiniame Estijos kine, glaudžiau susijusį su dinamišku anksčiau užgniaužtų tautinių naratyvų iškilimu, vietos identitetų pervertinimu ir griežtos sovietinių taisyklių, strategijų ir administravimo kritikos atsiradimu. 7-ojo ir 8-ojo dešimtmečių filmai bandė išvengti tam metui aktualių temų, kolchozo aplinkos ir pagrindinių sovietizuotos istorijos įvykių. Šie filmai siekė kurti taip vadinamą „tautos vaizdinį“ arba „tautos erdvę“, kuri sąmoningai atsiribojo nuo tiesioginės sovietinės realybės ir aplinkos kurdama šiek tiek nostalgiką, eskapistišką atmosferą. Paskutiniųjų sovietinės Estijos metų filmai, be kita ko, atskleidžia aiškų atsiribojimą nuo tų strategijų ir aplinkos bei kolektyvinių tapatybių vaizdavimo modelių. Ankstesnis iš dalies intravertiškas ar bent jau eskapistiškas ir dažnai nostalgikškas „tautos vaizdinys“ viena vertus

buvo kupinas sovietinės realybės siaubo, kita vertus – užgniaužtos istorijos(-ų) kančios, sielvarto ir naštos. Nuo 9-o dešimtmečio vidurio iki socialistinės visuomenės žlugimo sukurti filmai, tokie kaip Peeterio Urblos *Aš ne turistas, aš čia gyvenu* (*Ma pole turist, ma elan siin*, 1988), dažnai buvo nukreipti į nerimą keliančius ir niekingus šiuolaikinių ir istorinių laikų aspektus, vaizduojantys tiek individualias, tiek kolektyvines traumuotas asmenybes ir paženklintas sielas, deformuotas būtybes ir likimus, įstrigusius epinių istorinių įvykių ratuose. Žlugus Tarybų sąjungai šie vadinamieji tautos vaizdiniai pamažu tapo nebeaktualūs: dainuojančios revoliucijos metu filmuose drąsiai vaizduoti (tuomet neegzistuojančios) valstybės ženklai ir simboliai įgavo atsitiktinio priedo reikšmę, energingi patriotizmo proveržiai beveik išnyko, ir, kaip tikėtasi, neatsirado jokia kritinė pozicija naujosios valdžios atžvilgiu. Kino kūrėjai atrodė suglumę po kataklizminių įvykių ir pasimetę, nes įprastas Kitas staiga dingo, o taip ilgai laukti kapitalistiniai Vakarai atnešė svajinančią gausybę pasirinkimų. Dauguma Estijos posovietinių filmų rėmėsi transnacionaliniu įsi-vaizdavimu, demonstruodami preferenciją „belytėms“ erdvėms, kuriose dominuoja universalūs naratyvai, transnacionaliniai pasakojimai, planai ir tapatybės (pagal Ewą Mazierską, 2010). Tuo metu, 10-ojo dešimtmečio pradžioje, ieškodami savo bestseleriui tinkančios dramatiškos istorijos, į posovietines respublikas atvyko keletas užsienio režisierių. Ilkka Järvilaturi *Sutemos Taline* (*Tallinn pimeduses*, 1993) yra vienas iš tų suvakarietintų/kolonizuotų ir dramatuotų vietos istorijų, patirčių ir tapatybių pavyzdys.

Eesti filmimaastikud.

Ruumid, kohad ja paigad Nõukogude Eesti filmis (ning edaspidi)

Resümee

Eesti filmi ajalugu on senini suures osas kaardistamata territoorium. Ehkki siinse filmikunsti “ametlikust” sünnihetkest on möödunud juba peaaegu terve sajand, ootab selle ajaloo “krestomaatiline” narratiiv ikka veel kirjutamist ja avaldamist. Kuigi Eesti filmipärandi mitmesuguseid aspekte ja perioode on uurinud kohalikud filmikriitikud ning viimasel ajal üha täienev rida nii kodu- kui ka välismaiseid teadlasi,¹ on see üldjoontes ometi jätkuvalt alauuritud valdkond. Nende kaante vahel ilmuv artiklidissertatsioon keskendub peamiselt mängufilmile, mis moodustab ju mistahes küpsuse saavutanud (rahvusliku) filmikultuuri selgroo, ja põhisias Nõukogude Eesti kinotoodangule, sest just Teise maailmasõja järel kujunes siinmail välja mitmekülgne ja professionaalne kinotööstus.² Selle viljad, mida küll kujundas ja vürtsitas teatavat sorti ideoloogia, moodustavad ometigi olulise osa siinsest filmiloost ning – rõhutagem – ka kodumaisest kultuuripärandist laiemalt. Mõne silmatorkava erandiga haigutab Nõukogude Eesti filmikunsti kohal kollektiivses teadvuses hiiglaslik lünk ning endiselt vaadatakse toonasest filmist sageli ebaõiglaselt mööda kui ebamugavast “teisest”.

Minu projekti esialgne eesmärk oli seda lünka osaliselt täita, uurides Nõukogude Eesti mängufilmide ruumirepresentatsioone, eeldusel, et mittesõnalise (ja seega ainult üldjoontes või osaliselt tsensuuri “kastratsioonimasina” (Lokk 1989: 57) läbinud steenaariumi tasandil väljenduva) materjali analüüs võiks ehk pakkuda uusi sissevaateid seni liigagi kergetäielisel “võõrak” territooriumiks tembeldatud filmikunsti narratiivsetesse ja diskursiivsetesse kihistustesse. Algne huvi inimloodud ja linnakeskkondade vastu tekitas aga peagi vajaduse vaadelda filmiruumi aegruumilisi struktuure hoopis avaramas raamistikus, nii *linna-*, *küla-* kui ka *meelemaastikena*, mis haakuvad mitte

¹ Eesti filmiajaloo *bricolage*'i loomisse on olulise panuse andnud Tatjana Elmanovitši, Ivar Kosenkraniuse, Öie Orava, Veste Paasi, Jaan Ruusi ja Valdeko Tobro (põhiliselt ajakirjanduslikud) kirjutised nõukogude perioodist, mis mõnel juhul käsitlevad ühelt poolt ka varasemaid saavutusi, ulatudes teisalt osaliselt taasiseseisvumisjärgsesse perioodigi. Nende projekti on jätkanud ja laiendanud kohalike filmikriitikute ja -teadlaste “keskmise” generatsiooni kuuluvad Lauri Kärk (vt nt Kärk 2000), Peeter Linnap, Tiina Lokk, Jaak Lõhmus, Olev Remsu, Peeter Torop ja Aune Unt. Annika Koppeli mullu avaldatud raamat Arvo Kruusemendi legendaarsest filmitrilooziast “Kevade” (1969), “Suvi” (1976) ja “Sügis” (1990) (Koppel 2010) ning Paavo Kanguri äsjailmunud köide Grigori Kromanovi samavõrd ikoonilise “Viimsest reliikviast” (1969) (Kangur 2011) lisavad paar uut peatükki sellele võrdlemisi pikale ajakirjanduslikule traditsioonile, mis vajab aga kindlasti täiendamist süvitsiminevalt analüütilisemate ja tänapäevasemaid metodoloogiad rakendavate käsitlustega. Seda vajadust on jõudumööda rahuldanud noorema põlve eesti teadlased, näiteks Kaire Maimets-Volt, kelle uurimistöo keskendub filmimuusikale (Maimets 2003 ja Maimets-Volt 2009), ning Mari Laanemets ja Andreas Trossek, kelle arvukate artiklite põhiaines on laialdast rahvusvahelist tunnustust pälvinud Eesti animatsioon (nt Laaniste 2006, 2008, 2009; Trossek 2006, 2008, 2009), aga ka nõukogudejärgne *live action* mängufilm (Laaniste 2010; Laaniste, Torim 2010). “Kõrvalseisja” valgustavat vaatenurka pakuvad mitmed Ewa Mazierska artiklid taasiseseisvumisjärgsest eesti filmist (Mazierska 2010d, 2011) ning kanada päritolu Chris J. Robinsoni raamat eesti animatsioonist, mis ilmus 2003. aastal esmalt ingliskeelsena pealkirja *Between Genius & Utter Illiteracy: A Story of Estonian Animation* all (Robinson 2003) ning tõlgiti eesti keelde alles 2010 (vt Robinson 2010).

² Ent samamoodi on tõsi, et Teine maailmasõda ja Nõukogude okupatsioon katkestasid sõdadevahelise Eesti Vabariigi filmikultuuri arengu, hävitades suurema osa seniseid saavutusi.

üksnes tegevuspaiga, mitmesuguste filmispetsiifiliste tehnikate, narratiivsete võtete ja muu sarnasega seotud küsimustega, vaid ka identiteedi ja ajaloo, võimu ja õonestuse ning rahvusliku (ja rahvusülese³) filmikunsti laiema teemaringiga. Lühidalt öeldes sai kiiresti selgeks, et esialgset uurimishorizonti – Nõukogude Eesti filmi ruumirepresentatsioonide kaardistamine – tuli oluliselt avardada ning tegelda Nõukogude Eesti filmikunsti kaardistamisega palju üldisemas tähenduses. Nõnda omandas esiti filmiarhitektuurile keskendunud uurimisprojekt märksa lennukama ambitsiooni kirjutada ruumirepresentatsioonide toel (ümber) ühe rahvusfilmi (aja)lugu. Analüüsides tegevuspaiku, nende vahekordi tegelaste ja jutustatavate lugudega, nende esitust filmi väljendusvahendite najal (kaameratöö, montaaž, heli) ning nende tekstiväliseid konnotatsioone, tuli peagi ilmsiks, et vaatamata kodupubliku leigele suhtumisele⁴, oli Nõukogude Eesti film õigupoolest tihedalt seotud rahvuslike/kohalike identiteetide konstrueerimise ja arendamise projektiga, väljendades kollektiivseid unelmaid ja ühiskondlikke paineid ning kätkedes keerukaid mahavaikimiste, vastupanu ja kohandumise strateegiaid, mis jäid küll kaas-aegsetele vaatajatele pahatihti märkamatuks. Nagu Tiina Lokk (2003: 15) on tabavalt tähendanud, panid negatiivse retseptiooni pikale traditsioonile ja osalt tänini kestvale eelarvamusele 1960. aastail aluse kohalikud filmikriitikud, kelle hinnangul ei küündinud eesti kirjandusklassika ekraniseeringud kvaliteedilt algupäranditele ligilähedalegi. Samas on õige seegi, et kohaliku kinopubliku hulgas valitsevaid hoiakuid ja samastumismustreid kujundas paljuski see, et “tolleaegse eesti intelligentsi jaoks film valetas” (Lokk 2003: 15) isegi kõige süngemate stalinistlike aegade möödudes ning eriti võrreldes kirjanduse, teatri või kujutava kunstiga. Muidugimõista tingis niisugused kahtlused filmitööstuse enda eripära, asjaolu, et kino tervikuna oli keskvoimude erilisel terasele ja otsesele kontrollile alluv kultuurivaldkond, mis Nõukogude Liidu ääremail mehitati esialgu “importkaadriga” nii loovjõudude kui ka bürokraatide tasandil. Ehkki peagi astusid krooniliselt andetuiks põlatud külalisrežissööride asemele kohaliku taustaga kineastid, säilis annekteeritud Baltikumis veel aastakümneid umbusk Moskvast, ses rõhuva võõrvõimu kantsis ja sovetliku ideoloogia kolonialistlikus koldes, koolitatud filmitegijate ja nende loome suhtes.

³ Mõistan rahvusülesust nõukogude filmikunsti kontekstis esiteks kui võrdleva analüüsi meetodit (vrd Bergfelder *et al* 2007), mis rõhutab isolatsiooni asemel kultuuridevahelisi dialooge ning ületab kolonialismi kui ohvridiskursuse vaatenurga, võttes arvesse koostoime ja vastasmõjude komplitseeritud põiminguid ning kohanemise ja mõjutuste keerukaid mustreid. Teiseks osutab rahvusülesus ka nõukogude filmitööstuse teatavatele eripäradele ja tingimustele: nõukogude filmiloojate etniliselt mitmekesine seltskond sai erialase hariduse Moskva suurlinlikus atmosfääris, vabariiklike stuudiote tööd koordineerisid keskusest tulnud ideoloogilised juhtnöörid ja kapital ning valminud filme, mille tootmises osalesid sageli paljudest eri rahvustest filmitegijad ja näitlejad, levitati üleliidulises kinovõrgus (vrd Higson 2010).

⁴ 1999. aastal publitseeritud Eesti Instituudi infolehes (<http://www.einst.ee/publications/film/film.htm>) nenditakse, et “Eesti filmi ühiskondlik positsioon on läbi aegade meenutanud narri rolli kuninglikus õukonnas: keegi ei võta teda tõsiselt, teda naeruvääristatakse, isegi vihatakse, ent samas teavad kõik, et ta asetab õukonnaelu kõnekasse kõverpeeglisse.”

Nagu ülaltoodust nähtub, konstrueeris, (re)produtseeris ja representeeris Nõukogude Eesti film rahvusidentiteete mitmesuguste rahvusvaheliste ja -ülestest jõujoonte lakkamatust mõjuväljas, mistõttu tuleb siinset filmikunsti vaadelda laiemas piirkondlikus taustsüsteemis, ennekõike Nõukogude Liidu ja Ida-Euroopa filmikultuuri, aga ka Euroopa ja laiema lääne kinomaastiku kontekstis. Ühelt poolt kuulub regionaalse filmikultuuri vereringesse mõistagi (Nõukogude) Eesti filmikunsti ise, nii esteetilises plaanis, sarnase või sama tootmismudeli poolest kui ka levivõrgustike mõttes. Ent teisalt on oluline rõhutada, et ka Eesti filmiteadus ja -ajalookirjutus moodustavad osa Ida-Euroopa filmidiskursusest.⁵ Hiljuti asutatud ajakirja *Studies in Eastern European Cinema* avanumbris kirjutas Ewa Mazierska, et sotsialismijärgsel perioodil on Ida-Euroopa filmiteaduse metodoloogiline baas märkimisväärsel määral täienenud ning muu hulgas on täheldatav tendents “eemalduda ajalookesksest käsitluslaadist ja eelistada ruumipõhiseid vaatenurki”, mis avaldub ühelt poolt huvis “sotsialistlike linnade, elurajoonide, ehitiste ja geograafiliste piirkondade” filmirepresentatsioonide vastu, ent teisalt tähendab ka “Ida-Euroopa filmikunstile eriomaste žanrite ja paradigmade eritelu ruumidiskursuse kaudu” (Mazierska 2010a: 12). Minu tööd on inspireerinud rida viimastel aastatel ilmunud uurimusi nõukogude ja Ida-Euroopa filmiajaloo mitmesugustest aspektidest ja perioodidest,⁶ samuti olen püüdnud vaadelda Nõukogude Eesti kino regionaalses kontekstis, nii võrdleva uurimismeetodi kui ka tegelike ajalooliste sidemete ja paralleelide mõttes.

Ruum kui teatav filmi “korrastav kategooria” (Shiel 2001: 5) pälvis mu tähelepanu varasema arhitektuurihuvi loogilise jätkuna ning tänu bakalaureuseõppes tekkinud praktilisele vajadusele piiritleda oma uurimisvaldkond. See poolkogemata leitud teots hargnes edaspidi kahe- ja hiljem mitmeharuliseks projektiks, mille raskuspunktiks kujunes ehituskunsti asemel kiiresti film, andes Eesti filmiuurimusele uue vaatenurga,

⁵ On huvitav tõdeda, et Nõukogude Liidu lagunemise järel on tõmmatud sisuliselt võrdusmärki nõukogude ja vene filmiajaloo vahele (tõsi, vahel kuuluvad sellesse võrrandisse ka endised Kesk-Aasia vabariigid) ning kunagiste Balti sotsialistlike vabariikide toodang nõnda oma ajaloolisest arealist välja arvatud. Ajakiri *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema* peegeldab seda olukorda küllaltki kujukalt ning pole avaldanud ainsatki artiklit Nõukogude Eesti, Läti või Leedu filmitoodangust, samas kui John Cunningham, 2010. aastal Intellecti kirjastuse lansseeritud väljaande *Studies in Eastern European Cinema* peatoimetaja, arvab Balti riigid kindlalt oma ajakirja geograafilisse huviorbiiti. Samas peab siiski märkima, et veebiväljanne *Kinokultuura: New Russian Cinema* on alates 2005. aastast avaldanud rea erinumbreid ka N. Liidu läänepoolsete vabariikide ja sotsmaade filmikunstist, sealhulgas 2010. aastal Eesti kinost, toimetajaiks mina ise, Ewa Mazierska ja Mari Laaniste (vt Näripea *et al* 2010). Võrdlemisi õnnestunud katse Eesti filmi (ajaloo) lõimimisel Ida-Euroopa kinokultuuriga oli 2007. aasta oktoobris Kumu kunstimuseumis toimunud kahepäevane rahvusvaheline konverents *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc* (korraldajad Eva Näripea, Andreas Trossek ja Maria-Kristiina Soomre). Üritusele järgnes sama pealkirja kandev artiklilokogumik, kuhu mahtus konverentsiettekannete põhjal valminud uurimuste kõrval ka rida artikleid teistelt kodu- ja välismaistelt teadlastelt (vt Näripea, Trossek 2008).

⁶ Olgu nimetatud vaid mõningad kõige olulisemad ja uuemad ingliskeelsed monograafiad ja artiklilokogumikud: Beumers 2007; Coates 2005; Cunningham 2004; Dobrenko 2008; Falkowska 2008; Faraday 2000; Haltof 2002; Hames 2005a, 2005b; Hanáková, Johnson 2010; Imre 2005; Iordanova 2001, 2003, 2006; Mazierska, Rascaroli 2003; Mazierska 2007a, 2007b, 2008, 2010b; Orr, Ostrowska 2003; Owen 2011; Prokhorov 2002; Ronduda, Piwowarska 2008; Sukaitytė 2010; Widdis 2003b; Woll 2000.

mida tahtmise korral oleks ehk võimalik rakendada ka laiemas regionaalses kontekstis. Ent iseäranis Eesti puhul on ruumirepresentatsioonidele keskendumine võimaldanud kaevuda kohalike filmikihistuste sügavustesse, lükates kõrvale seni valitsenud väärtuskategooriad ja “rahvus kino” ideed puudutavad teatavad eelarvamused (nt kirjandusklassika ekraniseeringute hindamisel), mille tõttu on paljud linateosed saanud teenimatu kriitika osaliseks⁷, samal ajal kui terve rida äärmiselt huvitavaid filme on vajunud sootuks unustustehõlma ning enamjagu Nõukogude Eesti kinoproduksioonist tunnistatud “ideoloogia nahka” läinud ebaõnnestumisteks (Koppel 2010: 70). Ruumipõhine käsitlusviis vaatleb rahvus kino mõneti erinevast rakursist kui näiteks narratiivianalüüs, mis Nõukogude Eesti puhul asetaks tõenäoliselt rahvus klassika ekraniseeringud ja “rahvuslikke” teemasid või allusioone sisaldavad filmid “kvaliteedihierarhia” tippu (tunnistades üksiti kõik ülejäänud linalood vähemväärtuslikeks) ning jätkaks tähelepanuta üliolulise asjaolu, et igasugune rahvus kino kujuneb vältimatult mitmesuguste rahvus üleste hoo-vuste ristmõjudes⁸. Seejuures töötab ruumianalüüs suurepäraselt mitme- ja sageli koguni vastassuunaliste jõujoonte ja tähendusväljade avamisel, tuues hästi välja “rahvuslikud” (või siis “kohalikud” või taotluslikult “eristuvad”) elemendid pealtnäha nõukogulikud mõttes poliitiliselt korrektsetes (või ka sotsrealistlikes) situatsioonides.

Kui niisugune “multifokaalne” käsitluslaad avastab Eesti filmikunstist loodetavasti nii mõndagi, mis kohalikul publikul varem märkamata jäi, siis asjaolu, et minu doktoritöö koosneb enamasti inglise keeles kirjutatud ja avaldatud (ning väikeses osas poola keelde tõlgitud) artiklitest, annab tunnistust teadlikust sihst suunata uurimus ja selle tulemused rahvusvahelisele teadlaskonnale, olgu nende põhivaldkond nõukogude ja Ida-Euroopa film või maailma kino laiemalt. Julgen oletada, et regionaalset kasutusdiapasooni võiks omada näiteks mõistepaar “rahvusmaastik/-ruum” – “nõukogude maastik/ruum”. Need väitekirjas keskset rolli mängivad kontseptid vormusid seoses vajadusega suhestada 1960. aastail esile kerkinud “rahvusliku” filmikoolkonna vaatenurk Eesti kinos eelneval kümnendil tooni andnud Moskva keskvoimude poolt uue vabariigi stuudiosse tööle suunatud nn külalisrežissööride lähenemisviisiga. Need “gastroleerivad” lavastajad importisid siinsetele ekraanidele stalinistliku sotsrealismi vormeleist läbiimbunud kujundist, järgides tsentraalselt koostatud temaatilisi plaane, mis projitseerisid kinolinale pilte kommunistlikult reipast kaasajast ja stseene nõukogulikustatud kangelaslikust ajaloonaratiivist, eelistades tegevuspaikadena kas äsjaasutatud kolhoose või sotsialismi progressiivsest vaimust küllastunud linnakeskkondi. Kui aga esimesed Eesti päritolu filmitegijad

⁷ Öie Orava sõnul on film tavaliselt “ikka nõrgem kui kirjandusteos” (Orav 2003: 27).

⁸ Eric Hobsbawm on tabavalt märkinud, et “elame ikka veel rahvusriikide ajastul – see on üleilmastumise ainus tahk, millele üleilmastumine pole mõju avaldanud” (Hobsbawm 2007: 156). Ühe rahva filmikunstile keskenduv väitekirjaniisiis peegeldab seda situatsiooni teatavas mõttes. Ometi olen püüdnud võtta arvesse sedagi, et ükski rahvus (või rahvus kino) ei eksisteeri mitte vaakumis, vaid lakkamatute “välismõjude” toimeväljas. Lisaks suudab võrdlev uurimismeetod tuua esile nii mõndagi, mis muidu kipub kahe silma vahele jääma.

lõpetasid 1960. aastate alguses Moskva Üleliidulise Riikliku Kinematograafia Instituudi (ÜRKI)⁹, tulvas siinsesse filmiellu uus energiavoog, mis tõi kaasa märkimisväärse murangu nii dramaturgilis-narratiivses kui ka ruumilises plaanis. Põigeldes nii palju kui võimalik kõrvale kaasaegsest temaatikast, kolhoosikeskkondadest ja nõukoguliku ajaloojutustuse sõlmpunktidest, püüdsid need filmitegijad tekitada “rahvusruume”, milles eemalduti teadlikult ümbritsevast nõukogude olmest ja tegelikkusest, luues nostalgilis-eskapistliku atmosfääri, mida läbisid punase niidina looritatud hõllandused ja vaikne nukrus luhtunud lootuste, põrmustatud võimaluste ja kättesaamatute pürgimuste pärast. Mehhaniseeritud ja ekspansiivse nõukogude “agrokraatia” kaaperdatud keskkonna asemel projitseeriti ekraanidele sõjaeelse maailma turvaliselt tuttavlikud ja kodused mälu- maastikud. Need kaks ruumilis-kultuurilis-ajaloolise tunnetuse mudelit – rahvusmaastik ja nõukogude maastik – arenesid, põimusid omavahel ja mõjutasid teineteist järgnevate kümnendite jooksul, luues arvukalt variatsioone ja andes aimu võimusuuhete keerulistest mustritest mitte üksnes mängu-, vaid ka dokumentaalfilmides¹⁰, nagu ilmneb artiklist, mis keskendub Tallinna vanalinna veetleva turismisihtkohana reklaamivate vaatefilmide hulgitoodangule.

Kuna ilmselgelt pole üheainsa doktoritöö raames võimalik käsitleda amمندava põhjalikkusega kõiki Nõukogude Eesti filmides leiduvaid kohti, paiku ja ruume, nende dramaturgiliste rollide täisskaalat ja väljendusvõttestiku koguarsenali, samuti denotatiivsete ja konnotatiivsete tähenduste tervet välja ning (regionaalseid) eeskuju- ja mõjuvõrgustikke, isegi kui tegemist on kvantitatiivselt suhteliselt väikese (ja seega suhteliselt hõlpsalt hõlmatava) materjalikogumiga, tuleks esitatud artikliteseeriat vaadelda pigem ikka veel pooleli oleva projekti vahekokkuvõttena, mis pealekauba reedab oma kujunemise ja arengu keerdkäike, nii edasiviivate avastuste kui ka ilmselgete ummikteede plaanis. Nõnda on 1940.–1960. aastate mängufilmi vaadeldud just nagu linnulennult, visandades neil kümnendil filmiruumile omased üldised rajajooned ja juhtmotiivid ning nüansseerides käsitlust mõnede pisut sügavamale minevamate välkanalüüsides. 1970. aastate toodangule on aga lähenetud kitsamate žanri- ja autoriperspektiivide kaudu, jättes suuremad tendentsid kumama taustale (või hoopis tähelepanu alt välja) ning keskendudes tahtlikult vähemtuntud, suhteliselt kõrvalistele, ent vahest seda intriigerivamatele episoodidele toonases ekraanikultuuris. Viimase nõukogude kümnendi filmikunsti esindab vaid 1980. aastate lõpu ja 1990. aastate alguse üleminekuajal valminud kahe filmi võrdlev analüüs. Kokkuvõttes olen paari erandiga teadlikult ja ettekatsetult

⁹ Ka 1948. aastal Moskva Lunatšarski-nimelise Riikliku Teatriinstituudi (GITIS) juurde rajatud nn Eesti stuudio vilistlaste hulka kuulub terve rida Eesti filmiajaloo keskset rolli mänginud lavastajaid ja näitlejaid: Kaljo Kiisk, Grigori Kromanov, Arvo Kruusement, Tõnis Kask, Rein Aren, Ervin Abel, Ita Ever jt.

¹⁰ Leian, et filmiruum ning selle denotatiivsed ja konnotatiivsed toimeviisid on mängu- ja dokumentaalfilmide puhul põhiosas sarnase olemusega. Seda toetab näiteks David Bordwelli ja Kristin Thompsoni käsitlus dokumentalistika ja fiktsionaalse kino ähmastest piiridest (Bordwell, Thompson 2004: 130jj), mis moodustab ühe peatüki juba 1920. aastail alguse saanud selleteemalistest aruteludest.

keskendunud Eesti kino “panteonist” välja jäävatele või koguni Eesti “filmeliidi” poolt demoniseeritud linastele, näiteks nagu Marek Piestraki kurikuulus “Navigaator Pirx” (*Test pilota Pirxa*, 1978), mille jätkuv publikumenu ja koguni kultusstaatus pole suutnud selle mainet siinse filmikultuuri vanema generatsiooni esindajate silmis karvavõrdki lunastada. Muidugimõista vajak seesugune lünklik käsitlus edaspidiseid täiendusi, et võiks sündida (Nõukogude) Eesti filmikunsti igakülgsem “ruumiline ajalugu” (või pigem “ruumikollaaž”).

Ruum. Metodoloogiline raamistik

Ruumikujutuse temaatika on köitnud paljusid filmi- (aga ka muude visuaal- ja sõnakunstidega tegelevaid) teadlasi ja -teoreetikuid juba meediumi sünniaegadest saati, pälvides erilise tähelepanu tänu 1970. aastail vasakpoolses ühiskonna- ja kultuuriteoorias aset leidnud “ruumilisele pöördele”, mida iseloomustas “üha laiemalt leviv arusaam ruumist kui käepärasest korrastavast kategooriast ning modernse ja (veelgi enam) postmodernse ühiskonna ja kultuuri analüüsimine ja kirjeldamine “ruumistumise” kontseпти kaudu” (Shiel 2001: 5)¹¹. Ometi pole kriitikute ja filosoofide mõttepingutused põimunud üheks sidusaks filmiruumi “isandteooriaks”, selle asemel eksisteerib lugematu hulk erinevaid vaatenurki ja probleemiasetusi, mida on ühelt poolt kujundanud üksikute uurijate konkreetsed huvid ja eesmärgid, kindlad taustsüsteemid ja mõtterraamistikud, teisalt aga ka analüüsitava filmiainese enda rikkalik mitmepalgelisus. Robert Stam on koguni tabavalt märkinud, et film “kui sünesteetiline, “mitmeribaline” meedium, mil on õnnestunud luua ülimalt kirev tekstikorpust, niisama hästi kui *eeldab* mitmetahulisi vaatlusraamistikke.” (Stam 2011: 10.) Pealegi, kuna nn kinosajandi jooksul on ruumi kui sellise olemust lugematutest vaatenurkadest mõtestanud terve geograafide, sotsioloogide ja filosoofide müriaad (näiteks hõlmab käsiraamat *Key Thinkers on Space and Place* tervelt 52 “hetkel aktuaalsetes ruumi- ja kohateemalistes arutlustes olulist autorit” (Hubbard *et al* 2004: 3; minu väljatõste – *E. N.*; vt ka Crang, Thrift 2000)¹² –, on üha raskem ettegi kujutada, et filmiruumi analüüsimiseks võiks leida üksainus “teoreetiline raamistik”. Niisuguses äratundmises pole muidugi midagi imekspandavat, sest elame ju jätkuvalt “postmoder-

¹¹ Mark Shiel toob välja terve rea selles vallas mõjukaid mõtlejaid ja teoseid, näiteks Henri Lefebvre (*La Production de l'espace*, 1974), Michel Foucault (*Surveiller et punir*, 1975), Ernest Mandel (*Der Spätkapitalismus. Versuch einer marxistischen Erklärung*, 1972), Marshall Berman (*All That Is Solid Melts into Air*, 1982), David Harvey (*The Condition of Postmodernity*, 1989), Fredric Jameson (*Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, 1991), Edward Soja (*Postmodern Geographies*, 1989) ja Mike Davis (*City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, 1990). Lefebvre'i, Harvey and Foucault' loome on mänginud olulist rolli ka minu uurimistöös erinevates lõikudes.

¹² Veelgi enam, artiklis “The End of Temporality” kurdab Fredric Jameson, et “statistika ruumiteemaliste raamatute kohta on sama murettekitav kui mõne põlisvaenlase sündimus”, märkides, et globaalse raamatukataloogi Worldcat andmeil avaldati ainuüksi ajavahemikus 2000–2003 ligikaudu viis tuhat ruumiainelist teost (Jameson 2003: 696).

nistlike tingimuste” ajastul, mille umbesku metanarratiividesse kuulutas Jean-François Lyotard juba enam kui kolme aastakümne eest (vt Lyotard 1984: xxiv).

Niisiis on filmiruumikujutust lahatud ja kaardistatud väga erinevate distsipliinide raames, sh filmi- ja meediateaduses, kirjandusteaduses, kunstiajaloo, kultuuriuuringutes, filosoofias, sotsioloogias, geograafias, arhitektuuriajaloo ja urbanistikas. Kõik sellesse tekstikogumisse panustajad on lisanud “ruumidiskursusele” uut ainet ja värskeid rakursse, toetudes eelnevatele teadmistele ja vaatenurkadele, ent samavõrra neid ka ümber töötades ja küsimuse alla seades. Laias laastus näivad arutelud koonduvat ümber kahe peamise, ehkki iseenesest mitmetahulise, ja sageli eraldamatult ühtepõimunud ning võrdse kaaluga sõlmepunkti: mida kujutatakse ja kuidas kujutatakse. Seejuures on erinevad valdkondlikud kontekstid kallutanud kaalukaussi ühe või teise raskuskeskme suunas: filmiteoreetikud ja vahel ka filmitegijad on ootuspäraselt huvitunud pigem viimasest küsimusest, käsitledes ruumi filmi vormi- ja narratiivitarindi lahutamatu osana, uurides näiteks seda, kuidas misanstseeni, kaameratöö, montaaži ja heli abil taasesitatakse ja konstrueeritakse kahemõttelisel ekraanil kolmemõttelisi ruume ning kuidas need konfiguratsioonid seostuvad jutustatavate lugudega, luues mitmekesiseid tekstimustreid, ning kuidas teatud filmikonventsioone ja -koode leiutatakse ja sisse töötatakse, seejärel nende autoriteeti kõigutatakse, nad kõrvale heidetakse ning viimaks taas ausse tõstetakse. Geograafid, arhitektuuriteadlased ja -praktikud ning urbanistid on samal ajal kaldunud keskenduma küsimusele “mida kujutatakse”, eritledes filmides representeeritud linnakeskkondi ja maastikke ning seostades neid ühelt poolt filmi diegeesiga (tegevusmaailmaga), aga lisaks ka selle esitamise viisidega ning teisalt transdiegeetilise või filmivälise sfääriga, ümbritseva maailmaga selle kõige laiemas tähenduses, mis hõlmab tegelikke linnu ja külasid, tehis- ja looduskeskkondi, füüsilisi, sotsiaalseid ja mentaalseid ruume, aga ka arhitektuuri ja maastikku ning ühiskondlikku, kultuurilist ja ideoloogilist ruumi puudutavaid mitmesuguseid ja pidevalt muutuvaid diskursusi.

Enamjagu filmide ruumirepresentatsioonid käsitlevaid uurimusi kombineerib neid lähenemisviise, analüüsides filme ja nende fiktsionaalseid aegruume ajalooliselt ja ühiskondlikult kontekstualiseeritud audiovisuaalteostena, vaadeldes kinokunsti vastupidiselt filmikirjutuses laialt levinud tekstianalüüsile pigem ruumilise kui tekstipõhise süsteemina (Shiel 2001: 6). Pealekauba on ulatuslikku kõlapinda leidnud arusaam, et filmiruumid “on sageli sümbolised ja osalevad sotsiaalsetes formatsioonides, mõjutades inimsuhteid ning ühiskondlikke norme”, kusjuures nad pole “ei intentsiooni ega retseptiooni tasandil kunagi neutraalsed” (Harper, Rayner 2010: 16).

Järgnevates artiklites käsitletakse filmiruumi, -kohti ja -paiku figuratiivsete kategooriatena, milles lõimuvad tegelikud ruumid, nende representatsioonid ja kujuteldavad paigad, mitmesugused kujutusrežiimid ja -traditsioonid, publiku arusaamad ning laiemad ideoloogilised, ajaloolised, kultuurilised ja ühiskondlikud taustad. Neis peatükkides lõikub filmiuurimus mõttelõngadega mitmesuguseid ruumipraktikaid, tehis- ja looduskeskkondi, ühiskondlikke ja ideoloogilisi struktuure jmt uurivatest teadusharudest. Minu

metodoloogiat võiks ehk kõige paremini kirjeldada “ruumistunud” tekstianalüüsina, mis “on valla erinevatele mõjutustele ..., erinevatele mõtteraamistikele ..., erinevatele n-ö skeemidele ... ning erinevatele asjakohastele põhimõtetele, mis võivad kuuluda filmivalda (kaameratöö, montaaž) või olla filmivälised” (Stam 2011: 206–207). Samas on see ka “pragmaatiline, rakendades just neid lähenemisnurki, mis vaatlusalusele ainesele kõige enam valgust heidavad” (Kuhn 1990: 10–11). Ehkki olen teatavas mõttes Robert Stami moodi “teoreetiline kubist” (Stam 2011: 10), on mind sügavalt mõjutanud ja olulisel määral aidanud (nagu Robert Stamigi) Mihhail Bahtini heterogeenne, polüfooniline ja inspireeriv mõttepärand. Sageli viitan Bahtini 1937.–1938. aastal kirjutatud uurimuses “Aja ning kronotoobi vormid romaanis. Ajaloolise poeetika põhijooni” (*Формы времени и хронотопа в романе. Очерки по исторической поэтике*, 1975 (lõppmärkused 1973. aastast); vt Bahtin 1987: 44–184) esitatud kronotoobikontseptsioonile, mis märgib “Kirjanduses hõlvatud aja- ja ruumisuhete olemuslikku seost” ning tähendab sõna-sõnalt “aegruum”:

Ilukirjanduse kronotoobis toimub ruumi- ja ajatunnetuste kokkusulamine mõtestatud ja konkreetseks tervikuks. Aeg surutakse kokku, teda tihendatakse, ta muutub kunstiliselt nähtavaks; ruumi aga intensiivistatakse, lülitatakse aja, süžee, sündmuste kulgu. Aja tunnused avalduvad ruumi kaudu, ruum aga leiab mõõtmist ja mõtestamist aja kaudu. Niisugune aja- ja ruumitunnuste põimumine ning ühtesulamine iseloomustab kunstilist kronotoopi. (Bahtin 1987: 44.)

Lisaks rõhutab Bahtin, et

Kronotoop kui aja peamine kehastaja ruumis on niisiis kujutatava konkretiseerimise keskpunkt romaanis. Kõik romaani abstraktsed elemendid, filosoofilised ja sotsiaalsed üldistused, ideed, põhjuste ja tagajärgede analüüsid jne. suunduvad kronotoopi ning saavad seekaudu liha ja vere – omandavad kunstilise kujundlikkuse. Niisugune on kronotoobi kujutatav tähendus. (Bahtin 1987: 177–178.)

Niisiis toimib kronotoop “kahe kogemusliku ja diskursiivse korra – ajaloo ja kunstisfääri – vahendajana, luues fiktsionaalseid keskkondi, kus muutuvad nähtavaks teatavad ajaloolised võimukonstellatsioonid” (Stam 1989: 11). Stam juhib erilist tähelepanu Bahtini süsteemis eksisteerivale konkreetsele piirile fiktsionaalsete aegruumiliste struktuuride ja reaalse elumaailma tegelikkuse vahel: esimene *vahendab* teist, nad küll korreleeruvad, ent ei kattu (Stam 1989: 11). Ehkki Bahtin manitseb mitte ajama segi “kujutatud maailma” “kujutatava maailmaga, nagu seda on tehtud ja ikka veel tehakse (naiivne realism)”, leiab ta samas ometi, et

niisama lubamatu on ka selle põhimõttelise piiri absoluutseks ja ületamatuks kuu-
lutamine (lihtsustav dogmaatiline lahterdamine). Hoolimata kujutatud ja kujutava
maailma ühtimusest ja neid lahutavast põhimõttelisest piirist, on need maailmad
teineteisega ometi lahutamatu seotud ja mõjutavad vastastikku pidevalt teineteist;
nende vahel toimub pidev vahetus, analoogiline ainevahetusega elusorganismi ja üm-
britseva keskkonna vahel: organism elab keskkonnas, aga ei ole sellega üks; kui organism
sellest keskkonnast välja rebida, siis ta hukub. Kirjandus- ja kunstiteos ning selles kju-
tatud maailm kuuluvad reaalsesse maailma ja rikastavad seda; reaalne maailm lülitub
teostesse ja selles kujutatud maailma nii loomeprotsessi ajal kui ka teose hilisematel
eluperioodidel, mil teda pidevalt taasluuakse kuulajate-lugejate retseptiooniprotsessis.
Vahetusprotsess on, mõistagi, kronotoopne: ta leiab aset ajalooliselt arenevas sotsiaalses
maailmas, olles ühtlasi seotud muutuva ajaloolise ruumiga. (Bahtin 1987: 180.)

Kuigi Bahtin ise filmikunsti ei puudutanud, on rida hilisemaid kinoteadlasi pidanud
kronotoopi ülimalt käepäraseks ja viljakaks analüüsiraamistikuks (vt nt Mercer 1988;
Turovskaya 1989; Willemen 1989; Stam 1989; Montgomery 1994; Deltcheva, Vlasov
1997; Vice 1997; Sobchack 1998; Naficy 2001; Massood 2003b; Ganser *et al* 2006;
Alexander 2007 jpt). Robert Stam on koguni leidnud, et kronotoop sobib

ehk kirjandusest pareminigi filmile, sest kui kirjandus toimib virtuaalses sõnaruu-
mis, siis filmi kronotoopi võib mõista üsna tähttäheliselt, ekraanil konkreetselt ja
kindlas mõõtkavas aset leidva ning otseselt ajas kulgeva (tavaliselt 24 kaadrit sekun-
dis) nähtusena, mis eristub selgelt konkreetsete filmide väljamõeldud aegruumidest.
(Stam 1989: 11; vt ka Stam *et al* 1992: 218, Stam 2011: 218.)

Mitmel puhul toetun Bahtini enda kirjeldatud kronotoopidele, näiteks idüll, tee
ja lävi, analüüsides nende kaudu konkreetsete filmide ruuminarratiive või kirjeldades
Nõukogude Eesti filmiajaloo teatavatel perioodidel valitsenud suundumusi ruumirep-
resentatsioonides. Ent veelgi tulemuslikumaks osutub kronotoobianalüüs siis (nagu
täheleb ka Stam), kui püüda Bahtini olemuslikult filmieelsesse perioodi kuuluvatele
kirjanduslikele kronotoopidele filmivastete otsimise asemel konstrueerida spetsiifilisi
filmikronotoope (Stam 2011: 218). Õigupoolest võib ju järgnevais artiklis defineeritud
mõisteid “rahvusruum” ja “nõukogude ruum” pidada samuti omamoodi kronotoopideks
(mis võiksid seejuures omada kasutusväärtust nii väljaspool filmikunsti kui ka väljaspool
Nõukogude Eesti kino). Üldisemas plaanis saab aga kronotoobianalüüsi pidada minu
käsitluste metodoloogiliseks raamiks ja mudeliks selles mõttes, et see

toimib kolmel [sageli ühtepalmunud – *E. N.*] tasandil: esiteks kui vahend, mille
kaudu kujutatakse tekstis ajalugu [sh tegelikku maailma – *E. N.*]; teiseks kui aja- ja

ruumikujutiste vaheline suhe romaanis [või filmis – *E. N.*], mille toel konstrueeritakse igasugune ajaloorepresentatsioon; ja kolmandaks kui teksti enese, selle süžee ja jutustaja vormiomaduste ning teiste tekstidega eksisteerivate vahekordade kirjeldamise viis. (Vice 1997: 201–202.)

Sellesse üldisesse kontseptuaalsesse karkassi mahuvad üsna hästi minu projekti põhi-eeldused ja -strateegiad, peaesmärgid ja -vahendid. Lisaks, nagu Bahtin rõhutas inimolemise ja kogu kultuuri sügavat dialoogilisust¹³, toimivad need kolm üldtasandit laiahaardelise ja olemuslikult heterogeense vestlusplatvormina, kus kohtuvad mitmesugused teooriad, vaatenurgad ja viited; see on skelett, mis kaetakse analüüsi lihaga (kui kasutada võrdlust, mis oleks ehk Bahtinilegi meeldinud). Neil tasandil pole selgelt tajutavaid ja teravaid piire, pigem kattuvad nad üksteisega teatud osas. Need ei moodusta hierarhiat, vaid on kui mitmekihiline läbihajuv filmikaader, milles kumavad ja sulanduvad erinevad ideed, vihjed ja järeloomid. Nõnda on järgnevate käsitluste mitmesuguste tahkude ja tasandite lahterdamine selle tarindi konkreetseile astmeile teatud mõttes reduktiivne ja abstraheriv tegevus, ehkki samas hädavajalik selgitamiseks kronotoobikateegooria keskset tähtsust minu uurimistöös. Rõhutagem, et nii kronotoop kui ka teised Bahtini ideed pole minu jaoks mitte selgepiirilised valemid või skeemid, toimides pigem juhtlõngade või teoreetiliste “karkudena”.

Esimesel, kõige üldisemal tasandil olen püüdnud vaadelda Nõukogude Eesti filmikunsti paigana, mille aegruumilised konfiguratsioonid annavad nii kaasaegse kui ka ajaloolise tegevusmaailma korral võimaluse jälgida mitmesuguste ajalooliste, kultuuriliste ja ühiskondlike protsesside projitseerumist ja (taas)tootmist kinoekraanil. Niisuguse pürgimuse kõige olulisem tulem on ehk arusaam, et Nõukogude Eesti kino vahekorrad “rahvusliku imaginaarsuse” ja laiema sotsiokultuurilise väljaga vajavad ümbermõtestamist, kusjuures seda tehes tuleb kohaliku konteksti kõrval arvesse võtta ka siinse filmikultuuri kuulumist laiematesse regionaalsetesse (filmi)võrgustikesse. Näiteks lubab levinud arvamuse kohaselt “eesti rahvusfilmi taastekke” (nt Orav 2003: 20jj) perioodiks kuulutatud 1960. aastate filmide ruumi (ja aja-) representatsioonide analüüs heita valgust põhjustele, miks tekkis toona nii kohalikul kinopublikul kui ka suuremal osal eesti filmikriitikutest ületamatuid raskusi Tallinnfilmi toodangu omaksvõtul: isegi kui filmiloojail läks omariikluse puudumise kiuste korda “rahvusmaastike” konstrueerimine kinolinal (“kirjutades” neid teatud määral “ridade vahele”¹⁴), luues nõnda “tõeliselt” rahvuslikku ja kohalikku filmikunsti, ei jõudnud nende sõnumid pahatihti publikuni, sest sidet segasid neid narratiivseid ruume rikkuvad rahvusüleused, s.t nõukogulikud impulsid

¹³ “Olla tähendab suhelda dialoogiliselt. Kui lõpeb dialoog, lõpeb kõik.” (Bahtin 1984b: 252.)

¹⁴ Stami järgi “viitab [Bahtini] dialogism teksti ja tema teiste vahekorrale mitte üksnes suhteliselt jämedakoeliste ja sirgjooneliste žanrite (poleemika ja paroodia) vormis, vaid ka hoopis hajusamal ja subtiilsamal moel, ülemtoonide, pauside, aimatava hoiaku, ütleмата jätmiste ja vihjete kaudu.” (Stam 1989: 14.)

(muu seas teatud narratiivsed ja audiovisuaalsed koodid, aga ka Nõukogude keskparaadi käepikendusena tajutud filmitööstuse ja -kultuuri laiem taust – siirdas ju Nõukogude Vene võim kino siia maile Teise maailmasõja järel transplantaadina, nagu Lennart Meri 1960. aastate lõpus müllusööbivald diagnoosis; vt Meri 1968). Hilissotsialistlike ja varakapitalistlike filmide aegruumilise tekstuuri võrdlev analüüs artiklis “Rahvusmaastikust rahvusriigini. Ümberseadistused filmiruumis ja nõukogudejärgne eesti film”, mis kõrvutab Peeter Urbla tundlikku draamat “Ma pole turist, ma elan siin” (1988) Ilkka Järvilaturi koomilise märuliga “Tallinn pimeduses” (1993), näitab aga ilmekalt, kuidas projitseerisid kinoekraanidele poliitiliselt ja ajalooliselt murrangulised ajad ühel juhul kohalike kogemuste filtri kaudu ja teisel välismaalase silme läbi nähtuna ning mõtestatuna Gilles Deleuze’i liikumispildi ja ajapildi kontseptide kaudu, mida David Martin-Jones on Homi K. Bhabhale toetudes tõlgendanud “rahvuse jutustamise” erinevate artikulatsioonidena (Martin-Jones 2006: 32).

Kronotoopilise eritluse teisel tasandil on huvikeskmes “aja- ja ruumikujutiste vaheline suhe, mille toel konstrueeritakse igasugune ajaloorepresentatsioon”. Sellel tasandil kohtuvad väga erinevad viiteraamistikud, moodustades kireva probleemide ja perspektiivide kaleidoskoobi, millel leidub siiski ka ühiseid nimetajaid, juhtides esimese tasandi “ajaloo representatsioonide” ehk tegeliku maailma kujutuste juurde (või võrsudes neist, olenevalt vaatenurgast). Sellele tasandile mahuvad näiteks arutelud arhitektuuri ja linnaruumi representatsioonide üle, nagu artiklis “Turistlik pilk kui arhitektuuri representeerimise strateegiline vahend. Tallinna vanalinn ja Nõukogude turismiturundus 1960. ja 1970. aastail”, mis keskendub Tallinna vanalinna rollile Nõukogude Eesti turismiturunduse audiovisuaalsetes abivahendites – enamasti lühifilmide (aga mõnel juhul ka täispikkade mängufilmide, vt Näripea 2004, 2005a, 2005b) formaadis vändatud materjalis, mille ülesanne oli reklaamida Tallinna “Nõukogude Lääne” ühe kuumima reisisihtpaigana potentsiaalsetele külalistele teispooll raudset eesriiet. Nõnda olid need ekraaniteosed osa mehhanismist, mis pidi tagama konventeeritava välisvaluuta sissevoolu Nõukogude Liitu, kus seda vajati hädasti üleliidulise majandusliku (ja ideoloogilise) masinavärgi püstitamiseks. Samuti liigitub siia artikkel “Postkoloniaalsed heterotoopiad Marek Piestraki Eestis kaastoodetud filmides. Parafilmiline tõlgendus” selle poola lavastaja kultusstaatusse tõusnud koostööfilmidest Tallinnfilmiga, iseäranis ulmežanrisse kuuluva “Navigaator Pirxi” analüüs, mille tegevusmaailma kuuluv modernistlik arhitektuur funktsioneerib ühelt poolt rahvusülesuse tunnusmärgina, ent mille narratiivse ruumi lähemal vaatlusel selgub, et narratiivi ja esituse sõnumid võivad teinekord olla vastuoklikud (Umberto Eco sõnul on see kultusfilmide üldtunnus (vt Eco 1985) ning Ewa Mazierska on märkinud, et niisugused sisu- ja väljendusplaani konfliktid kummitavad Ida-Euroopa kino sageli). Ja viimaks võiks siia paigutada ka käsitluse 1950. aastate filmides figureerivatest “pahelistest villadest”, milles liituvad erinevad ajakihistused ja kontrastsed ideoloogilised režiimid.

Sellele tasandile kuuluvad ka maastike ja külakogukondade, aga ka laiemate ja/või abstraktsemate ruumikategooriate, nagu looduse ja piiride representatsioonid, mis on vaatluse all artiklites “Vaade ääremaalt. Ruumidiskursus 1940. ja 1950. aastate Nõukogude Eesti mängufilms”, “Rahvusruum, rahvus(ülene)kino. Eesti film 1960. aastail”, “Loodus, liikumine, piirilised. Rahvusruumi kujutusi 1960. aastate Eesti filmikunstis” ning “Tulnukad ja ajasrändajad. Übermõtestatud rahvusruum eesti ulmefilmides”. Nagu kolmest viimasest pealkirjast näha, on rahvusliku identiteedi (ja sellega ka rahvusfilmi) problemaatika tõusetunud minu uurimistöös möödapääsmatu konstandina, iseäranis muidugi seoses maakohtades asuvate tegevuspaikadega filmide puhul, ent siin-seal ka seoses linnakeskkondadega. Filmiteaduses kõneldakse rahvusfilmist kõige sagedamini Benedict Andersoni (1983: 659) paljutsiteeritud formuleeringu “rahvuse kujuteldav kogukond” valguses. Seejuures on suur osa uurijaid¹⁵ ühel meelel selles, et mitte ükski rahvusokino pole puutumata rahvusvahelistest ja -üledest mõjuritest, seda nii filmitööstuse (tootmise, levi ja linastamisega seotud struktuurid, tarbimismustrid ja -ulatus ning vaatajaskond) kui ka rahvusidentiteedi kujutamise plaanis. Rahvusidentiteeti ennast tuleks aga mõista pigem millegi “omandatava” kui “antuna” (Heath 1978: 10); selle asemel, et kõnelda identiteedist

kui millestki lõpetatust, tuleks kõnelda *identifitseerumisest*, vaadeldes seda jätkuva protsessina. Identiteet võrsub mitte niivõrd meie kui indiviidide sees juba olemas olevast valmisidentiteedist, vaid terviklikkuse *puudumisest*, mis “täidetakse” meist *väljastpoolt* tulevaga, sellega, kuidas me kujutame end *teiste* poolt nähtuna. (Hall 1992: 287–288.)

Nõnda pole ka Nõukogude Eesti filmikunstis representeeritud – ja (taas)toodetud – identiteet püsikindel, pigem on see alatise muutumises ja ümberkujunemises, nagu nii mõneski järgnevas artiklis ka osutatakse. Näiteks Tallinna vanalinna turistlikud representatsioonid näitavad kujukalt, kuidas koha ja selle asukate identiteeti konstrueeriti kohalike ja nõukogude ideoloogia arhitektide pürgimuste risttuultes; neil ambitsioonidel võis küll vahel olla kattuvusi, ent tähendus oli neil kummagi poole jaoks enamasti erinev, lavastades seega ideoloogilise vastupanu ja kohandumise keerukaid etendusi. Kui 1940. aastate lõpus ja 1950. aastate alguses valminud filmides valitsenud sotsrealismi koodid tingisid kahvatult ja puiselt stereotüüpse identiteedilooma mudeli, mis hõlmas antagonistlikke klišeesisid, nagu “kodanlikud natsionalistid” ja “progressiivsed kommunistid”, surudes alla variatsioonid ja pooltoonid ning kanaliseerides lõputu varjundirohkuse šabloonse sotsrealismi liinilt tulnud torustikku (ehkki publikureaktsioonide aspektist mitte alati edukalt, säilitades nõnda teataval määral ebasoovitavat mitmeplaanisust), paljunesid ja killustusid

¹⁵ Nt Crofts 1993; Higson 1989, 2000, 2002a, 2002b; Walsh 1996; Bergfelder 2005; vt ka artiklikogumikke Hjort, MacKenzie 2000; Willimas 2002; Vitali, Willemen 2006; Hjort, Petrie 2007.

identiteedid kinolinal alates 1960. aastaist diferentseeritud (nt soolisteks ja seksuaalseteks) ja suhteliselt ebastabiilseteks konglomeraatideks, ühes samaaegselt oluliselt avardunud ja avanenud ruumitunnetusega. Ehkki rahvusmaastiku mõiste võib iseenesest näida viitavat üheainsa rahvusidentiteedi olemasolule (mida 1970. ja 1980. aastail õõnestasid ja vaidlustasid nii eripalgelised autorid nagu populaarsele ulmežanrile keskendunud Raul Tammet ja radikaalseid eksperimentaalfilme vandanud Jaan Tooming), oli selle areng tegelikult läbinisti dialoogiline, vormudes rahvuslike (kohalike) ning rahvusvaheliste ja -üleste (nii nõukogude kui ka lääne) pingeväljade koostoimel, sest “*Olla tähendab ühenduses olla* [...] *Olla tähendab olla teise jaoks, ja teise kaudu iseenda jaoks.* [...] *Ma ei saa ilma teiseta hakkama, ma ei saa ilma teiseta iseendaks.*” (Bakhtin 1984b: 287.) Teatud tasandil olid Nõukogude Eesti filmi ruumid täis vastakaid vihjeid ja polaarseid tõekspidamisi; isegi pealtnäha “silepindsed” ja ideoloogiliselt viksid filmid varjasid sageli mitmekihilisi aegruumilisi ladestusi ja peenekoelisel keerukaid identifitseerumisprotsesse, mille manöövrite taga aimus ühelt poolt nii nõukogude kui ka lääne päritolu hoobasid ning teisalt kohalikku/rahvuslikku päritolu toimejõude.

Need valdavalt heterogeensed ruumirepresentatsioonid, nii linnakeskkondade kui ka küla- ja loodusmaastike kujul, seostuvad tihedalt Michel Foucault’ heterotoopiakontseptiga. Foucault’ määratleb heterotoopiad “teiste ruumidena” ehk

tõeliste ruumidena ..., mis on omamoodi vastupaigad, teatud mõjusalt ellu viidud utoopia, mis kujutab tegelikke paiku, kõiki kultuuris leiduvaid tegelikke paiku, neid ühtaegu ka kahtluse alla seades ja pahupidi pöörates. Niisugused kohad asuvad väljaspool kõiki teisi kohti, isegi kui nende tegelik asupaik on teada. (Foucault 1986: 24.)

Heterotoopia vastandub utoopiale, “paigale, millel pole tegelikku asukohta” (Foucault 1986: 24) ning allub kuuele printsiibile, millest kolmas, neljas ja kuues on siinse arutelu suhtes eriti asjakohased. Kolmanda printsiibi all kirjeldab Foucault teatri ja idamaiste aedade kõrval kino (ruumi, mille vältimatu osis on ka ekraanile projitseeritud filmi tegevusmaailm), tuues need näiteks heterotoopia siseomasest võimest sõlmida kokku “mitmed ruumid, mitmed paigad, mis on iseenesest vastuoklikud” (Foucault 1986: 25), aga ka, nagu on märkinud Giuliana Bruno, “erinevate ajalookihistuste segmendid” (Bruno 2002: 147). Bruno tõmbab lisaks paralleele ka Foucault’ teise printsiibiga, mille alla paigutub kalmistuheterotoopia: Bruno sõnul “on nii film kui ka kalmistu ... paigad, kus puudub geograafia, või pigem püsikindel, ühetähenduslik ja geomeetiline arusaam geograafiast. Nad kuuluvad ühekorraga mitmesse ajahetke ja liidavad ühte erinevad kohad.” (Bruno 2002: 147.) Foucault’ neljanda printsiibi kohaselt on heterotoopiad “valla” kaht põhitüüpi heterokrooniatele: ühelt poolt aja kogumise ja talletamisega seotud paigad, nagu muuseumid ja raamatukogud, ning teisalt läbinisti ajalikud ja üürikesed kohad, näiteks laadaplatsid ja festivalid (Foucault 1986: 26). Kuuenda printsiibina leiab

Foucault, et heterotoopiad toimivad ülejäänud ruumi suhtes skaalal, mis jääb kahe äärmusliku punkti vahele: ühelt poolt “illusiooniruumidena, milles paljastuvad kõik tõelised ruumid, kõik paigad, millesse inimelu on lahterdatud, kui veelgi illusoorsemad”, ja teisalt korvamisruum, kus luuakse “ruum, mis on teine, veel üks tegelik ruum, samavõrd täiuslik, üksikasjalik ja hästi korraldatud nagu meie ruum on laokil, nigelalt ehitatud ja korratu” (Foucault 1986: 27). Niisuguses mõtteraamistikus võib väita, et rahvusmaastiku ja nõukogude maastiku kronotoobid on olemuslikult heterotoopsed. Nõukogude maastiku puhul põimuvad kompensatsioonimehhanismid stalinistliku sotsrealismi esteetiliste ja ideoloogiliste kaanonitega, mis Evgeny Dobrenko sõnul töötlesid “nõukogude reaalsuse” klanitud, reaalsusvabaks filmirepresentatsiooniks, “tarbekaubastatud reaalsuseks” (Dobrenko 2004: 690), ühtaegu museumiseerides hävitava žestiga “elava ajaloo” (Dobrenko 2008: 9) nii sakraliseeritud keskuses (Moskvas) kui ka provintsidest sellest “kiirgavate mõjutelgede” otstes (Widdis 2003a: 221), ning taandades “aktiivselt toimiva” looduse tausta “maalilisteks jäänusteks” (Widdis 2003b: 186), nagu koorub 1940. ja 1950. aastate eesti filme käsitlevast artiklist “Vaade ääremaalt”. 1960. aastate linasteostes esile kerkinud rahvusmaastik tegi seevastu kõik, et mõnevõrra samasugusel kompensatoorsel moel eemalduda nõukogude tegelikkusest, manades rahvusliku kirjandusklassika ekraniseeringutes kinolinale aegruume, millest hoovas sõdadevahelise omariikluse hõllandust ning mis vastandus valusalt vaatajate argielu trööstitutele realiteetidele. Seega loodi mõlemal juhul “teiste ruumide” imaginaarset geograafiat, sulandades kokku mitu loomult vastandlikku ajaladestust, sest oma suhtelisele eskapismile vaatamata on need filmiruumid vältimatult seotud oma tootmisaegse vahetu ümbritseva tegelikkusega (ja vahest isegi järgneva ajavooluga, kui võtta arvesse hilisemate – näiteks käesolevagi – tõlgenduste aegruumilisi lisakihte). Samas tuleb siiski ka märkida, et kui stalinistlikud filmid kaldusid aegruumi museumiseerima, siis 1960. aastate toodangus võib pigem täheldada efemeersuse, dünaamika ja hetkelisuse ülekaalu, suundumust üürikest tüüpi heterokrooniade poole.

Kui Bahtini kronotoobianalüüsi esimene ja teine tasand, s.t 1) viited laiematele ühiskondlikele, kultuurilistele ja poliitilistele küsimustele ning nendega seotud seisukohavõetud filmides (ajaloo/tegeliku elumaailma kujutused) ning 2) nende ideede kommuniqueerimiseks kasutatud konkreetset aegruumilised konfiguratsioonid seostuvad esmajoones ja peajasjalikult filmide silmanähtava või looritatud sisuplaani ja temaatikaga, siis **kronotoobianalüüsi kolmas tasand** hõlmab “teksti enese ... vormiomaduste” eritelu, mis filmi puhul tähendab ühelt poolt visuaalset esitusvõttestikku, selliseid nn kinotehnikaid nagu misanstseen, kaameratöö, montaaž ja helikujundus, ning teisalt narratiivset vormi. Minu arusaamu sellest kaheosalisest vormitarindist ning viisidest, kuidas see mängu- (aga ka dokumentaal-) filmide ruumiloomes osaleb, on olulisel määral mõjutanud David Bordwelli ja Kristin Thompsoni kirjutised. Isegi kui nende kognitivistlik ja uusformalistlik (eriti Thompson 1988) mõttesüsteem ei veena mind täies ulatuses, on nende arvukad uurimused

kahtlemata suunanud pöörama väärilist tähelepanu misantstseeni, kaameratöösse ja montaaži puutuvate vormiotsustuste ning stilistika keskele rollile filmi ja selle ruumikujutuse (narratiivsete) tähenduste ja sõnumite vormimisel. Nende teosed on pakkunud hindamatut abi filmianalüüsiks vajalike üldisemate juhtnööride kujul (eelkõige Bordwell, Thompson 2004) ja toonud selgust selsse, kuidas konstrueeritakse narratiivset ruumi (ennekõike Hollywoodi stuudiokinos, nt Bordwell 1985a, 1985b). Filmist mõtlemist on õpetanud ka Bordwelli kirjutised filmistiilist (nt Bordwell 1999) ja “ajaloolisest poetikast” (sellest, “kuidas filmid teatud kindlaksmääratud tingimustes komponeeritakse, missuguseid konkreetseid eesmärke need täidavad ja missugust mõju omavad”; Bordwell 1989b: 266–267). Kitsamalt ruumikujutuse plaanis on olnud eriline koht Bordwelli ja Thompsoni käsitlusel Hollywoodi “klassikalise paradigma” koodidest, mis loovad “suletud”, narratiivile alluva ruumi”, seda nii toimiva ja rakendatava mudeli kui ka lähetekoha mõttes, ehkki Nõukogude Eesti filmikunsti puhul kaldub see sageli jääma pigem “vastupidisuse” positsioonile:

Klassikalises paradigmas on ruumiloomes pruugitava süsteemi (“järjestikstiili”) eesmärk allutada ruumilised (ja ajalised) struktuurid narratiivi loogikale, esmajoones põhjuse-tagajärje ahelale. Negatiivses mõttes esitatakse ruumi sellisel moel, mis ei rõõvi tähelepanu valitsevatelt tegevustelt; positiivses plaanis tarvitatakse ruum “lõpuni ära” narratiivselt oluliste tegevuspaikade, tegelaste iseloomujoonte (“psühholoogia”) ja teiste põhjuslike toimijate esitamiseks. Teatavate menetluste kaudu pannakse ruum kui *ruum* ruumi kui *tegevuspaiga* teenistusse. (Thompson, Bordwell 1976: 42.)

Siinkohal on oluline lühidalt peatuda Thompsoni ja Bordwelli käsitlusviisi eeskujudel ja juurtel. Nende loome jätkab filmimõttes võrdlemisi pika ajalooa formalistlikku traditsiooni, mis seab esiplaanile filmi kunstlikkuse, tehislikkuse, selle “suutmatuse jälgendada täiuslikult normaalset visuaalset tegelikkusekogemust”, pakkudes filmitegijatele “võimaluse manipuleerida ja moonutada meie argist reaalsuskogemust” (Buckland 2008: 25). See mõteliin vastandub realistlikule teooriatraditsioonile, mis keskendub “ontoloogilisele” realismile”, filmi “võimele pakkuda vaadet (vahendamata) tegelikkusele” (Elsaesser, Hagenner 2010: 3). Nagu tunnistab Bordwell ise, toetub nende uusformalism “peamiselt slaavi poetikale, täpsemalt teatavatele vene ja tšehhi mõtlejatele, olles mõjutatud ka vähem või rohkem kaudselt “naasmisest slaavi mõtte juurde” nii Todorovi, Genette’i kui ka ajavahe- mikus 1966–1970 valminud Barthes’i töödes ning nüüdisaegsete iisraeli poetide, nagu Meir Sternbergi loomes”, samuti “Bazini, nõukogude filmitegijate ja Burchi kirjutistele, hoidudes samas pühendumast “fenomenoloogilisele”, “materialistlikule” või “serialistlikule” filmitooriale” (Bordwell 1989a: 378). “Vene ja tšehhi mõtlejate” all peab Bordwell silmas formalistliku mõttetraditsiooni teerajajaid: 1920. ja 1930. aastate vene vormikoolkonna liikmeid Juri Tõnjanovit, Boriss Kazanskit ja Boriss Eichenbaumi, kelle ideid kritiseerisid

ja arendasid edasi teiste seas ka Praha Lingvistikaringi kuuluv Jan Mukařovský (vt Eagle 1981; Mukařovský 1978) ning Bahtini ringi esindajad¹⁶. Väga lühidalt kokku võttes oli filmiteooria kui terviku ühe olulisima “allikmõttevooluna” käsitledava vene vormikoolkonna peacesmärk filmi kui esteetilise praktika konkreetse vormieripära väljatoomine (ning selle positsioneerimine ja suhestamine teiste loomevaldkondadega¹⁷), varem kirjandusega seoses arendatud ideede proovilepanek teises kunstiliigis ning filmi ja keele sarnasuste uurimine, mis viis arusaamani, et filmi tuleb vaadelda “pigem märkide ja reeglite süsteemina kui tegelikkuse peegeldusena” (Stam 2000: 49). Formalistlikust mõttepärandist innustus hiljem Noël Burch, kes kuulub samuti Bordwelli ja Thompsoni mõjutajate ringi. Ta oli ameerika filmilooja ja kriitik, kes kolis 1950. aastail Prantsusmaale, jätkates vormikoolkonna filosoofilise traditsiooni kõrval ka eisensteinlikku praktiseerivate teoreetikute liini. Raamatus *Theory of Film Practice* (1973; algselt avaldatud 1969. aastal prantsuskeelsena pealkirja *Praxis du cinema* all), millest ta peagi lahti ütles, formuleeris Burch sestpeale laia kõlapinda võitnud määratlused “filmistiili nullpunkt” ja “institutionaalne kujutusrežiim” tähistamaks valitsevat, s.t (klassikalist) Hollywoodi kino, mille ta mõistis hukka, kuna see varjab tahtlikult “filmiruumi *ambivalentset* loomust” (Burch 1973: 16).

Kuigi Bordwelli ja Thompsoni süsteem on teataval instrumentaalsel tasandil kahtlemata väga efektiivne, kaldun ometi nõustuma Robert Stami bahtinliku vaatenurgaga, mis kritiseerib Bordwelli “ajaloolist poeetikat”, sest ta “eirab seda, mida Bahtin nimetaks vormide eneste ajaloolisuseks: see eirab vorme ajalooliste sündmustena, mis ühelt poolt kujunevad mitmekihilise, ühekorraga nii kunstilise kui ka kunstülese ajaloo toimel ning teisalt ka kujundavad seda ise”, pidades sarnaselt vormikoolkonnale “kunsti vormilis-lingvistiliste võimaluste kompleksiks, kuigi tunduvalt viljakam oleks näha seda ühiskondlike ja diskursiivsete vastuoksuste palju suurema välja osana” (Stam 2011: 210–211). Samuti nõustun Stami arvamusega, et “Stiil, ideoloogia ja ajalugu on omavahel lahutamatu seotud” (Stam 2011: 212) ning olen seega püüdnud seostada filmi vormiplaani eritluse konkreetsete representatsioonide ideoloogiliste ja ajalooliste tagamaadega. Kuigi vormianalüüs moodustab lahutamatu osa kõigist järgnevatest artiklitest, mängib see iseäranis keskset rolli kahes peatükis: “Film, ruum ja vorm: “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?”

¹⁶ Mihhail Bahtini ümber koondunud ringi kaks kõige tuntumat liiget on ilmselt Pavel Medvedev ja Valentin Vološinov. “Formalistliku meetodi provokatiivsest kriitikast” hoolimata jagasid need kaks mõttevoolu (vormikoolkond ja Bahtini ring) siiski ka teatavat ühisosa ja -huve: mõlemad uskusid “kunsti enesele suunatud spetsiifilisusse”, kumbki ei tunnistanud romantilist, väljenduskeskset ehk naiivselt realistlikku kunstikäsitlust ega “soostunud vaarlema kunsti üksnes klassi- ja majandusküsimuste taandatava valdkonnana”. Bahtini ringi dialoogilisuse mõiste oli aga teatud mõttes vormikoolkonna kummastamisidee laiahaardelisem edasiarendus (mille aluseks oli formalistide arusaam kirjanduslikkusest kui “tekstides loomupäraselt sisaldavaid erinevussuhteid” tähistavast kategooriast) (Stam 2011: 62).

¹⁷ Huvitaval kombel väitis Boriss Kazanski artiklis “Filmi olemus” (avaldatud 1927), et õigupoolest seisab film kõige lähemal arhitektuurile: “Arhitektuur vormib mitte pindu ja mahte, nagu teevad maal ja skulptuur, vaid pigem “ruumi”. Täpsemalt liigendab see pinnad ja mahud (või nende vahekorrad) ruumiks ning seega väärib iseseisva kunsti nime.” (Kazanskij 1981: 105.)

ning “Viini postmark” ja “Uued lained, uued ruumid. Eesti eksperimentaalfilm 1970. aastail”. Kui “Film, ruum ja vorm” võtab lähivaatluse alla kaks 1960. aastate peavoolu kuuluvat filmi, lahates nende narratiivseid ruume ja stiilikonnotatsioone poliitilisel ja kultuurilisel murrangulisel sulajal esile tõusta saanud innovaatilise nõukogude kino kontekstis¹⁸, siis “Uued lained, uued ruumid” keskendub Jaan Toominga napile, ent radikaalselt eksperimentaalsele ekraanipärandile, mis löi järk-järgult stagneeruvail 1970. aastail Nõukogude Eesti filmielus totaalse pretседendi, sattudes ootuspäraselt tsensuuri hammasratate vahele. Kõigis tema ekraaniteostes, ent eriti kurikuulsas riulifilmis “Lõppematu päev” (vändatud 1971., lõpetatud 1990. aastal) tähistab mäslav audiovisuaalne vorm otsustavat lahtiütlemist “filmistiili nullpunktist” ja sellest lähtuvast Lefebvre’i mõttes abstraktsest ruumist, õõnestades ja seades kahtluse alla nii nõukogude maastiku kui ka rahvusruumi paatose ning pakkudes nende asemele kompromissitult killunenud aegruumi ja identiteedikompleksi, võideldes esiti avatuse ja mitmekesisuse eest, ent taandudes hiljem metafüüsika sügavustesse.

Arhitektuuri- ja maastikukujutus filmis.

Lühike historiograafia ja muud allikad

Nende kaante vahel avaldatud uurimused ruumirepresentatsioonidest Eesti filmis on põhiolemuselt interdistsiplinaarsed, toetudes seega väga erinevate valdkondade senistele saavutustele. Kasutatud allikate ring hõlmab filosoofiat, filmi-, kirjandus-, arhitektuuri- ja linnateooriat, samuti ajaloolisi käsitlusi nii filmiteadlastelt kui ka mitmesuguste muude distsipliinide uurijatelt, teatri-, kunsti- ja arhitektuuriajaloo-, geograafia- ja urbanistikalaaseid käsitlusi.¹⁹ Lisaks aina kasvavale hulgale uurimustele Ida-Euroopa ja nõukogude filmist üldisemalt, millele minu tõlgendused Eesti filmist kahtlemata osaliselt rajanevad,²⁰ moodustab niisuguse uurimistöö vundamendi kahtlemata väga mitmekesine ja pidevalt täienev teadmus võttepaviljonidesse ehitatud ja natuuris jäädvustatud inimtekkeliste ruumide ja looduslike paikade, linnakeskkondade ja külamaastike representatsioonidest

¹⁸ Kuigi Alexander Prokhorov (2001) kasutab määratlust “uus laine”, pakuksin siiski pigem, et suurem osa toomasest nõukogude kinost, sealhulgas Nõukogude Eesti filmikunst kuuluvad siiski “peavoolu”, sest need linateosed ei olnud enamasti programmilises opositsioonis peavoolu filmitööstusega (nagu prantsuse *Nouvelle Vague*), vaid vändati selle raames. Ehkki pärast stalinistliku sotsrealismi süngel loomepöüda olid need filmid kahtlemata innovaatilised nii visuaalse kui ka narratiivse vormi poolest, aga ka (sageli siiski ettevaatliku ja tihti looritatud) ühiskondliku ja ideoloogilise kriitika mõttes, ei saanud need ometi ligilähedalegi lääne “uute lainete” radikaalsetele seisukohavõttudele või isegi idabloki mõõdukamale “pehmele avangardile” (vt nt Mazierska 2010e Poola filmist ja Owen 2011 Tšehhoslovakkia kinost). Oigupoolsest oli 1920. aastate nõukogude kinoavangard olnud kraadivõrra mässumeelsem ja intensiivsem ning Prokhorov kirjeldab ilmekalt, kuidas “sulaegsed lavastajad kasutavad 1920. aastate avangardse montaažiistiili jäljendusi või otseseid tsitaate 1920. aastate filmidest enamasti melodramaatilist aktsenti vajavates stseenides, kus esitus peatatakse viivuks ning allutatatakse karakterite visuaalsele vaatemängule.” (Prokhorov 2002: 63.)

¹⁹ Täpsemalt vt artiklite bibliograafiatest.

²⁰ Vt viiteid artiklitest ja ülal viide 6.

filmis. Esimene selgelt tajutav huvilaine, mis kõigepealt puudutas arhitektuurikujutust, tekkis 1980. aastate keskpaigas ning puudutas korraga mitut keele- ja kultuuriruumi. Seda märgib kolme monograafia ilmumine: Juan Antonio Ramírez hispaaniakeelne käsitus Hollywoodi kuldajast *La arquitectura en el cine: Hollywood, la edad de oro* (1986, inglise keeles Ramírez 2004), Donald Albrechti ingliskeelne, ent ainediapasoonilt interkontinentaalne uurimus modernistlikust filmiarhitektuurist *Designing Dreams: Modern Architecture in the Movies* (1987) ning Helmut Wehsmanni saksakeelne ja samuti laia huvispektriga *Gebaute Illusionen: Architektur im Film* (1988). Varem oli seda temaatikat puudutatud vaid mõnes üksikus uurimuses ja kogumikus ning harvades artiklites,²¹ ent nendele kolmele teosele järgnes monograafiate, artiklikogumike, artiklite ning tervete erinumbrate tõeline laviin²². Asjaolu, et valdav enamik käsitlusi on põhimõtteliselt juhtumiuuringud ning et filmiruumi või -arhitektuuri puudutavat sidusat ja laialdast kõlapinda haaravat “isandteooriat” pole senini ilmunud, annab tunnistust sellest, et ruumikeskse käsitusviisi potentsiaal on peaaegu hoomamatult suur, tehes teisalt väga keeruliseks valdkonna põhisaavutuste kaardistamise ja summeerimise. Väga lühidalt ja üldistavalt võib siiski tõdeda, et ruumirepresentatsioone on lahatud mitmesugustest rakurssidest ja vaatenurkadest (nt kunstnikutöö ja dekoratsiooniloome²³, filmižanrite,²⁴ autoripositsioonide²⁵ ja suurlinnade kujutamise²⁶ aspektist), erinevates ajaloolistes (alates tummfilmist²⁷ kuni postmodernistliku kinoni²⁸), geograafilistes (Hollywood,²⁹ Euroopa film³⁰ ja maailma kino³¹) ning kogemuslikes³² raamistiketes. Ilmselgelt on uurijaid kõige enam paelunud suurlinnakeskkonna ja modernistliku arhitektuuri filmiportreed (aga

²¹ Varasemat bibliograafiat vt Gold 1984.

²² Nt *East-West Film Journal* (kd 3, nr 1, 1988), *Iris* (nr 12, 1991), *Design Book Review* (nr 24, 1992), *Architectural Design* (kd 64, nr 11/12, 1994 ja kd 70, nr 1, 2000), *Wide Angle* (kd 19, nr 4, 1997), *Screen* (kd 40, nr 3, 1999), *City* (kd 7, nr 3, 2003) ning *Environment and Planning D* (kd 23, nr 1, 2005).

²³ Nt Barsaq 1976; Preston 1994; Sennett 1994; Affron, Affron 1995; Neumann 1997; Tashiro 1998; LoBrutto 2002; Heisner 2004; Ramírez 2004; Bergfelder *et al* 2007.

²⁴ Nt Hake 1994, Natter 1994, Gaughan 2003 ja Graf 2007 linnasümfooniatest; Christopher 1997, Staiger 1999 ja Dimendberg 2004 *film noir*’ist ning Gold 1985, Sobchack 1999, Desser 1999 ja Gold 2001 ulmefilmist.

²⁵ Nt Bruno 1993 Elvira Notari filmidest; Elliott, Purdy 1997 Peter Greenaway filmidest; Jacobs 2007 Alfred Hitchcocki loomingust; Rhodes 2007 Roomast Pasolini teostes; Pallasmaa 2007 Alfred Hitchcocki, Stanley Kubricki, Michelangelo Antonioni ja Andrei Tarkovski filmidest.

²⁶ Nt Sanders 2001, Celant, Dennison 2006 ja Pomerance 2007 New Yorgist; Brunson 2007 Londonist; Rhodes 2007 Roomast; Hake 1994 ja Jacobsen 1998 Berliinist.

²⁷ Nt Gunning 1995 ja Neumann 1997.

²⁸ Nt Dear 2000; Mazierska, Rascaroli 2003; Krause, Petro 2003.

²⁹ Nt Mandelbaum, Myers 1985, 1989; Sennett 1994; Shaal 1996; Bronfen 2004; Ramírez 2004.

³⁰ Nt Sorlin 1991; Penz, Thomas 1997; Konstantarakos 2000; Mazierska, Rascaroli 2003; Everett, Goodbody 2005; Bergfelder *et al* 2007.

³¹ Nt Shiel, Fitzmaurice 2001.

³² Nt Massood 2003a, 2003b afroameeriklaste linnakogemustest filmides.

ka modernsuse kujutamine kinolinal üldisemalt),³³ millest kumbki ei mängi (teatavate märkimisväärsete eranditega) Eesti filmikunstis eriti kandvat rolli. Ida-Euroopa filmile tüüpiliselt (nt Jordanova 2003: 92jj; vt ka Ostrowska 2004) domineerivad Nõukogude Eesti kinos maakeskkonnad ja väikelinnad. Kultuur- ja loodusmaastike teema on “tõlgendajate kogukonna” huviorbiiti sattunud aga üsna hiljuti ning seda teemaderingi puudutavat kirjandust ei leidu veel kuigi ohtralt, uusimatest käsitlustest võiks nimetada näiteks artiklikogumikke *Representing the Rural: Space, Place and Identity in Films about Land* (Fowler, Helfield 2006), *Landscape and Film* (Lefebvre 2006) ning *Cinema and Landscape* (Harper, Rayner 2010).

Mitmesuguste teoreetiliste mõttearenduste keerdkäike “maandab” ja tasakaalustab võrdlemisi põhjalik töö vaatlusaluste filmide kohta säilinud arhiivimaterjalidega. Kuigi Riigiarhiivis talletatud Tallinnfilmi ja Eesti Telefilmi toodangut puudutav dokumendatsioon on paiguti küllaltki lünklik ega hõlma näiteks loome- ja tootmisprotsessi puudutavat (sekundaarset) pildimaterjali, pakuvad need fondid siiski kõnekaid sissevaateid nõukogude perioodi filmitootmisse ja tsensuuripraktikasse, muutudes iseäranis paljuütlevaiks kõrvuti toona trükivalgust näinud filmikriitikaga. Üheskoos annavad need allikad üliväärtuslikku informatsiooni nii otseselt ruumirepresentatsioonide kui ka kaudselt mitmesuguste taustsüsteemide kohta.

Sisukord ja kokkuvõtte

Seeriasse kuuluvad artiklid on kirjutatud ja/või avaldatud ajavahemikus 2006–2011. Uurimuste järjekord järgib nende ainestiku kronoloogiat, alustades käsitlustega vahe- tult pärast Teist maailmasõda valminud filmidest ning liikudes seejärel läbi sula-aastate, stagnatsiooniperioodi ja laulva revolutsiooni Nõukogude Liidu lagunemisele järgnenud siirdeperioodini. Nagu juba mainitud, on pearõhk 1960. ja 1970. aastail, mis on osaliselt uurimisprotsessi juhuslik tulem, ent osalt peegeldab ühelt poolt üsna objektiivset asjaolu, et kuuekümnendad olid eesti filmi jaoks põnevaid arenguid tulvil murranguline ajajärk, ning teisalt minu enda maitset (nt keskendumine 1970. aastate populaarsele kinole või vaatefilmide “madalale” pseudoreklaamžanrile, mitte aga 1970. aastate lõpus ja 1980. aastate alguses esile kerkinud “tõelisele eesti uuele lainele”).

Esimene peatükk **“Vaade ääremaalt. Ruumidiskursus 1940. ja 1950. aastate Nõukogude Eesti mängufilmis”** võtab vaatluse alla Nõukogude Eesti filmikunsti esimese perioodi, mis vältas Teise maailmasõja lõpust kuni umbes 1962. aastani, mängufilmitead- histeks ühelt poolt Herbert Rappapordi “Elu tsitadellis” (1947) ning teisalt uue põlvkonna saabumist märkiv “Ühe küla mehed” (1962), Tallinnfilmis toodetud Jüri Müüri ÜRKI

³³ Nt Sutcliffe 1984; Albrecht 1987; Webb 1987; Caws 1991; Sorlin 1991; Hake 1994; Donald 1995; Gunning 1995; Clarke 1997; Donald 1997; Neumann 1997; Penz, Thomas 1997; Donald 1999; Balshaw, Kennedy 2000; Lamster 2000; Orr 2000; Shonfield 2000; Kaes 2001; Shiel, Fitzmaurice 2001; Barber 2002; Krause, Petro 2003; Mazierska, Rascaroli 2003; Shiel, Fitzmaurice 2003; AlSayyad 2006; Griffiths, Chudoba 2007; Marcus, Neumann 2007; Webber, Wilson 2008; Oukaderova 2010.

diplomitöö. Neil aastail kujundasid kohaliku filmikultuuri palet nn külalislavastajad, kelle Nõukogude keskvõimud olid suunanud endise kodanliku Baltikumi ääremaile, et panna siin alus ideoloogiliselt korrektselt filmikunstile. Ehkki kohalik publik ja valdav osa kriitikuid ei suutnud tookord ega tahta tegelikult senini sellal loodud linatseoseid Eesti kultuuri hulka arvata, tembeldades Venemaalt tulnud lavastajad üdini andetuiks kultuurilisteks võhikuteks, kelle loomel polnud kohaliku kontekstiga vähematki pistmist, pakuvad need filmid, aga iseäranis nende ruumi- ja kohakujutus ometi intrigeerivat sissevaadet valitsenud võimudiskursusse, ideoloogilistesse võngetesse ning nõukoguliku identiteedi konstrueerimise strateegiatesse ja mehhanismidesse. (Samuti ei tohi alahinnata filmitööstuse professionaliseerumist, mis sai programmilised alused siiski alles pärast Teist maailmasõda.)

Ruumirepresentatsioonide analüüsimisel on toetunud John Urry “turistliku pilgu” mõistele (Urry 1990), mis väga lühidalt öeldes viitab staatilisele, hierarhilinele, taltunud ja esemestatud maastikukäsitusele, ruumi ideoloogilisele alistamisele nii geograafilises kui ka mentaalses plaanis. Nõukogude kino kontekstis on turistlikust pilgust ja territooriumi alistamisest kirjutanud Emma Widdis (2000, 2003a, 2003b), kelle vahedad analüüsid 1920. ja 1930. aastate ruumikujutuse režiimist nõukogude filmis on pakkunud kõneka mudeli ka Teise maailmasõja järgse Nõukogude Eesti stalinistliku filmikunsti ruumi- ja neis avalduvate võimukonstellatsioonide lahkamiseks. Widdise järgi asendus 1920. aastail nõukogude kinos valitsenud avangardistlik, detsentraliseeritud, killustunud ja seikluslik ruumikogemus (mida ilmekaimalt väljendas 1929. aastal valminud Dziga Vertovi “Filmikaameraga inimene” (*Человек с киноаппаратом*)) 1930. aastaiks sotsrealismi tuimade dogmadega, mis tõi kaasa täiesti uue, staatilise, kivistunud ja esemestatud maastikukäsituse; maadeavastamine asendus maadevallutusega, uurimisretked turismi-reisidega. Talitsetud, tardunud ja objektistatud ruumimaatriks on omane ka 1950. aastail Nõukogude Eestis valminud mängufilmidele ning tuleb eriti hästi esile loodusmaastike kujutamisel, kus elav ja ettearvamatu loodus taandati passiivseks taustaks (nt filmides “Valgus Koordis” (rež Herbert Rappaport, 1951), “Jahid merel” (rež Mihhail Jegorov, 1955), “Veealused karid” (rež Viktor Nevežin, 1959) jt).

Artikli kolmas oluline teoreetiline allikas on Katerina Clarki uurimus n-ö sakraliseeritud sotsrealistlikust ruumist, mille kohaselt valitses sotsrealistliku kujutuskanooni süvastruktuure teineteisest täielikult eraldatud keskuse ja ääremaa aegruumide hierarhiline vahekorid: keskus oli läbinisti püha ruum, perifeeria profaniseerus aga tsentrumist kaugemale jäädes järk-järgult. Keskus kui võimu aujärg oli ainuüksi riigijuhile reserveeritud tempel, provintsid seevastu kuulusid massidele (Clark 2003: 10–14). Niisugune keskuse ja ääremaa dünaamika (või õigemini staatika) on iseäranis selgelt tajutav Rappapordi filmis “Valgus Koordis”, mille endisest punaväelasest peategelane Paul Runge laseb oma kodukülale paista Venemaalt toodud “Nõukogude paradiisi pühal valgusel”, juhtides kohaliku kolhoosi moodustamist.

Lisaks on selle ajajärgu filmides kujutatud külade aegruum teatud suguluses Bahtini idüllikronotoobiga, mille ajale on omane eriline suhe ruumiga, orgaaniline sunnismaisus:

“...elu ja ta sündmused on orgaaniliselt kokku kasvanud paikkonnaga (kohaga): kodupaigaga koos kõigi ta nurgakeste, koduste mägede, orgude, põldude ja niitudega, koduse jõe ja metsaga, kodumajaga.” (Bahtin 1987: 157.) Ent nõukogude kultuurile eripäraselt pulbitsevad isegi kõige tüünamalt poliitkorrektse pinna all pinged, mis manifesteeruvad perioodi ruumikujutuses ehk kõige kujukamalt nn paheliste villade näol: need on “kodanliku natsionalismi” kantsidena portreeteritud eramajad, näiteks nagu filmi “Elu tsitadellis” tsitadell. See professor Miilase kahe ja poole meetrise planguga ümbritsetud villa on mitte lihtsalt tegevuspaik, vaid üks peategelastest – majast saab August Miilase võrdkuju, need kaks sulavad kokku mingiks omaette eluvormiks. Kuigi Katerina Clark (2000: 195) ja Vera Dunham (1976: 42) on väitnud, et militaristlik-võitluslike tunnustega Teise maailmasõja eelsele nõukogude kultuuriväljale hiilisisid sõja võiduka lõpu järel “pehmemad” väärtused ning isegi teatav väikekodanlikkus, ei saa Eesti kontekstis küll väita, et kodanlikku elulaadi märkiv eramu oleks kandnud positiivseid konnotatsioone. Pigem vastupidi. Miilase tsitadellist, ja hiljem teistestki filmivilladest kujunes sümbol, mis järjekindlalt, filmi filmi järel seostus ikka ja jälle kurjuse, valskuse ja liiderlikkusega, otseselt nõukogude võimu ründava või siis vähemalt seda ohtlikult ja lubamatult õõnestava meelsuse ning tagurliku ilmavaatega. Neil eramutel on paheline fluidum, mis võngub kaasa elanike ebasoovitavate iseloomuomadustega.

Järgmised kolm artiklit käsitlevad 1960. aastate mängufilme. Kaks esimest peatükki keskenduvad rahvusruumi temaatikale küla- ja loodusmaastikke kujutavates linalugudes. Artiklis “**Rahvusruum, rahvus(ülene)kino. Eesti film 1960. aastail**” väidan, et just sel kümnendil kujunes ja kinnistus kogu hilisemas eesti filmis kesket rolli mänginud rahvusmaastiku kronotoop, mille loomises osales 1960. aastate alguses siinsele kinoareenile astunud noorte, sageli kohaliku päritolu filmitegijate põlvkond. 1960. aastate mängufilmis domineerisid tegevuspaigana maakohad ja väikeasulad linlike keskkondade üle, kusjuures Itaalia neorealismist mõjutatud vormikeel asendas stalinistlikult eksotiseeriva “turistliku pilgu” tundlikuma ja mitmekesisema keskkonnakujutlusega. Keskaapaadi temaatilistele suunistele vaatamata on tunda teadlikku irdumist sovetlikust kaasajast (ja seega ka kolhoosielust) ning nõukoguliku ajaloo sõlmpunktidest, mille asemel eelistatakse eesti kirjandusklassika ruraalseid aegruume, nagu filmides “Põrgupõhja uus Vanapagan” (rež Grigori Kromanov, Jüri Müür, 1964), “Mäeküla piimamees” (rež Leida Laius, 1965), “Libahunt” (rež Leida Laius, 1968) jt, otsides, vahel latentselt, kontakti kolhoosielsete külamaastikega. Nõukogude agrourbaniseerunud (Maandi 2005: 180) keskkondade asemel projitseeriti kinolinadele seega siin-seal ikka veel looduseski nähtaval olnud “mälumaastikud”. Need ruumikuvandid, millest sageli õhkub luhtunud lootuste ja kättesaamatute ootuste nukrust, näivad seetõttu teatud mõttes nostalgilised ja eskapistlikudki, sarnanedes seega paradoksaalsel kombel teataval tasandil eelmisel kümnendil nõukogude külalisrežissööride loodud eluvõõraste tegevusmaailmadega. Hoolimata märgatavast nihkest kohaliku sensibiliateedi suunas ning põlvkonnavahetuse

ja poliitiliste olude koostoimes avardunud nii sisulistest kui ka vormilistest väljendusvõimalustest, jäid kohalikud kriitikud filmikunsti kui terviku suhtes kaitsepositsioonile, tekitades aastakümneid valiselt püsiva (ja senini mõju avaldava) eelarvamuse, et eesti film pole suuteline teiste kultuurivaldkondadega võrdväärselt kvaliteetseteks saavutusteks. Leian, et selle taga oli nõukogude filmitööstuse olemuslik rahvusülesus, mis ei lasknud publikul filmikunstiga usaldusväärset suhet luua. Artiklis vaadeldakse lähemalt põlvkonnavahetuse n-ö avalöögina käsitletava filmi “Ühe küla mehed” saamislugu, selle loomisel osalenud filmitegijate taustu ning filmi varasemaga võrreldes olulisel määral teisenenud narratiivseid strateegiaid ja visuaalset vormi, kriipsutades iseäranis alla selles linatõeses avalduvat teadlikku pürgimust kohalikkusele/rahvuslikkusele.

Artiklis “**Loodus, liikumine, piirilisus. Rahvusruumi kujutusi 1960. aastate Eesti filmikunstis**” nüansseeritakse eelnevas peatükis esitatud üldkontseptsioone, analüüsides üksikasjalikumalt kümnendi filmide maastiku- ja looduskuvandeid. Stalinismijärgsest kinost kadusid järk-järgult heroilised, staatilised ja monumentaalsed maastikupildid, kõigepealt alates 1950. aastate keskpaigast suuremate keskstuudiote toodangus (nt Marlen Hutsijevi ja Feliks Mironeri “Kevad Zarečnajaal” (*Весна на Заречной улице*, 1956), Mihhail Kalatozovi rohkete auhindadega pärjatud “Kured lendavad” (*Летят журавли*, 1957) või Grigori Tšuhrai paljukiidetud “Ballaad sõdurist” (*Баллада о солдате*, 1959)), ent 1960. aastate alguses ka juba perifeersemate vabariiklike, sh Eesti stuudiote loomingus. Inimesed ja nende argielu, mis stalinistlikes filmides olid seisnud pitoresksetest maastikutaustadest kindlalt lahus, taasühendati nüüd looduse, selle rütmide ja stihiatega: nt “Ühe küla mehed”, “Jääminek” (rež Kaljo Kiisk, 1962) või “Kirjad Sõgedate külast” (rež Jüri Müür, 1966). Loodusest sai aktiivne toimija, sündmustiku käivitaja ja suunaja (nt “Ühe küla mehed”, “Jääminek”). Nagu on väitnud Jevgeni Margolit, muutusid filmimaastikud sula ajal “asendamatuteks väljendusvahenditeks, mille abil kuvada ekraanile inimeste sisemaailmu ja hingerännakuid” (Margolit 2001: 34–35; nt “Libahundi” metsikult ohjeldamatu Tiina ja “tsiviliseeritult” vagurate külaelanike võrdlus nende elu- ja tegevuskeskkondade kaudu). Maastikust sai üksiti kohaliku/rahvusliku identiteedi kandja (vrd Agnew 1998).

Kui stalinistlikus ekraaniloomes olid domineerinud bahtinliku idüllikronotoobi jooned (“paikkondlikult piiratud ja “isemajandav” väikemaailm; Bahtin 1987: 157), siis sulaaja filmikunsti aegruumid näitasid süvenevat tendentsi liikuvuse, teisenevuse ja voolavuse suunas. Sellega koos mõeldi ümber ka stalinistlikult püha keskuse ja “ilmaliku” ääremaa suhted. Keskus “desakraliseeriti” niisugustes filmides nagu Marlen Hutsijevi “Plitši värv” (*Застава Ильича*, 1962/1988) ja “Juulivihm” (*Июльский дождь*, 1967) ning Georgi Danelia “Ma kõnnin Moskva tänavail” (*Я шагаю по Москве*, 1964), milles Brinton Tench Coxe sõnul valitseb “voolav” ning “isiklik, intiimne ja lüüriline” ruum (Coxe 2008: 215). Ka eesti filmide ruumikuvandid muutusid dünaamilisemateks, osaliselt kahtlemata tänu vaheldusrikkamale kaameratööle ja montaažimustritele ning uuele

dramaturgilisele võttestikule. Idüllikronotoobi asemele astus teekronotoop (Bahtin 1987: 172) ning olulist rolli hakkasid mängima piirikujundid. Kõige puhtamal kujul avaldub teekronotoop 1967. aastal valminud Kaljo Kiisa filmis “Keskpäevane praam”, mida lisaks iseloomustavad nii Ida- kui ka Lääne-Euroopa uutes lainetes esile tõusnud uut tüüpi narratiivsed strateegiad (vrd Roman Polański “Nuga vees” (*Nóż w wodzie*, 1961). “Keskpäevases praamis” on

“Tee” ... peamine juhuslike kohtumiste koht. Teel ... ristuvad ühes aja ja ruumi punktis kõige erinevamate inimeste – kõigi seisuste, seisundite, usutunnistuste, rahvuste, vanuserühmade esindajate – teekonnad ajas ja ruumis. Siin võivad juhuslikult kohtuda need, keda tavaliselt eraldab sotsiaalne hierarhia ja ruumiline kaugus, siin võivad tekkida kõige erinevamad kontrastid, võivad kokku põrgata ja teineteisest läbi põimuda erinevad saatused. [...] Teel aeg justkui suubub ruumi ja voolab ruumis (moodustab teid)... (Bahtin 1987: 172.)

Kui “Keskpäevase praami” narratiivne hoog ning elegantselt mõjuv juhuste mäng olid (ja mõnes mõttes on senini) eesti filmis mõneti erandlikud, siis liikumine ühest aegruumist teise iseloomustas veel tervet rida 1960. aastail valminud filme, rõhutades ühtlasi piiri kui ruumikategooria kesket positsiooni mitte ainult filmikunstis, vaid ka siinses kultuuris tervikuna. Ehkki piirid olid täitnud olulist osa juba 1950. aastate filmides (enamasti püüti siinsete alade piiripealsust küll maskeerida, piiritagust läänemaailma tasalülitada, siduda ääremaad kõvemini keskuse nabanööri külge), sai piirilisusest 1960. aastail vahend, mille abil konstrueerida eripärast kohalikku identiteeti. Piir võis esineda merena, mis lahutab läänemaailmast (“Ühe küla mehed”) ja/või sõdadevahelisest iseseisvusest (“Jääminek”), aga ka nähtamatu joonena maa ja taeva vahel (“Põrgupõhja uus Vanapagan”), müürina hullumeelsuse ja terve mõistuse vahel (“Hullumeelsus”, rež Kaljo Kiisk, 1968), tarana oma ja võõra vahel (“Libahunt”). Seega ei pruugi piir olla üksnes ruumiline, vaid ka mentaalne ja/või ajaline, lahutades siia- ja sinnapoole Teist maailmasõda jäänud olemisviise.

Uurimuses “**Film, ruum ja vorm: “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?” ning “Viini postmark”**” on vaatluse all kahe 1960. aastail valminud ja kümnendi kontekstis üsna erandlikult linnakeskkonda paigutatud tegevustikuga filmi ruumikuvandid. Konkreetsemalt analüüsitakse seda, mil moel neis filmides ruumiaspekte kasutatakse ning kas ja kuidas põimuvad kujutatud keskkonnad jutustuse jõujoontega. Artikli esimese osa moodustab üldisem vormianalüüs, teeviidaks David Bordwelli väide, et teose “sisu jõuab meieni [filmi] tehniliste võtete sihipärase kasutamise vahendusel” (Bordwell 2005: 33), ning nõukogude sulaja filmi uurija Alexander Prokhorovi teesid (Prokhorov 2002).

Alexander Prokhorov tõestab võrdlemisi veenvalt, et kuigi filmitegijad pidasid 1960. aastail oma loomingut stalinistliku kino antiteesiks, keskendusid nad – tõsi, modifitseeritud vormis – endiselt stalinistliku kultuuri tähtsaimatele teemadele: positiivne

kangelane, perekond ja sõda. Samas toimus oluline nihe mõõtkavas: stalinistlik suurejooneline heroism asendus kammerlikumate ja isiklikumate saavutuste ning kordaminekutega, lahinguväljade asemel keskenduti sageli kodusele miljöole, (tuum) perekond ei peegeldanud enam ühemõtteliselt Suurt Rahvaste Peret, massidele eelistati nüüd (messosoost) indiviidi, kelle identiteet, personaalne eneseväljendus ning tundemaailm sai sageli lugude sõlmpunktiks. Märkatava transformatsiooni läbis kangelaste ja kaabakatega seonduv ikonograafia (Prokhorov 2002: 51jj; Prokhorov 2001: 8jj). Oluliseks muutus ka stalinistliku režiimi päevil kaotsi läinud revolutsioonilise meelsuse taastamine ning 1920. aastate “puhaste”, leninlike ideaalide juurde naasmine (Prokhorov 2002: 30–31). Need narratiivsed jooned esinevad ühel või teisel moel mõlemas vaatlusaluses filmis.

Ametlikult hülgas stalinistliku filmi peavool 1920. aastate nõukogude avangardi eksperimentaalse, mitmesuguste filmitehnoloogiate, ennekõike aga montaaži võimalustel põhineva kujutusviisi. Sula-aeg tõi 1950. aastate teisel poolel kaasa laiahaardelisema väljendusvahendite värskendamise, mida muuhulgas iseloomustab visuaalsete aspektide eelistamine narratiivsetele ja helilistele (Prokhorov 2002: 12–13): Euroopa autorifilmi eeskujul tõusis esiplaanile katsetamine erinevate ekraanitehnikatega (kiiretempoline montaaž, mis alati ei järginud ajalis-ruumilise selguse põhimõtteid, sagedased ülesulamisega kaadriüleminekud, keerulised panoraamvõtted ning subjektiivsed võttepunktid ja kaameramustrid (Prokhorov 2002: 13). Nõukogude filmikunsti ajaloost taaselustati eelkõige 1920. aastate avangardi montaažitehnikad. Avangardi stiili jälgendati või tsiteeriti pea alati narratiivsetel kõrghetkedel, mil jutustus peatati viivuks näiteks tegelase tugevate tunnete ja tema subjektiivse vaatepunkti edastamiseks. 1920. aastate avangard oli sula-ajaks saanud osaks kaanonist, mille kasutamine pigem toetas 1930. aastail loodud narratiivse režiimi mitmekesisemist (Prokhorov 2002: 62–67; vt ka Maimik 1999: 85), kui püüdis õhnestada viimase aluseks olevat ideoloogiat.

Uenduslikke visuaalseid stiilielemente võib üsna ohtralt leida nii “Viini postmarkist” (rež Veljo Käsper, 1967) kui ka “Lapeteusest”. Üldjoontes on “Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega?” (rež Grigori Kromanov, 1966) selles plaanis huvitavam ja mitmekesisem, ent mõningaid dünaamilisi pildilahendusi pakub ka “Viini postmark”. Märkimisväärselt kuuluvad paljud neist kaameratöö ja montaaži valdkonda. “Lapeteust” ja “Viini postmarki” ühendab sage altrakursi kasutamine, mis korduvalt keskendub ainsale, hetkel tähtsaimale tegelasele, sugereerides tema (võimu)suhteid teiste karakteritega, osutades tema jõupositsioonile, viidates seejuures ka tema enesekindlusele.

“Lapeteust” ja “Viini postmarki” seob ühine geograafiline tegevuspaik ning suhteline lähedus nii diegeetilisel kui ka tegelikul ajateljel: aastase vahega valminud filmid käsitlevad oma kaasaegses Tallinnas toimuvaid sündmusi. Samas loovad need linatõesed kaks võrdlemisi erinevat ruumimudelit, eelistades isesuguseid filmielemente ning ruumi ja narratiivi ühendamise viise. Kui “Lapeteuses” tundub domineerivat tugevalt personaliseeritud ruum,

kus reaalsusest valitud või spetsiaalselt filmi tarbeks konstrueeritud tegevuspaik sugereerib mõne tegelase vaimuseisundit, märgib tema sotsiaalset positsiooni ja väärtushinnanguid või kannab osaliste vahel valitsevate (võimu)suhete väljendamise funktsiooni, siis “Viini postmargis” tõuseb lisaks ruumiliste polaarsuste kaudu tegelaste küllaltki karkeerivale iseloomustamisele kaunis selgelt esile ka taotlus tõmmata mõttelisi paralleele keskkonna ning jutustuse teatud süžeealiste arengute vahel. Arhitektuuri- ja sisustuselemendid kui kujundid on silmatorkavamalt markeeritud “Viini postmargis”, samas kui “Lapeteuses” on ehitatud keskkond ja selle detailid punutud narratiivi märksa lihvitumalt ja peenekoelisemalt. Nii on “Lapeteuses” ehk olulisemal kohal filigraanne kaameratöö ja tegelaste hästikaalutletud asetus kaadris, samuti montaaž, mis säilitab jätkuvuse suhteliselt killustatud, ajas ja ruumis siia-sinna hüppavas süžees, “Viini postmargis” tõusevad esile aga (stuudio)dekoratsioonid ja natuurivõtete ehitatud keskkond. Need erinevused tulenevad muuhulgas ilmselt ka filmide žanrilistest erinevustest: “Lapeteus” kui suhte- ja isikudraama peabki keskenduma inimloomusele ja -suhetele, “Viini postmark” järgib aga komöödiadžanrile sageli omast joont kasutada koomiliste situatsioonide allikana ümbritseva keskkonna elutute objektide “hingestamist”. Paralleelina võiks viidata Charlie Chaplini ja Jacques Tati komöödiaklassikasse kuuluvale loomingle, ent samuti näiteks René Clairi filmile “Vabadust meile!” (*À nous la liberté*, 1931), millega “Viini postmarki” ühendab muuhulgas ka modernistliku arhitektuuri kujundistu. Tähtis erinevus “Lapeteuse” ja “Viini postmargi” ruumikäsitluses eksisteerib ka võttepaikade osas: kui “Lapeteus” on, nagu eespool mainitud, filmitud põhiliselt naturis, siis “Viini postmargis” domineerivad paviljonivõtted.

Neli järgmist artiklit võtavad vaatluse alla 1970. aastate filmiruumid. **“Turistlik pilk kui arhitektuuri representeerimise strateegiline vahend. Tallinna vanalinn ja Nõukogude turismiturundus 1960. ja 1970. aastail”** jätkab omal moel eelnevas tõusetunud piiripealsuse, vahepealoleku teemat, keskendudes sellele, kuidas Tallinna vanalinn toimis vaatefilmides representeerituna ühekorraga nii sovetlike turismiturundusmehhanismide hoovana kui ka kohaliku kultuurilise isolemise tunnismärgina. 1960. ja 1970. aastail kerkis Nõukogude Eesti kultuuriruumis – nii teaduslikus kui ka populaarses diskursuses, nii visuaal- kui ka kirjakultuuris – esile laialdane huvi Tallinna vanalinna kujundistu ja temaatika vastu. Algselt muinsuskaitsete ja restauraatorite tööpõllult lähtunud ajakirjanduslik diskussioon haaras 1960. aastail kiiresti kohaliku haritlaskonna tähelepanu, omandades peagi latentse rahvusliku vastupanu alatoonid, mis asetas ametlikuks arhitektuuriparadigmaks sätestunud, eripärasid tasalülitava modernismi vastu vanalinna unikaalse ajaloolise keskkonna ja moodustas nii üle okupatsiooni toodud kultuurikatkestuse silla lokaalse traditsiooniga. Kummatigi lahustus see eristumistahe üldise keskajavaimustuse laineharjale tõustes massiliseks romantilis-nostalgiliseks retrokujundistuks, “vanalinnamoeks”, mis tõmbas mõttelise võrdusmärgi vanalinna ja keskaja vahele ning “gootilik”-arhaiseeriv visuaalia levis plahvatuslikult lugematu hulga tarbeesemete, arvukate interjöörikujunduste ning terve rea mängu-, vaate-, dokumentaal- ja kontsertfilmide

kaudu (vt pikemalt Näripea 2004, 2005a). Esiti reaalse linnaruumi, hiljem ka selle representatsioonide tasandil hakiti vanalinna euroopalik keskaegne kujundistu sovetliku impeeriumi kirjusse kultuuriseljankasse, asendades vanad tähendused ja funktsioonid uutega, museumiseerides argise ruumi tardunud ja kaubastatud objektikollektsiooniks. Nõnda rakendus vanalinn nõukogude progressiivsuse kuvandisse, mis mängis ühtlasi paljuski lääne “vaatemänguühiskonna” mängureeglite järgi selleks, et turismitööstuse kaudu laekuva “kõva raha” arvel karpida Liidu ohtlikult paisuvat välisvõlga. Läänelikkus omakorda hakkas toimima nii sotsialistliku paratamatusega kohandumise kui ka sellele teatud moel vastandumise mehhanismina.

Kuna turismiturunduse hoovad mängivad vaatefilmide tootmisel äärmiselt olulist rolli, vaatlen artiklis John Urry jt turismiteoreetikute kirjutiste abil nn turistliku pilgu toimet linnaruumi representatsioonidele, mis ühtlasi haakub suurepäraselt Nõukogude Liidu Teise maailmasõja järgses kinotööstuses ametlikult soositud kõneviisidega ning konkreetselt Tallinna vanalinna kinematograafilise kujutamise. Samuti käsitlen turistlikule kujutamisaadile iseloomulikke filmitehnilisi võtteid, vormiaparatuuri ja stilistikat, lähtudes vaatefilmide kui olemuslikult turismitööstust teeniva žanri traditsioonidest.

Kui need turistlikud lühifilmid paigutusid “ametliku” nõukogude ideoloogia diskursusse, siis **“Uued lained, uued ruumid. Eesti eksperimentaalne film 1970. aastail”** keskendub mässumeelse Jaan Toominga autorifilmidele, mille eesmärk oli valitsevate jõudude õõnestamine. Toominga särav, ehkki mitte alati lõpuni lihvitud loominguline panus Eesti filmipärandisse väärib omaette miniatuurse uue laine tiitlit, tekitades siinse filmiajaloo taustal omamoodi pretsedendi. Tema mitmetahulist, intrigeerivaid väljendusvahendeid ja tähenduskihistusi tulvil filmiloomet iseloomustab iseäralik ruumikasutus ja -kujutus, mis nii mõneski mõttes kehtestab siinsel filmiväljal sootuks uue korra, pakudes ühtaegu provokatiivseid hinnanguid ning uusi vaatenurki rahvuslike, sotsiaalsete ja personaalsete identiteetide representeerimisele nii ajaloolises kui ka kontseptuaalses plaanis. Artikkel keskendub peamiselt ruumikujutusele ja -praktikatele, põigates siin-seal isiklike ja kollektiivsete identiteetide re/konstrueerimise valda.

Kogu kümnendi jooksul jõudis Toominga vändata üksnes neli filmi, mille loominguks kaalu on siiski raske ülehinnata: “Lõppematu päev” (Eesti Telefilm/Eesti Kultuurifilm, 1971, lõpetatud 1990) ja “Värvilised unenäod” (Tallinnfilm, 1974), mõlema kaaslavastaja Virve Aruoja; “Põrgupõhja uus Vanapagan” (1977, Eesti Telefilm; algselt Vanemuises etendunud teatrilavastuse televersioon, mis on siiski palju enam kui filmilindile talletatud teatritükk) ning “Mees ja mänd” (Eesti Telefilm, 1979). Peeter Linnapi sõnul meenutab Toominga filmide “vormikeele dünaamilisus ja ekspressiivsus” ennekõike prantsuse uue laine lavastajate (Jean-Luc Godard'i jpt) loomingut, aga ka 1960. aastate algul Ida-Euroopa (Tšehhoslovakkia, Poola, Ungari) ja Nõukogude Liidu režissööride sarnastest impulssidest tõukunud väljenduslaade (Linnap 2002: 62). (Eesti (filmi)kultuurile üldisemalt ja Toominga arengule autorina konkreetselt olid ehk kõige olulisemad

Poola ja Tšehhoslovakkia mõjutused.) Mulle tundub aga, et 1950. aastate lõpu ja 1960. aastate alguse Prantsuse või Ida-Euroopa/Nõukogude päritolu uute lainete asemel tuleks Toominga filmikunst nii kontseptuaalses kui ka vormilises mõttes asetada pigem eksperimentaalfilmi avaramale väljale, mille vormilis-stilistilised tunnused on loobumine traditsioonilisest (lineaarsest) narratiivist, abstraherivate visuaalsete võtete ja ebakonventsionaalse heliriba kasutamine.

Kui peavoolu(mängu)film loob Henri Lefebvre'i mõttes "abstraktset ruumi", mis "kustutab formaalse ja kvantitatiivsena erinevused", "kaldudes homogeensuse ning olemasolevate erisuste või iseärasuste kõrvaldamise poole" (Lefebvre 1991: 49, 52) ning olles "kodanluse repressiivne majanduslik ja poliitiline ruum" (Merrifield 2000: 175), s.t ühtaegu ka valitseva võimu ja ideoloogia ruum, siis eksperimentaalsemas filmiloomes, sh Toominga ekraanitöödes on valdav "eristuv ruum", mis pürib erisuste, variatsioonide, mitmekesisuse poole. Niisugusena kujutab see endast tõelist ohtu abstraktse ruumi muutumatusetele ja kestmajäämisele, mis teeb kõik selleks, et eristuvat ruumi tasalülitada või vähemalt varjata või selle mõju piirata ja kitsendada.

1971. aastal Tallinna tänavail vändatud "Lõppematu päev", nagu ka Toominga teised filmid, vastandub radikaalselt 1950. ja 1960. aastail Eesti mängufilmis valitsenud ruumidiskursusele. Selle mäsurevalt killunenud linnaruum ja palavikulised rütmid on diametraalses kontrastis 1960. aastate mõnevõrra romantiliste ning enamasti võrdlemisi aeglaste ja rahulike maaelustseenidega, mille looritatud rahvuslikud ambitsioonid on hoopis midagi muud kui Toominga jultunud ja väljakutsuvalt salvav kriitika nõukogude süsteemi aadressil. Toomingat painab rahulolematuse mitte üksnes teda vahetult ümbritseva sotsiopolitiilise situatsiooni, s.t nõukogude tegelikkuse toimemehhanismidega, vaid ka urbaniseerunud, tarbekaubastunud ja institutsionaliseerunud tsivilisatsiooni, olgu see kapitalistlik või sotsialistlik, arengusuundadega. Niisugused allhoovused saavutavad haripunkti tema viimases filmis "Mees ja mänd", mille aedlinnakodust pagenud peategelase rännakus läbi agrourbaniseerunud Eestimaa väljendub täieliku lootusetuse tunne, autori ahastamapanev avastus, et isegi metsikus looduses, mida tähistab pealkirjaski mainitud mänd, ei pruugi leiduda elujõulist alternatiivi inimkonna läbinisti rikutud eksistentsile ning selle poolt loodud tehiskeskkonnale.

Toominga koha- ja ruumikäsitlus ei keskendu mitte niivõrd konkreetset arhitektuursetele aspektidele, ehkki ta kahtlemata kasutab ehitatud keskkondi teatud olukordadele ja ideedele osutamiseks. Pigem vaatleb ta ruume ja paiku inimõtte, -identiteetide ja -suhtluse väljendustena. Nõnda on kõigis Toominga filmides oluline koht kehal ja kehalisel kogemusel, samamoodi nagu tema teatriloomeski (Unt 2002). Kehaliselt kogetud ja elatud ruumi mõiste, millele näib toetuvat "Lõppematu päeva" n-ö ruumipoliitika, samuti nagu peategelasest mehe ilmselgelt avatud ja tegus suhe ümbritsevaga suunab tähelepanu Toominga arusaama(de)le personaalsetest ja ühiskondlikest identiteetidest. Filmi peategelast, nimetatud meest, ja tema suhet maailmaga võib vaadelda Bahtini dialoogilise mina kontsepti valguses. Ta täidab mitmesuguseid ülesandeid ja rolle ning võtab

erinevaid seisukohti, lülitudes alatasa ühelt tegevuselt teisele, kulgedes ühest ruumist ja paigast teise, kehastades pidevalt voolava, karnevalliku või groteskse keha sarnaselt välismaailmale avatud bahtinlikult dialoogilist mina (Bakhtin 1984b: 287).

Kaheksa aastat hiljem valminud “Mees ja mänd” säilitab küll “aktiivse optika” ja ruumilise mobiilsuse (esmajoones *road movie*’liku narratiivi kujul), ent erinevalt “Lõppematust päevast” on peategelane ümbritseva füüsilise, ideoloogilise ja vaimse ruumiga lepitamatus konfliktis ja sellest täielikult võõrandunud. Keskkonna (moraalselt) moonunud palet toonitab nii värvilise pildirea väärdunud vormikeel, mille põhülme määrab ülilai kaameraobjektiiv, kui ka arhailise moega kaeblikud kõlad heliribal, mis ühelt poolt küll vastanduvad visuaalsele värvirikkusele, ent teisalt ka täiendavad selle kummastavalt kumerat kalasilmaefekti. Filmi sõnum peegeldab Toominga varasemat skepsist insti-tutsionaliseeritud ja normeeritud identiteetide suhtes, olgu need siis personaalsed või rahvuslikud/kollektiivsed, religioossed või poliitilised, kodanlikud või nõukogulikud, kapitalistlikud või sotsialistlikud, ent see kõneleb ka püsivast lõksusoleku tundest, pak-kumata mingitki positiivset või elujõulist lahendust.

Rahvusruumi ning sellega seotud filmidiskursuse ümbermõtestamise ja kriitikaga tegeleb ka Raul Tammet, kelle lühifilmid “Soolo” (1979) ja “Pulmapilt” (1980) on artikli **“Tul-nukad ja ajasrändajad. Ümbermõtestatud rahvusruum eesti ulmefilmides”** põhiteema. Lüheldasse ulmefilmide tõusulainesse, mille initsieeris 1978. aastal Poola-Eesti koostöös valminud Marek Piestraki kultuslik “Navigaator Pírx”, kuuluvaid Tammeti linatöoseid tabas Toominga filmidega mõneti sarnane saatuse, ehkki hoopis teistel põhjustel: ka need on jäänud siinse kinotoodangu unustustehõlma vajanud ääremaille. Ida-Euroopas vändatud teadusliku fantastika taustal tõusevad Tammeti ekraanitööd esile oma eripärase aegruumi poolest: nii “Soolo” kui ka “Pulmapildi” tegevusmaailmaks on kaasaegne maakeskkond meie koduplaneedil, samas kui suur osa Nõukogude Liidus ja selle mõjusfääris toodetud filme kujutavad lähemat või kaugemat tulevikku kosmoseavarustes. Ühelt poolt on üsna tõenäoline, et tegevuspaiga valikul mängisid olulist rolli eelarvelised põhjused, olid ju need lühifilmid õpipõisitööd (“Soolo” diplomitöö kaheaastasel kõrgematel režiikursustel ja “Pulmapilt” Moskva eksperimentaalfilmistuudios valminud “meistritöö”, millega Tammet sai täieõiguslikuks filmilavastajaks). Teisalt aga annab ruraalne tegevusmaailm tunnistust režissööri soovist sekkuda “imaginaarse rahvusliku kogukonna” (de)konstrueerimise protsessi, sest mõlemad filmid näivad kommenteerivat 1960. aastail kujunenud rahvusruumide kuvandeid, seades kahtluse alla valitsevaid ajaloonarratiive (nii nõukogulikke kui ka sellele vastanduvaid), käsitledes kollektiivseid kahtlusi ja pingeid ning analüüsides kaasaegseid ühiskondlikke koode ja protseduure. Samas tuleb Tammeti linalugude eritlemisel arvesse võtta ka ulmežanri laiemaid taustu ja postmodernismi kultuuridiskursust.

Taas Bahtini kronotoobikäsitusele toetudes vaatlen Tammeti filmides konstrueeritud aegruume ning uurin, kuidas seostub tema loome rahvusruume, -(aja)lugusid ja -iden-titeete puudutavate diskursustega. “Soolo” ja “Pulmapildi” aegruumid on hübriidsed,

haakudes ühelt poolt suletust sisendava idüllikronotoobiga ning sugereerides teisalt tugevat piirilisusmuljet. Lisaks sisaldavad need lähikontakte teiste, võõraste maailmades, mistõttu leidub neis ka Bahtini künnise ehk läve kronotoobi elemente:

Ta võib liituda kohtumismotiiviga, tema kõige olulisemaks täienduseks on aga kriisi ja elumurrangu kronotoop. [...] Aeg selles kronotoobis on tegelikult vaid hetk, ta justkui ei evigi kestust [...] need otsustavad hetked [lülituvad] müsteeriumi- ja karnevaliaja suuremahulistesse kronotoopidesse. (Bahtin 1987: 176.)

Mõlemat filmi iseloomustab mitme erineva aegruumi kohalolu, mis vahetevahel sulanduvad kokku, luues keerukaid ja müstilisi narratiivseid paiku. Kõrvalise, endasestõmbunud ja igava kolka stabiilsust, mis üksiti viitab neid asustavate inimeste võõrandumusele, väljapääsmatuse- ja kurbusetundele, häirib nii “Soolos” kui ka “Pulmapildis” ootamatute võõraste saabumine. Staatilisi (idüll) ja dünaamilisi (tee) elemente kombineerides näib “Pulmapilt” sedastavat, et ajalugu on suletud peatükk ning et elada tuleb olevikus, leppides varasemate otsuste tagajärgedega ja õppides elama saatuse poolt antuga. Seostades kohaliku maakeskkonna eksimatult kaasaegse ajaraamiga ning tulevikku (või väljapoole) vaatava narratiivse sisuga ning pakkudes, et minevik on isegi ajasrändajatele sisuliselt kättesaamatu, ütleb Tammet otsustavalt lahti nostalgiast sõdadevahelise möödajärgi järele, kritiseerides nii 1960. aastate rahvusmaastike eskapismi. Nõnda saab temast “hilissotsialismi kultuuriloo” (Annus 2000b) esindaja, rahvusmütoloogiate postmodernistlik dekonstrueerija. (Selles kontekstis on kõnekas asjaolu, et “Soolo” põhineb 1925. aastal kirjutatud Peet Vallaku novellil “Lodjavahi surm”, mis oli omal ajal innovaatiline teos, just nagu Tammeti filmiloo seitsmekümnendail (samal kui 1960. aastatel ekraniseeriti “peavoolulist” kirjandusklassikat).) “Soolo” kosmoselaeva võib näiteks vaadelda müütilise valge laeva postmodernistliku teisendusena, selle pühaku allegooria iroonilise kommentaarina. Et filmi peategelane, nimetu sillavaht otsustab ufonautidega kaasa minna, suundudes tundmatusse ja kahtlemata põnevasse tulevikku, näib film tervikuna soovivat jätta selja taha nii olnu kui ka kõik suured narratiivid.

Vastupidiselt Toominga ekraaniteostele ei pööra Tammet teravdatud tähelepanu sovetiseerimise nähtavatele haavadele ja armidele maastikus, keeldudes seega osalemast ühiskondlik-poliitilises ohvridiskursuses. Selle asemel pakub ta postmodernistlikult iroonilist ja redigeeritud vaadet rahvusmaastikele, kollektiivsetele müütidele ja identiteetidele. Ta mitte üksnes ei kujuta muutusi, vaid lööb kultuuriliste nihete esilekutsumises ka ise kaasa. Tammeti filmide analüüs näitab muuhulgas seda, et rahvuskinokäsitlused ei tohi vaadata mööda populaarse žanrikino saavutustest.

Kui Toominga ja Tammeti teoste publikumõju oli ja on siiani suhteliselt väike, siis Marek Piestraki ulmefilm “Navigaator Pirx” ja fantaasiaseiklus “Madude oru needus” (*Kłątwa Doliny Węży*, 1988), millele keskendun artiklis “**Postkoloniaalsed**

heterotoopiad Marek Piestraki Eestis kaastoodetud filmides. Parafilmiline tõlgendus” on pälvinud kümnete miljonite vaatajate ja arvukate kriitikute imetluse ning festivalipreemiaidki (“Navigaator Pirx” sai 1979. aastal Trieste ulmefilmide festivalil peapreemia, edestades nii Ridley Scotti “Tulnukat” (*Alien*, 1979)). On mõneti irooniline, et jätkuvat populaarsust ja kultusstaatust nautivad filmid tekitavad nii Poola kui ka Eesti vanema põlve filmitegijates ja -uurijates sama kestva halvakspanu. Väidan, et need “parafilmikunstina” (Sconce 2004: 535) käsitletavat linalood pakuvad tegelikult kujukat sissevaadet oma ajastusse, toonastesse ühiskondlik-poliitilistesse ja kultuurilistesse väärtussüsteemidesse, ihadesse ja hirmudesse, kujutades endast seega põnevat uurimisainest. Piestraki filmide ruumimaailmu uurides toetun põhiosas Foucault’ heterotoopiakontseptsioonile ja mõningatele postkolonialistliku teooria mõttekäikudele.

Piestraki filmid, ent iseäranis “Navigaator Pirx” paigutuvad laiemasse žanritrendi, mis 1970. aastate lõpus vabastas Nõukogude Liidus ja idablokis ulmefilmi kui sellise “surmapatu” staatusest (First 2008a: 318) ning mille õitsengut toitis kahtlemata Hollywoodist alguse saanud “ulmerenessass” (Sobchack 2004: 221). “Navigaator Pirxi” tegevusmaailm on just nagu piirideta, kõikehaarav angloameerikalik lää, mille kangelased ja kurikaelad elavad moodsates klaasist kõrghoonetes ja historitsistlikes paleedes. “Legendaarne seiklusfilm” (Tuumalu 2008) “Madude oru needus” leiab aga aset frankofoonses ruumis: Pariisis ning Kagu-Aasia endistes prantsuse kolooniates (täpsemalt Prantsuse Indohiinas, mis hõlmas Kambodža, Laose ja Vietnami alasid). Kui “Navigaator Pirxi” angloameerikalik tulevik komponeeriti Ameerikas, Poolas, Eestis, Prantsusmaal ja Venemaal filmitud kildudest, siis analepsiseid sisaldava, ent muidu suures osas tootmisaegsesse olevikku paigutuva “Madude oru needuse” võtted toimusid valdavalt Pariisis ja Vietnamis: (võtte)ruum vastab seega narratiivi sisule. Kui “Navigaator Pirxi” ruum on kultuuriliselt monotsentriline ja rahvusülene (futuristlik, linnastunud, kõrgtehnoloogiline lää), siis “Madude oru needuse” aegruumi lõhestavad polaarsused: Euroopa prantsuskeelne süda, lääne tsivilisatsiooni kultuuri ja teadmuse kants, seisab vastakuti oma saladusliku, ohtliku ja anakronistliku orientalse teisega. Siiski on mõlemal juhul tegemist heterotoopiatega, sarnaselt paljude teiste tol perioodil nii läänes kui ka Nõukogude blokis valminud ulmefilmidega, milles modernistlik-manihheistlik utoopia-düstoopia mudel oli asendunud hübriidsema, killunenuma ja hägusama hiliskapitalismi/-sotsialismi postmodernse loogikaga. Piestraki filmide pealtnäha probleemitu mono- või bipolaarsus peidab lähemal vaatlusel mitut aegruumilist kihistust, aga ka vastuoklikke ideoloogilisi hoovusi.

Kuigi Piestraki linateoste tegevusmaailmal on nende filmide tootmises osalenud maade rahvaste ja kultuuridega vahetuid seoseid väga napilt või üldse mitte (Eesti puhul), võib siiski väita, et neist aimub teatavat “kohalikku” või isegi “rahvuslikku” mentaliteeti. Ennekõike tuleb see välja selgelt avalduvas kolonialismikriitikas (mis samal ajal on paradoksaalsel kombel poliitiliselt korrektne ka nõukogude vaatepunktist). Nii annavad nende heterotoopiad ehk Foucault’ järgi “teised ruumid” hääle võimu õõnestavatele ja

vaikima sunnitud diskursustele ning seega ka voli koloniseeritud subjektidele. Nende filmide õövastavas õhustikus heiastuvad Nõukogude Liidu ja selle satelliitriikide toonases ühiskondlik-kultuurilises kliimas valitsenud meeleolud ning koloniaalsituatsioon. “Navigaator Pirxi” mõõdutundetu lääneimetlus toob reljeefselt esile koloniseeritute nostalgia kunagiste sidemete järele raudse eesriide taguse õhtumaaga, kust nende kultuur ja identiteet Nõukogude invasiooni tõttu lahti rebiti. “Madude oru needuses” kujutatakse oriendi kapitalistlikke kolonisaatoreid ehtsate hädavarestena, kes peenele tehnoloogiale vaatamata ei suuda ida enda tahtmisele allutada, pöörates koloniaalsed võimusuhted seega pahupidi ning ida, mille lühiviitena toimib Madude org, jääb lääne vallutusambitsioonide ees vankumatuks. Allegoorilise registrivahetusega võib aga prantslaste asemele hõlpsalt kujutleda venelased ning seega viidata nõukogude ürituse totaalsele läbikukkumisele. Poola, keda sümboliseerib “Madude oru needuse” peategelane, teadlane Jan Tarnas, pendeldab ida ja lääne vahel, toimides nende kahe vahemehena. Just niisuguses vahepealsuses tõusevad ekraanile keerukad koloniaalsuhted, purustades sirgjooneliselt bipolaarsete vastanduste ja banaalsete narratiivsete mustrite sileda pinna. Lühidalt öeldes sekkuvad Piestraki filmid postkolonialistlikku diskursusse, milles Homi K. Bhabha sõnul osalevad teineteisest sõltuvad ja vastastikku valitsevad kolonisaator ja koloniseeritu ning mille subjektid on ühtmoodi lõhestunud (vt Annus, Peiker 2009; Bhabha 1994: 85–92).

Seeria viimane artikkel **“Rahvusmaastikust rahvusriigini. Ümberseadistused filmiruumis ja nõukogudejärgne eesti film”** käsitleb nihkeid ruumikujutuses perestroika-aegses ja vahetult taasiseseisvumisjärgses Eesti filmikunstis, võrreldes kahte mängufilmi: Peeter Urbla lavastatud draamat “Ma pole turist, ma elan siin” (1988) ja Ilkka Järvilaturi vändatud põnevikku “Tallinn pimeduses” (1993). Fookuses on ennekõike see, kuidas need kaks filmi/režissööri portreeterivad Tallinna, ent mitte üksnes linna kui ehitatud keskkonda, vaid kui paika, kus tõusevad pinnale siinse ajaloo keerdkäigud, kohtuvad erinevad isiklikud, rahvuslikud ja kohalikud identiteedid ning põkkuvad mitmerahvuselised vaatenurgad. Mind huvitab ka see, mis juhtus alates 1960. aastatest Eesti mängufilmis konstrueeritud nn “rahvuse ruumiga” perestroika ajal, ning mil viisil mõjutas neid ruumirepresentatsioone riikliku iseseisvuse taastamine. Vaatlen Urbla ja Järvilaturi filmide ruumi-, aga ka identiteedirepresentatsioone, rahvus- ja ruuminarratiive Gilles Deleuze’i mõistepaari “liikumispilt–ajapilt” (Deleuze 1986, 1989) mõtteraamistikus.

Analüüsides Euroopa ja Ameerika filmile iseloomulikke monteerimispraktikaid, tähistas Deleuze liikumispildi mõistega kõige üldisemas tähenduses sidusaid, lineaarseid narratiive, mis toetusid Hollywoodi stuudiosüsteemi raames sätestatud järjestikmontaaži reeglitele, samas kui “ajapilt” osutas Euroopa “uute lainete” eksperimentidele katkendliku narratiivse ajaga. Sidudes need mõisted rahvuslike identiteetide representatsioonidega filmides, on David Martin-Jones (2006: 2jj) väitnud, et segi paisatud, fragmenteerunud, mitmekordistatud või ümberpööratud narratiivid (ehk siis ajapildid) aktualiseerusid erilisel Teise maailmasõja järgsetes Euroopa rahvuskinodes ning osutasid raskustele

rahvusliku identiteedi konstrueerimisel ja väljendamisel: eelnevalt valgustusajast pärit ajaloolise progressi kontseptuaalses raamistikus toimunud rahvuslikud identiteedid olid nüüd saanud tõsise löögi traumeerivald sõjakogemuselt ja need tuli ümber defineerida. Samas demonstreerib Martin-Jones oma filmianalüüsid, et liikumis- ja ajapilt võivad ühes ja samas filmis ka kõrvuti eksisteerida ning selle järgi, kumb kipub konkreetsetel juhtudel esile tõusma, saab otsustada, kas filmis esitatud rahvusliku identiteedi kontsept on pigem reterritoriseeritud ehk siis Homi K. Bhabha mõistes pedagoogiline, fikseeritud, stabiilne, monumentaalne (linearsele ajateljele piiratud narratiiv) või deterritoriseeritud ehk Bhabha mõistes performatiivne, avatud, muutlik, keerukas (Bhabha 1990).

Kuigi on selge, et Urbla filmis sisaldub hea annus liikumispildi elemente – näiteks annab selle ruumile ühtsuse ja sidususe selles liikuvate tegelaste “taju-liigutuslik jätkuvus” (kui kasutada Deleuze’i määratlust), tundub siiski, et üldises plaanis jääb peale ajapilt ja deterritoriseeritud (ruumi)protsessid, mida Eik Hermann kirjeldab kui protsesse, mis murravad suletud alad uuesti liikumisteks lahti, võimendavad, lükkavad liikvele (Hermann 2009: 749). Liikumispilti iseloomustab kõige reljeefsemalt liikumine esialgselt situatsioonist tegevuse või rea tegevuste kaudu muutunud olukorrani – see on klassikaline Hollywoodi suletud ehk sõlmitud narratiiv, mille abil saab hästi kirjeldada Järvilaturi ekraaniteose narratiivset struktuuri. Selle protsessi peamiseks käivituseks on tegelased ja nende psühholoogilised motiivid: otsused, valikud, ihad, iseloomujooned. Urbla “Turisti” valitseb aga ajapilt, milles tegelane ei suuda enam oma olukorda täielikult kontrollida ja irdub liikumispildi ruumistatud aja lineaarsest jätkuvusest. Selle asemel rõhutatakse aja enda kulgu. Lisaks, kui “Turistis” on esil väikesed narratiivid, siis “Tallinn pimeduses” loob pigem ühe suure ja stiliseeritud narratiivi, “monumentaliseerides” Eesti ajalugu, isegi kui see on väljamõeldis, mütologiseeritud “fiktsionaalne maailm”.

“Turisti” ajapilt annab tunnistust rahvusnarratiivi esitamise raskustest: vaatamata ohtrale rahvusatribuutikale (lipud, fosforiidikaevandamise teema jm laulva revolutsiooniga seostuv kujundistu), kummitab filmi peategelasi ja Tallinna põlisasukaid kohatuse ja kodutuse tunne, millesse see rahvusnarratiiv osaliselt lahustub. Väga tugevalt tuleb esile ühiskondliku ja personaalse peataoleku, lõputu keerukuse ja ühtaegu paljude võimaluste kõrvuti eksisteerimise mulje. Filmi jutustuslaad on pigem triiviv, helmestena niidile lükitud episoodide ühendab peamiselt lõtv kronoloogia, tegelaste ümber voolav aeg. Tegelased ise aga jäävad kogu filmi jooksul üsna samasugusteks, nad ei arene, nende olukord ei muutu kuigivõrd – nagu peaks juhtuma klassikaliste narratiivide liikumispildis. Samuti jääb lõpp lahtiseks, otsad kokku sõlmimata. “Tallinn pimeduses” on seevastu liikumispilt, mille tarindi määratlevad suures osas klassikalisest esituslaadist tulenevad žanrireeglid, antud juhul Hollywoodi *film noir*’i ja gängsterifilmide kontseptuaalne karkass, mille toel saab Tallinnast justkui koomiksilaadne linn, kus omavahel võitlevad hea ja halb, valgus ja pimedus. Postsotsialistlikust segadikust vormib Järvilaturi kergesti haaratava, lihtsustatud ja ülevaatliku, peaaegu valemi selgusega konfiguratsiooni. Linateses esitatud

rahvusnarratiiv on selge ja ühtne, kurjus kaotab, õigus võidab. Filmi lõpus sündiv laps tähistab riigi taassündi läbi raskuste. See on pedagoogiline narratiiv: lugu jutustatakse klassikaliste skeemide alusel, tegelased “kasuvad” filmi lõpuks.

“Ma pole turist, ma elan siin” esindab Bhabha mõistes performatiivset ajaloo- ja identiteedinarratiivi: see valmis sõna otseses mõttes ajaloo keerises ja konkreetse stsenaariumi olemasolule vaatamata osales siiski vahetult oma valmimisaja sündmustes, jäädvustades üsnagi õnnestunult nende hetkede ettearvatust, aga ka ebakindlust, kimbatust ja teatavat peataolekut, mida tunnevad Urbla tegelased ajal, mil nad on ühtäkki jäänud ilma võimalusest konstrueerida oma identiteeti vastanduses nõukoguliku Teisega. Selles kerkivad esile “iga päev ennast uuesti loovad inimeste tavad ja praktikad, elu mitmepalgeline ja dünaamiline protsess” (Annus, Peiker 2009: 928). Seevastu Järvilaturi ajaloo- ja rahvusnarratiiv on Bhabha mõttes pedagoogiline: fikseeritud vaade “valmis” ajaloole ning staatilisele ja stabiilsele rahvuslikule identiteedile, mis toetub legitimeeritud sündmustejadale ja kinnistatud sümboolikale (filmis annavad sellest tunnistust ohtrad lipud, linnatännavail tantsivad ja laulvad rahvarõivis inimesed, Eesti hümn, arhiivikaadrid laulva revolutsiooni sündmustest). Toimub võltsi “autentsuse” otsing ja selle konstrueerimine rahvusvahelise (või -ülese) auditoriumi jaoks – siinjuures tuleb aga rõhutada, et kuigi Eesti rahvussümbolite, ikooniliste rahvusmärkide, s.t riiklikult genereeritud, sätestatud ja toetatud rahvusliku identiteedi märkide kontsentratsioon on küllaltki kõrge, sugereerib film üldiselt siiski üsna jultunult postsotsialistlikku/varakapitalistlikku Ida-Euroopa eksootikat, kuigi otseselt turistlik “pitoresk” puudub.

Järeldusi ja ettepanekuid

Varem kaardistamata territooriumeile suunduvaid projekte kummitab sageli oht jõuda mõneti lihtsakoeliselt ja elementaarselt kõlavate järeldusteni. Nii näiteks on minu enda jaoks kohalikele filmiväljadele viinud avastusretkedel leitust olulisim tõdemus, et nii nõukogude-eelne, -aegne kui ka järgne Eesti filmikunst moodustab küllusliku visuaalkultuurivaramu, milles peituvat suutis käesolev doktoritöö üksnes põgusalt puudutada, riivates vaid selle ladestuste pinnakihte. Eesti kinoajaloos, aga iseäranis selle nõukogude perioodil väärrib uurimist palju (ja võib-olla eriti) muudki kui “Eesti filmikriitike TOP 10” arvatud linateosed³⁴. Õigupoolest on üsna tõenäoline, et selle “tõeline pale” tuleb esile *ainult* juhul, kui siinset filmiajalugu käsitletakse tervikuna – sellise tervikuna, mis pole sõltumatult vaakumis eksisteeriv ja eneseküllane süsteem, vaid mis kuulub arvukate

³⁴ 2002. aastal Eesti filmi 90. aastapäeva puhul kohalike filmikriitike seas läbi viidud küsitluse järgi kuuluvad sellesse: 1) “Kevade” (rež Arvo Kruusement, 1969); 2) “Hullumeelus” (rež Kaljo Kiisk, 1968); 3) “Ideaalmaastik” (rež Peeter Simm, 1980); 4) “Viimne reliikvia” (rež Grigori Kromanov, 1969); 5) “Georgica” (rež Sulev Keedus, 1998); 6) “Nipernaadi” (rež Kaljo Kiisk, 1983); 7) “Hukkunud Alpinisti hotell” (rež Grigori Kromanov, 1979); 8) “Naerata ometi” (rež Leida Laius, Arvo Iho, 1985); 9) “Põrgupõhja uus Vanapagan” (Grigori Kromanov, Jüri Müür, 1964); 10) “Tuulte pesa” (rež Olav Neuland, 1979). Vt Ruus s.a.

jätkete ja närvilõpmete kaudu laiematesse piirkondlikesse ning koguni globaalsetesse kultuuri-, poliitika- ja võimuvõrgustikesse.

Ruumianalüüsi võttestik on lubanud üsna edukalt vabaneda rahvus kino piiravatest väärtuskategooriatest, mis sätestasid rohkem ja vähem "hinnalised" teemad ja ainekuid ning sellest tulenevad klassi- ja kvaliteedihierarhiad (nt kirjandusklassika vs võõra autorite stsenaariumid), andes võimaluse nüansseerida arusaamu Nõukogude Eesti filmist, mida liiga sageli peetakse kergekäeliselt lõviosas keskpäraseks. Samas ei olnud mul kavatsustki rahvus kino mõtteraamistikust sootuks loobuda. Pigem vastupidi: need filmid mängisid ilmselgelt olulist rolli rahvusprojekti artikuleerimisel ja ehk isegi selle kujundamisel ajal, mil rahvusriik kui poliitiline realiteet oli kättesaamatu, pakkudes filmitegijatele võimaluse küsitavate kultuuripoliitikate vaidlustamiseks ning (küll osaliselt summutatud või koguni viimaks vaigistatud) hääle oma arvamuste, ideede ja kriitika väljendamiseks. Olen püüdnud näidata, et kultuurilise iseolemise tahe ei avaldunud mitte üksnes niisugustes paljukiidetud filmides nagu "Hullumeelsus" ja "Viimne reliikvia", vaid ka pealtnäha hoopis "konformistlikemates" ekraaniteostes, nagu Raul Tammeti ulmefilmid, ning tagasihoidlikumat järelkaja leidnud linalugudes, nagu Jüri Müüri "Ühe küla mehed", mille mälestus on aegade jooksul publikuteadvuses tuhmunud või isegi täiesti kustunud. Lõpuks olen üritanud demonstreerida, et ilma "sovetimeelsemate" filmideta jääb kogupilt puudulikuks, sest need moodustavad ajastu filmi- (aga ka üldisemalt kultuuri-) ökoloogia raskuskeskme, millest tasakaalustatud käsitlus ei või mööda vaadata. Nagu autorifilmi saab igakülgselt hinnata, mõista ja kritiseerida üksnes kõrvutuses populaarse žanrikinoga (ja vastupidi), kerkivad rahvusmaastike spetsiifilised karakteristikud reljeefselt esile vaid võrdluses nõukogude maastikega. Rahvusmaastike ja nõukogude maastike mõisted on seejuures loomulikult funktsionaalsed abstraktsioonid, mis, nagu ülalpool rõhutatud, arenesid ja teisesid vastastikusel koostoimes ning ka välistegurite mõjul pidevalt.

Viimaks pakuksin, et kuna Eesti filmiajaloo "suur narratiiv" näib kollektiivses teadvuses üldse puuduvat ega vaja seetõttu ei de- ega rekonstrueerimist (kui mitte arvestada vajadust lükata ümber levinud arusaam, et Eesti film on reeglina igav ja ebaoluline), on aeg viljaka ja dialoogilise käsitluse kirjutamiseks küps ning olud soodsad, et hakkaks kujunema vaatenurk, mis seoks kohaliku empiirilise materjali ühelt poolt piirkondlike ja üleilmsete filmiilmingute ja -arengutega ning teisalt laiemate mõttevoolude, ühiskonna-, ajaloo- ja kultuurikäsitluste ning filmiteoreetiliste aruteludega. Mul jääb üle ainult loota, et siin esitatud artiklid suudavad tulevastele uurijatele kätte näidata mõned võimalikud teeotsad.

- Affron, Charles; Affron, Mirella Jona 1995. *Sets in Motion: Art Direction and Film Narrative*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Agnew, John 1998. *European Landscape and Identity*. – *Modern Europe: Place, Culture and Identity*. Ed. Brian Graham. London: Arnold, pp. 213–235.
- Aitken Stuart C.; Zonn, Leo E. (eds.) 1994. *Place, Power, Situation, and Spectacle: A Geography of Film*. Lanham, London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Albers, Patricia C.; James, William R. 1988. *Travel Photography: A Methodological Approach*. – *Annals of Tourism Research*, no. 15, pp. 134–158.
- Albrecht, Donald 1987. *Designing Dreams: Modern Architecture in the Movies*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Alexander, Lily 2007. *Storytelling in Time and Space: Studies in the Chronotope and Narrative Logic on Screen*. – *Journal of Narrative Theory*, vol. 37 (1), pp. 27–64.
- Allan, Seán 1999. *DEFA: An Historical Overview*. – *DEFA: East German Cinema, 1946–1992*. Eds. Seán Allan, John Sandford. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–21.
- Allas, Anu 2008. *Tagasipöördumine ja taktika. Mängu idee 1960. aastate eesti kultuuris ja happening “Mannekeeni matmine” / Return and Tactics: The Idea of Play in the Estonian Culture of the 1960s and the Happening *The Burial of a Mannequin**. – *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi*, vol. 17 (4), pp. 9–30.
- AlSayyad, Nezar 2006. *Cinematic Urbanism: A History of the Modern from Reel to Real*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Anderson, Benedict 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Annus, Epp 2000a. *National Mythology: Past and Present*. – *Interlitteraria*, vol. 5, pp. 115–130.
- Annus, Epp 2000b. *Postmodernism: The Cultural Logic of Late Socialism*. – *Hybrid Spaces: Theory, Culture, Economy*. Eds. Johannes Angermüller, Katharina Bunzmann, Christina Rauch. New York: Transaction; Münster: LIT Verlag, pp. 25–36.
- Annus, Epp; Hughes, Robert 2004. *Reversals of the Postmodern and the Late Soviet Simulacrum in the Baltic Countries – With Exemplifications from Estonian Literature*. – *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe, Volume 1: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Ed. Marcel Cornis-Pope. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 54–65.
- Annus, Epp; Peiker, Piret 2009. *Homi K. Bhabha*. – 20. sajandi mõttevoolud. Ed. Epp Annus. Tallinn, Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, pp. 918–930.
- [Anonymous] 1950. *Uue elu valgus. Uus värviline kunstiline film “Valgus Koordis” jõudis Tallinna*. – *Rahva Hääl*, 31 December.
- Ansip, Karol 2007. *Sissevaateid Eesti dokumentaalfilmi III*. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 9, pp. 144–155, <http://www.temuki.ee/arhiiv/2007/09/lugu24.pdf>.
- Aruoja-Hellström, Virve 1992. *Vastab Virve Aruoja-Hellström*. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 8, pp. 5–13.
- Ashworth, Gregory John; Tunbridge, J. E. 2000. *The Tourist-Historic City: Retrospect and Prospect of Managing the Heritage City*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

- Attwood, Lynne 1993. *Women, Cinema and Society*. – *Red Women on the Silver Screen: Soviet Women and Cinema from the Beginning to the End of the Communist Era*. Ed. Lynne Attwood. London: Pandora Press, pp. 17–130.
- Augé, Marc 1995. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. Trans. John Howe. London, New York: Verso.
- Aumont, Jacques 1997. *The Image*. Trans. C. Pajackowska. London: British Film Institute.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 1987. *Valitud töid*. Ed. Peeter Torop. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 1981/2004. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 1984a. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 1984b. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Balshaw, Maria; Kennedy, Liam (eds.) 2000. *Urban Space and Representation*. London, Sterling: Pluto Press.
- Baltic Films: Facts & Figures. Estonian Film Foundation, 2008, <http://www.efsa.ee/public/files/Facts%26Figures%202008.pdf>.
- Barber, Stephen 2002. *Projected Cities: Cinema and Urban Space*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Barsacq, Léon 1976. *Caligari's Cabinet and Other Grand Illusions: A History of Film Design*. Boston: New York Graphic Society.
- Barthes, Roland 1977. *Image, Music, Text*. Ed. and trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Baudry, Jean-Louis 1974/1975. *Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematic Apparatus*. – *Film Quarterly*, vol. 27 (2), pp. 39–47.
- Bazin, André 1967. *The Evolution of the Language of Cinema*. – A. Bazin. *What Is Cinema*. Vol. 1. Trans. Hugh Gray. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 23–40.
- Bergfelder, Tim 2005. *National, Transnational or Supranational Cinema? Rethinking European Film Studies*. – *Media, Culture & Society*, vol. 27 (3), pp. 315–331.
- Bergfelder, Tim; Harris, Sue; Street, Sarah 2007. *Film Architecture and the Transnational Imagination: Set Design in 1930s European Cinema*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Beumers, Birgit (ed.) 2007. *The Cinema of Russia and the Former Soviet Union*. London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1990. *DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation*. – *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, pp. 291–322.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Bordwell, David 1985a. *Narration in the Fiction Film*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bordwell, David 1985b. *The Classical Hollywood Style, 1917–60*. – D. Bordwell, J. Staiger, K. Thompson. *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*. London, Melbourne, Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 1–84.
- Bordwell, David 1989a. *Historical Poetics of Cinema*. – *The Cinematic Text: Methods and Approaches*. Ed. R. Barton Palmer. New York: AMS Press, pp. 393–398.
- Bordwell, David 1989b. *Making Meaning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Bordwell, David 1999. *On the History of Film Style*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Bordwell, David 2001. Eisenstein, Socialist Realism, and the Charms of *Mizanstsen*. – Eisenstein at 100: A Reconsideration. Eds. Al. LaValley, Barry P. Sherr. New Brunswick, London: Rutgers University Press, pp. 13–37.
- Bordwell, David 2004. *The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice* [1979]. – *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 6th ed. Eds. Leo Braudy, Marshall Cohen. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 774–782.
- Bordwell, David 2005. *Figures Traced in Light: On Cinematic Staging*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Bordwell, David; Staiger, Janet; Thompson, Kristin 1985. *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*. London, Melbourne, Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bordwell, David; Thompson, Kristin 2004. *Film Art: An Introduction*. 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Branigan, Edward 1992. *Narrative Comprehension and Film*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Bronfen, Elisabeth 2004. *Home in Hollywood: The Imaginary Geography of Cinema*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers; Loveman, Mara; Stamatov, Peter 2004. Ethnicity as Cognition. – *Theory and Society*, no. 33, pp. 31–64.
- Bruno, Giuliana 1993. *Streetwalking on a Ruined Map: Cultural Theory and the City Films of Elvira Notari*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bruno, Giuliana 2002. *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*. New York: Verso.
- Brunsdon, Charlotte 2007. *London in Cinema: The Cinematic City since 1945*. London: British Film Institute.
- Buckland, Warren 2008. *Film Studies*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brüggemann, Karsten 2009. Writing National History in a Globalising World. – *Tallinn University Newsletter*, 30 November, <http://www.tlu.ee/?LangID=5&CatID=3918&ArtID=6643&action=article>.
- Burch, Noël 1973. *Theory of Film Practice*. Trans. Helen R. Lane, intro. Annette Michelson. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Burch, Noël 1990. *Life to Those Shadows*. Trans. and ed. Ben Brewster. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Butler, Alison 2007. *Avant-Garde and Counter-Cinema*. – *The Cinema Book*. Ed. Pam Cook. London: British Film Institute, pp. 89–96.
- Carrier, James G. 2003. Mind, Gaze and Engagement: Understanding the Environment. – *Journal of Material Culture*, vol. 8 (1), pp. 5–23.
- Caute, David 2003. *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy during the Cold War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caws, Mary Ann (ed.) 1991. *City Images: Perspectives from Literature, Philosophy, and Film*. New York: Gordon and Breach.

- Celant, Germano; Dennison, Lisa 2006. *New York, New York: Fifty Years of Art, Architecture, Cinema, Performance, Photography and Video*. Milano: Skira.
- Chioni Moore, David 2001. *Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique*. – *PMLA*, vol. 116 (1), pp. 111–128.
- Christopher, Nicholas 1997. *Somewhere in the Night: Film Noir and the American City*. New York: The Free Press.
- Clark, Katerina 1997. *Socialist Realism with Shores: The Conventions for the Positive Hero*. – *Socialist Realism without Shores*. Eds. Thomas Lahusen, Evgeny Dobrenko. Durham, London: Duke University Press, pp. 27–50.
- Clark, Katerina 2000. *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*. 3rd ed. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Clark, Katerina 2003. *Socialist Realism and the Sacralizing of Space*. – *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*. Eds. Evgeny Dobrenko, Eric Naiman. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, pp. 3–18.
- Clarke, David B. (ed.) 1997. *The Cinematic City*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Coates, Paul 1996. *Forms of the Polish Intellectual's Self-Criticism: Revisiting Ashes and Diamonds with Andrzejewski and Wajda*. – *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. 38 (3–4), pp. 287–303.
- Coates, Paul 2005. *The Red and the White: The Cinema of People's Poland*. London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Coleman, Simon; Crang, Mike 2002. *Grounded Tourists, Travelling Theory*. – *Tourism: Between Place and Performance*. Eds. Simon Coleman, Mike Crang. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–17.
- Comolli, Jean-Louis 1985a. *Technique and Ideology: Camera, Perspective, Depth of Field (Part One) [1971]*. – *Movies and Methods*. Vol. 2. Ed. Bill Nichols. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 40–57.
- Comolli, Jean-Louis 1985b. *Technique and Ideology: Camera, Perspective, Depth of Field (Parts Three and Four) [1971]*. – *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader*. Ed. Philip Rosen. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 421–443.
- Cowie, Peter 2004. *Revolution! The Explosion of World Cinema in the 60s*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Coxe, Brinton Tench 2005. *An Imprint of the Times: Marlen Khutsiev's July Rain and the End of the Thaw*. – *Ulbändus: The Slavic Review of Columbia University*, no. 9, pp. 30–47.
- Coxe, Brinton Tench 2008. *Screening 1960s Moscow: Marlen Khutsiev's Ilich's Gate*. – *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics*, no. 7. Special Issue: *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Eds. Eva Näripea, Andreas Trossek. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts; Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum, pp. 213–227.
- Crang, Mike; Thrift, Nigel (eds.) 2000. *Thinking Space*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Crawshaw, Carol; Urry, John 1997. *Tourism and the Photographic Eye*. – *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*. Eds. Chris Rojek, John Urry. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 176–195.

- Crofts, Stephen 1993. Reconceptualizing National Cinema/s. – *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, vol. 14 (3), pp. 49–67.
- Cunningham, John 2004. *Hungarian Cinema: From Coffee House to Multiplex*. London: Wallflower Press.
- Dear, Michael J. 2000. *Film, Architecture and Filmspace*. – *The Postmodern Urban Condition*. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 176–198.
- Debord, Guy 1995. *The Society of Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, Gilles 1986. *Cinema I: The Movement-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson, Barbara Habberjam. London: Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles 1989. *Cinema II: The Time-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson, Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deltcheva, Roumiana; Vlasov, Eduard 1997. Back to the House II: On the Chronotopic and Ideological Reinterpretation of Lem's *Solaris* in Tarkovsky's Film. – *The Russian Review*, vol. 56 (4), pp. 532–549.
- Dempsey, Michael 1981. Lost Harmony: Tarkovsky's "The Mirror" and "The Stalker". – *Film Quarterly*, vol. 35 (1), pp. 12–17.
- Desser, David 1999. Race, Space and Class: The Politics of Cityscapes in Science-Fiction Films. – *Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science-Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Annette Kuhn. London, New York: Verso, pp. 80–96.
- Dimendberg, Edward 2004. *Film Noir and the Spaces of Modernity*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Doane, Mary Ann 2004. The Voice in the Cinema: The Articulation of Body and Space. – *Film Theory and Criticism*. 6th ed. Eds. Leo Braudy, Marshall Cohen. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 373–385.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny 2004. Socialism as Will and Representation, or What Legacy Are We Rejecting? – *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, vol. 5 (4), pp. 675–708.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny 2008. *Stalinist Cinema and the Production of History: Museum of the Revolution*. Trans. Sarah Young. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Donald, James 1995. The City, the Cinema: Modern Space. – *Visual Culture*. Ed. Charles Jencks. London: Routledge, pp. 77–95.
- Donald, James 1997. This, Here, Now: Imagining the Modern City. – *Imagining Cities: Scripts, Signs, Memory*. Eds. Sallie Westwood, John Williams. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 181–201.
- Donald, James 1999. *Imagining the Modern City*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Drummond, Philip 1979. Notions of Avant-Garde Cinema. – *Film as Film: Formal Experiment in Film 1910–1975*. Ed. Philip Drummond. London: The Arts Council of Great Britain, pp. 9–16.
- Dunham, Vera 1976. In *Stalin's Time: Middle-Class Values in Soviet Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eagle, Herbert (ed.) 1981. *Russian Formalist Film Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures.

- Eco, Umberto 1985. *Casablanca: Cult Movies and Intertextual Collage*. – *SubStance*, vol. 14 (2), pp. 3–12.
- Ehin, Andres 2001. Nelikümmend aastat vabavärsivaidlusest. – *Looming*, no. 9, pp. 1398–1401.
- Elliott, Bridget; Purdy, Anthony 1997. *Peter Greenaway: Architecture and Allegory*. London: Academy.
- Elsaesser, Thomas (ed.) 1990. *Early Cinema: Space, Frame, Narrative*. London: British Film Institute.
- Elsaesser, Thomas; Hagener, Malte 2010. *Film Theory: An Introduction through the Senses*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Elmanovitš, Tatjana 1984. Eesti filmikunsti žanrijooni I. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 10, pp. 19–32.
- Elmanovitš, Tatjana 1987. Väljamurd üksildusest. Kaotused ja võidud. – *Sirp ja Vasar*, 6 November.
- Elmanovitš, Tatjana 1988. “Elu tsitadellis” täna. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 8, pp. 56–61.
- Elmanovitš, Tatjana 1995. Grigori Kromanovi filmid. – Lavastaja Grigori Kromanov. Mälestused. Artiklid. Kirjad. Päevikud. Ed. Irena Veisaitė-Kromanova. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, pp. 517–532.
- Epner, Eero 2004. Ära pane, isa! – *Teatrielu 2003*. Eds. Anneli Saro, Sven Karja. Tallinn: Eesti Teatriliit, pp. 254–282.
- Epner, Luule 2002. Kaks visandit Hermaküla teatrist. – *Hermaküla*. Eds. Luule Epner, Mati Unt, Vaino Vahing. Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 436–446.
- Epner, Luule 2006. Murrang teatriestetiikas ja Evald Hermaküla (1969–1971). – *Akadeemia*, no. 11, pp. 2438–2448.
- Epner, Luule 2007. Director as Playwright in Postdramatic Theatre. – *Interlitteraria*, vol. 12, pp. 210–224.
- Epner, Luule; Unt, Mati; Vahing, Vaino (eds.) 2002. *Hermaküla*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Everett, Wendy; Goodbody, Axel (eds.) 2005. *Revisiting Space: Space and Place in European Cinema*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Ezra, Elizabeth; Rowden, Terry (eds.) 2006. *Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Fainstein, Susan S.; Judd, Dennis R. 1999. *Cities as Places to Play. – The Tourist City*. Eds. Dennis R. Judd, Susan S. Fainstein. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, pp. 261–272.
- Falkowska, Janina 2008. *Andrzej Wajda: History, Politics and Nostalgia in Polish Cinema*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Faraday, George 2000. *Revolt of the Filmmakers: The Struggle for Artistic Autonomy and the Fall of the Soviet Film Industry*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- First, Joshua 2008a. From Spectator to “Differentiated” Consumer. – *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, no. 9, pp. 317–344.
- First, Joshua J. 2008b. *Scenes of Belonging: Cinema and the Nationality Question in Soviet Ukraine during the long 1960s*. PhD dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/2027.42/61707/1/jfirst_1.pdf.

- Фомин, В. И. (сост.) 1998. Кинематограф оттепели. Документы и свидетельства НИИ киноискусства Госкино РФ. Москва: Материк.
- Forgacs, David 2000. Antonioni: Space, Place, Sexuality. – *Spaces in European Cinema*. Ed. Myrto Konstantarakos. Exeter, Portland: Intellect, pp. 101–111.
- Foucault, Michel 1986. Of Other Spaces. Trans. Jay Miskowicz. – *Diacritics*, vol. 16 (1), pp. 22–27.
- Foucault, Michel 1991. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Allan Sheridan. London: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, Michel 2002. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, Catherine; Helfield, Gillian (eds.) 2006. *Representing the Rural: Space, Place, and Identity in Films about the Land*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Frampton, Kenneth 1992. *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*. 3rd ed. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Fritzsche, Sonja 2006. East Germany's "Werkstatt Zukunft": Futurology and the Science Fiction Films of "defa-futurum". – *German Studies Review*, vol. 29 (2), pp. 367–386.
- Galichenko, Nicholas 1991. *Glasnost – Soviet Cinema Responds*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ganser, Alexandra; Pühringer, Julia; Rheindorf, Markus 2006. Bakhtin's Chronotope on the Road: Space, Time, and Place in Road Movies Since the 1970s. – *Facta Universitatis. Linguistic and Literature*, vol. 4 (1), pp. 1–17.
- Gaughan, Martin 2003. Ruttman's Berlin: Filming in a "Hollow Space". – *Screening the City*. Eds. Mark Shiel, Tony Fitzmaurice. London, New York: Verso, pp. 42–57.
- Gibbs, John; Pye, Douglas 2005. *Style and Meaning: Studies in the Detailed Analysis of Film*. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press.
- Gold, John R. 1984. *The City in Films*. Architecture Series 1218. Monvicello: Vance Bibliographies.
- Gold, John R. 1985. From 'Metropolis' to 'The City': Film Visions of the Future City, 1919–39. – *Geography, the Media & Popular Culture*. Eds. Jacquelin Burgess, John R. Gold. New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 123–143.
- Gold, John R. 2001. Under Darkened Skies: The City in Science-Fiction Film. – *Geography*, vol. 86 (4), pp. 337–345.
- Golovskoy, Val 1986. *Behind the Soviet Screen: The Motion-Picture Industry in the USSR, 1972–1982*. Ann Arbor: Ardis.
- Golovskoy, Val 1992. Art and Propaganda in the Soviet Union, 1980–5. – *The Red Screen: Politics, Society, Art in Soviet Cinema*. Ed. Anna Lawton. London: Routledge, pp. 264–282.
- Graf, Alexander 2007. Berlin–Moscow: On the Montage Aesthetic in the City Symphony Films of the 1920s. – *Avant-Garde Film*. Eds. Alexander Graf, Dietrich Scheunemann. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, pp. 77–91.
- Graham, Seth 2000. Chernukha and Russian Film. – *Studies in Slavic Culture*, no. 1, pp. 9–27.
- Griffiths, Gareth; Chudoba, Minna 2007. *City + Cinema: Essays on the Specificity of Location in Film*. Tampere: Tampere University of Technology.

- Gunning, Tom 1995. *Urban Spaces in Early Silent Film*. København: Center for Urbanitet og Æstetik, University of Copenhagen.
- Hake, Sabine 1994. *Urban Spectacle in Walter Ruttmann's Berlin: Symphony of the Big City*. – *Dancing on the Volcano: Essays on the Culture of the Weimar Republic*. Eds. Thomas W. Kniesche, Stephen Brockmann. Columbia: Camden House, pp. 127–142.
- Hall, Derek R. 1991. *Tourism and Economic Development in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. London: Belhaven Press; New York, Toronto: Halsted Press.
- Hall, Stuart 1992. *The Question of Cultural Identity*. – *Modernity and Its Futures*. Eds. Stuart Hall, David Held, Tony McGrew. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 273–326.
- Haltof, Marek 2002. *Polish National Cinema*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Hames, Peter 2005a. *The Cinema of Central Europe*. London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Hames, Peter 2005b. *The Czechoslovak New Wave*. London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Hanáková, Petra 2008. “The Films We Are Ashamed of”: Czech Crazy Comedy of the 1970s and 1980s. – *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics*, no. 7. Special Issue: *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Eds. Eva Näripea, Andreas Trossek. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts; Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum, pp. 109–121.
- Hanáková, Petra; Johnson, Kevin B. (eds.) 2010. *Visegrad Cinema: Points of Contact from the New Waves to the Present*. Prague: Casablanca.
- Харитонов, Евгений; Щербак-Жуков, Андрей (сост.) 2003. *На экране – Чудо. Отечественная кинофантастика и киносказка (1909–2002)*. Материалы к популярной энциклопедии. Москва: Научно-исследовательский институт киноискусства министерства культуры РФ, журнал фантастики “Если”.
- Harper, Graeme; Rayner, Jonathan (eds.) 2010. *Cinema and Landscape*. Bristol, Chicago: Intellect.
- Harvey, David 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heath, Stephen 1975. *Film and System: Terms of Analysis, Part I*. – *Screen*, vol. 16 (1), pp. 7–77.
- Heath, Stephen 1978. *Questions of Property: Film and Nationhood*. – *Cine-tracts*, vol. 1 (4), pp. 2–11.
- Heath, Stephen 1985. *Questions of Cinema*. London: Macmillan.
- Heidegger, Martin 1997a. *Building. Dwelling. Thinking*. – *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. Ed. Neil Leach. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 100–109.
- Heidegger, Martin 1997b. *...Poetically Man Dwells...* – *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. Ed. Neil Leach. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 109–119.
- Heisner, Beverly 2004. *Production Design in the Contemporary American Film: A Critical Study of 23 Movies and Their Designers*. Jefferson, London: McFarland.
- Hendrykowska, Małgorzata 1996. *East Central Europe before the Second World War*. – *The Oxford History of World Cinema*. Ed. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 383–389.
- Hendrykowski, Marek 1996. *Changing States in East Central Europe*. – *The Oxford History of World Cinema*. Ed. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 632–635.

- Hermaküla, Evald 1992. Vastab Evald Hermaküla. – Teater. Muusika. Kino, no. 2, pp. 5–13.
- Hermaküla, Evald 2002. Katkendeid Evald Hermaküla kirjadest Kaarel Irdile. – Hermaküla. Eds. Luule Epner, Mati Unt, Vaino Vahing. Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 33–38.
- Hermann, Eik 2009. Gilles Deleuze. – 20. sajandi mõttevoolud. Ed. Epp Annus. Tallinn, Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, pp. 727–754.
- Higson, Andrew 1989. The Concept of National Cinema. – *Screen*, vol. 30 (4), pp. 36–47.
- Higson, Andrew 2000. National Cinema(s), International Markets and Cross-cultural Identities. – *Moving Images, Culture and the Mind*. Ed. Ib Bondebjerg. Luton: University of Luton Press, pp. 205–214.
- Higson, Andrew 2002a. The Concept of National Cinema. – *Film and Nationalism*. Ed. Alan Williams. New Brunswick, London: Rutgers University Press, pp. 52–67.
- Higson, Andrew 2002b. The Limiting Imagination of National Cinema. – *Cinema and Nation*. Eds. Mette Hjort, Scott MacKenzie. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 63–74.
- Higson, Andrew 2010. Transnational Developments in European Cinema in the 1920s. – *Transnational Cinemas*, vol. 1 (1), pp. 69–82.
- Hinrikus, Rutt (ed.) 2003. Eesti rahva elulood. III osa. Tallinn: Tänapäev.
- Hjort, Mette; MacKenzie, Scott (eds.) 2000. *Cinema and Nation*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Hjort, Mette; Petrie, Duncan (eds.) 2007. *The Cinemas of Small Nations*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric 2007. *Globalisation, Democracy and Terrorism*. London: Abacus.
- Holloway, Julian; Kneale, James 2000. Mikhail Bakhtin: Dialogics of Space. – *Thinking Space*. Eds. Mike Crang, Nigel Thrift. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 71–88.
- Horton, Andrew 1990. “Nothing Worth Living For”: Soviet Youth and the Documentary Movement. – *Wide Angle*, vol. 12 (4), pp. 38–47.
- Horton, Andrew; Brashinsky, Michael 1992. *The Zero Hour: Glasnost and Soviet Cinema in Transition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hubbard, Phil; Kitchin, Rob; Valentine, Gill (eds.) 2004. *Key Thinkers on Space and Place*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Hummon, David M. 1988. Tourist Worlds: Tourist Advertising, Ritual, and American Culture. – *The Sociological Quarterly*, vol. 29 (2), pp. 179–202.
- Iho, Arvo 1991. Oli ja on. Muutusi ja hetkeseise Eesti filmis. – *Sirp*, 25 January.
- Imre, Anikó (ed.) 2005. *East European Cinemas*. London: Routledge.
- Ingvoldstad, Bjorn 2008. The Paradox of Lithuanian National Cinema. – *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics*, no. 7. Special Issue: *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Eds. Eva Närripea, Andreas Trossek. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts; Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum, pp. 137–154.
- Iordanova, Dina 2001. *Cinema of Flames: Balkan Film, Culture, and the Media*. London: British Film Institute.
- Iordanova, Dina 2003. *Cinema of the Other Europe: The Industry and Artistry of East Central European Film*. London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Iordanova, Dina (ed.) 2006. *The Cinema of the Balkans*. London, New York: Wallflower Press.

- Jacobs, Steven 2007. *The Wrong House: The Architecture of Alfred Hitchcock*. Rotterdam: 010.
- Jacobsen, Wolfgang (ed.) 1998. *Berlin im Film: Die Stadt – die Menchen*. Berlin: Argon.
- Jakobson, Roman 1971. *The Dominant. – Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matejka, Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 41–46.
- Jameson, Fredric 1991. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Jameson, Fredric 2003. *The End of Temporality. – Critical Inquiry*, vol. 29 (4), pp. 695–718.
- Jirgens, Karl E. 2006. *Fusions of Discourse: Postcolonial/Postmodern Horizons in Baltic Culture. – Baltic Postcolonialism*. Ed. Violeta Kelertas. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, pp. 45–81.
- Jänes, Liina 2004. *The Stalinist Collective Farm Village: Attempts to Establish Town-Type Settlements in the Estonian Landscape. – Constructed Happiness – Domestic Environment in the Cold War Era*. Eds. Mart Kalm, Ingrid Ruudi. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts, pp. 184–199.
- Kaes, Anton 2001. *Metropolis: City, Cinema, Modernity. – Expressionist Utopias: Paradise. Metropolis. Architectural Fantasy*. Ed. Timothy O. Benson. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 146–165.
- Kaganovsky, Lilya 2009. *The Cultural Logic of Late Socialism. – Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, vol. 3 (2), pp. 185–199.
- Kaidu, Epp 1956. *Eesti kunstilisest filmist. – Eesti Nõukogude teater. Almanahh. II*. Tallinn, pp. 188–199.
- Kalm, Mart 2001. *Eesti 20. sajandi arhitektuur*. Tallinn: Prisma Prindi Kirjastus.
- Kalm, Mart 2008. *Ons linnaelu maal hea? Majandi keskasula Eesti NSV-s / Is Urban Life in the Countryside Good? The Central Settlements of Collective Farms in the Estonian SSR. – Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi*, vol. 17 (4), pp. 61–87.
- Kangur, Paavo 2011. *Viimne reliikvia. Pilk legendi taha*. Tallinn: Ajakirjade Kirjastus.
- Karja, Sven 2001. *Paul-Eerik Rummo – Evald Hermaküla “Tuhkatriinumäng”, 1969. – Teatrielu ’99*. Ed. Reet Neimar. Tallinn: Eesti Teatriliit, pp. 359–387.
- Karriker, Alexandra Heidi 1993. *Turmoil on the Screen: Shifting Perspectives in Soviet and Post-Communist Cinema*. Morgantown: West Virginia University, Department of Foreign Languages.
- Kazanskij, Boris 1981. *The Nature of Cinema. – Russian Formalist Film Theory*. Ed. Herbert Eagle. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, pp. 101–129.
- Kelertas, Violeta (ed.) 2006. *Baltic Postcolonialism*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Kenez, Peter 2001. *Cinema and Soviet Society from the Revolution to the Death of Stalin*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Kiisk, Kaljo 2005. *Kaljo Kiisa ebatavaline elu. – Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 12, pp. 121–128.
- Kirt, Liina 1980. *Eesti nõukogude filmikunst tõusuteel. – Küsimused ja Vastused*, no. 8, pp. 33–36.
- Kivimaa, Katrin 2009. *Rahvuslik ja modernne naiselikkus eesti kunstis 1850–2000*. Tallinn, Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

- Kluger, Daniel 2004. Fables of Desire. – Science Fiction Studies, vol. 31 (3), pp. 415–417.
- Konstantarakos, Myrto (ed.) 2000. Spaces in European Cinema. Exeter, Portland: Intellect.
- Koppel, Annika 2010. Kevade. Suvi. Sügis. Arvo Kruusemendi filmid. *S.L.*: Kadmirell.
- Kosenkranius, Ivar 1962. “Ühe küla mehed”. – Sirp ja Vasar, 23 February.
- Kosenkranius, Ivar 1974. Kuidas on arenenud Eesti filmikunst? [1966.] – I. Kosenkranius. Film ja aeg. Esseid, etüüde, portreevisandeid. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, pp. 84–91.
- Kovács, András Bálint 2007. Screening Modernism: European Art Cinema, 1950–1980. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Krause, Linda; Petro, Patrice (eds.) 2003. Global Cities: Cinema, Architecture, and Urbanism in a Digital Age. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Kross, Jaan 2008. Kallid kaasteelised II. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Kuhn, Annette (ed.) 1990. Alien Zone: Cultural Theory and Contemporary Science Fiction Cinema. London, New York: Verso.
- Kuhn, Annette (ed.) 1999. Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science-Fiction Cinema. London, New York: Verso.
- Kulo, Helle 1981. 90 minutit. – Noorte Hääl, 23 April.
- Kurg, Andres 2004. Almanahh “Kunst ja Kodu” 1973–1980 / Kunst ja kodu 1973–1980. – Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi, vol. 13 (2), pp. 110–142.
- Kuuli, Olav 2002. Sula ja hallad Eesti NSV-s. Kultuuripoliitikast aastail 1953–1969. Tallinn: O. Kuuli.
- Kõrver, Kristina 2004. Eino Tambergi balletid ja nende roll Eesti balletielus 1960. aastatel II. – Teater. Muusika. Kino, no. 3, pp. 72–84.
- Kärk, Lauri 1995. Mida oleks hea teada ajaloost? Eesti filmiloo lühikonspekt. – Teater. Muusika. Kino, no. 8–9, pp. 114–123.
- Kärk, Lauri 1996. Laske ma näitan – Jaan Toominga filmid. – Kultuurileht, 29 March.
- Kärk, Lauri 2000. Pildi sisse minek. Filmikirjutisi Tšehhovist *virtual reality*’ni 1977–1999. Tallinn: Kirjastuskeskus.
- Kärk, Lauri 2008. Poola koolkond: tasub teada. – Postimees, 19 April.
- Kärk, Lauri 2010. Estonian Film: From Bear Hunt to Autumn Ball. Notes on Estonian Film History. – KinoKultura: New Russian Cinema, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema. Eds. Eva Näripea, Ewa Mazierska, Mari Laaniste, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/kark.shtml>.
- Laak, Marin 2000. Estonian Literature in the 1920s and 1930s. – Estonian Literary Magazine, no. 11, <http://elm.einst.ee/issue/11/estonian-literature-1920s-and-1930s/>.
- Laanemets, Mari 2005. Pilg sotsialistliku linna tühermaadele ja tagahoovidesse: *happening*’id, mängud ja jalutuskäigud Tallinnas 1970. aastatel / A Glance at the Wastelands and Back Yards of a Socialist City: Happenings, Games and Walks in Tallinn in the 1970s. – Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi, vol. 14 (4), pp. 139–178.
- Laaniste, Mari 2006. Eine murul. Ühe animafilmi tekst ja kontekst / Luncheon on the Grass: The Text and the Context of One Animated Film. – Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi, vol. 15 (4), pp. 77–97.
- Laaniste, Mari 2008. Pushing the Limits: Priit Pärn’s Animated Cartoons and Soviet Cinema Censorship. – Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and

- Semiotics, no. 7. Special Issue: *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Eds. Eva Näripea, Andreas Trossek. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts; Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum, pp. 47–55.
- Laaniste, Mari 2009. Karikatuur ja/või kunst. Valdkondade vahekorraest Eestis Priit Pärna loomingu näitel / Cartoons and/or Art: On the Relationship of Two Fields in Estonia, Based on Priit Pärn's Creative Career. – *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi*, vol. 18 (1–2), pp. 111–145.
- Laaniste, Mari 2010. *Conflicting Visions: Estonia and Estonians as Presented in the Cinema of 1990s and 2000s*. – *Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema*, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema. Eds. Eva Näripea, Ewa Mazierska, Mari Laaniste, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/laaniste.shtml>.
- Laaniste, Mari; Torim, Leena 2010. *Apartment Blocks and Alienation: Tallinn's Lasnamäe District as Seen in the Film "Autumn Ball"*. – *Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema*, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema. Eds. Eva Näripea, Ewa Mazierska, Mari Laaniste, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/laaniste-torim.shtml>.
- Laasi, Evald 1988. *Ajaloolase pilguga filmist "Valgus Koordis"*. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 8, pp. 62–65.
- Laasik, Andres 2005. *Kaks teatriutoopiat. 1960. ja 1970. aastate teatriuendus Eestis ja Soomes – kaks paralleelset kultuuriilmingut*. MA thesis. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool.
- Lamster, Mark (ed.) 2000. *Architecture and Film*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Lapsley, Robert; Westlake, Michael 1988. *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Lauristin, Marju; Vihalemm, Peeter 1997. *Recent Historical Developments in Estonia: Three Stages of Transition (1987–1997)*. – *Return to the Western World: Cultural and Political Perspectives on the Estonian Post-Communist Transition*. Eds. Marju Lauristin, Peeter Vihalemm, Karl E. Rosengren, Lennart Weibull. Tartu: Tartu University Press, pp. 73–126.
- Lawton, Anna 1989. *Toward a New Openness in Soviet Cinema, 1976–1987*. – *Post New Wave Cinema in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. Ed. Daniel J. Golding. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 1–50.
- Lawton, Anna (ed.) 1992. *The Red Screen: Politics, Society and Art in Soviet Union*. London: Routledge.
- Lawton, Anna 1992. *Kinoglasnost: Soviet Cinema in Our Time*. Cambridge, New York, Victoria: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawton, Anna 2007. *Before the Fall: Soviet Cinema in the Gorbachev Years*. Washington: New Academia Publishing.
- Lefebvre, Henri 1991. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, Martin (ed.) 2006. *Landscape and Film*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Liehm, Mira; Liehm, Antonín J. 1977. *The Most Important Art: Eastern European Film After 1945*. Trans. Káča Poláčková-Henley. Berkeley, London: University of California Press.
- Liidja, Marja 1967. *Komöödia sünd*. – *Õhtuleht*, 7. September.
- Lilja, Pekka; Olesk, Sirje 2005. *Urho Kaleva Kekkoneni kõne Soome estofiilidele*. – *Akadeemia*, no. 2, pp. 243–254.

- Linnap, Peeter 2000. Modernity in Estonian Photography (1960s–1980s). Part 1. – *Kunst.ee: Estonian Quarterly of Visual Culture*, no. 1, pp. 80–84.
- Linnap, Peeter 2002. Astu parteisse ja nõua! Jaan Toominga ekspressionistlikud resistance-filmid ENSVs. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 1, pp. 62–70, http://www.temuki.ee/arhiiv/arhiiv_vana/Kino/02jaan_k1.html.
- Linnap, Peeter 2003. Pictorial Estonia. – *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics*, no. 3. *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Arts*, no. 14. Eds. Virve Sarapik, Kadri Tüür. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts, pp. 433–443, http://eki.ee/km/place/pdf/kp3_28_Linnap.pdf.
- LoBrutto, Vincent 2002. *The Filmmakers Guide to Production Design*. New York: Allworth Press.
- Lokk, Tiina 1989. Eesti tõsielufilmi suundumustest. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 6, pp. 57–64.
- Lokk, Tiina 2003. Vastab Tiina Lokk. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 11, pp. 3–16, http://www.temuki.ee/arhiiv/2003/11/03nov_k01.htm.
- Loska, Krzysztof 2006. *Lem on Film. – The Art and Science of Stanisław Lem*. Ed. Peter Swirski. Montréal, London: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 153–171.
- Lowenstein, Adam 2006. From the Tsars to the Stars: A Journey through Russian Fantastik Cinema. – *KinoKultura: New Russian Cinema*, no. 14, <http://www.kinokultura.com/2006/14-lowenstein.shtml>.
- Luik, Hans 1968. Siit nurgast ja sealt nurgast. – *Rahva Hääl*, 16 January.
- Lyotard, Jean-François 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi, foreword by Fredric Jameson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lõhmus, Jaak 2009. Sarv soe, Samm sees, Säde silmis ja Meri põlvini! – *Sirp*, 27 March.
- Maandi, Peeter 2005. *Change and Persistence in a Reformed Landscape: A Geographical Analysis of Land Reforms and Landscape Change in Muhu and Rapla Municipalities, Estonia, c. 1840 to 2003*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Maimets, Kaire 2003. *Visuaalse ja muusikalise tasandi suhtest Leida Laiuse filmis "Ukuaru"*. MA thesis. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Music.
- Maimets-Volt, Kaire 2009. *Mediating the "Idea of One": Arvo Pärt's Pre-existing Music in Film*. *Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre Dissertations*, no. 4. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre.
- Maimik, Andres 1999. "Hullumeelus" – modernistlik üksiklane 1960. aastate eesti mängufilmis. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 11, pp. 85–88, http://www.temuki.ee/arhiiv/arhiiv_vana/Kino/99nov_k7.htm.
- Mandelbaum, Howard; Myers, Eric 1985. *Screen Deco*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Mandelbaum, Howard; Myers, Eric 1989. *Forties Screen Style: A Celebration of High Pastiche in Hollywood*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Mander, Ülo; Palang, Hannes 1994. Changes of Landscape Structure in Estonia during the Soviet period. – *GeoJournal*, vol. 33 (1), pp. 45–54.
- Marcus, Alan; Neumann, Dietrich (eds.) 2007. *Visualizing the City*. London, New York: Routledge.

- Margolit, Evgeni 2001. Landscape, with Hero. – Springtime for Soviet Cinema: Re/viewing the 1960s. Ed. Alexander Prokhorov. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Russian Film Symposium, pp. 29–50, <http://www.rusfilm.pitt.edu/booklets/Thaw.pdf>.
- Marshall, Herbert 1992. The New Wave in Soviet Cinema. – The Red Screen: Politics, Society, Art in Soviet Cinema. Ed. Anna Lawton. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 175–192.
- Martin, Terry 2001. The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Martin-Jones, David 2006. Deleuze, Cinema and National Identity: Narrative Time in National Contexts. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Massood, Paula J. 2003a. Black City Cinema: African American Urban Experiences in Film. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Massood, Paula J. 2003b. City Spaces and City Times: Bakhtin's Chronotope and Recent African-American Cinema. – Screening the City. Eds. Mark Shiel, Tony Fitzmaurice. London, New York: Verso, pp. 200–215.
- Matjus, Ülo 1968. Ei üksi, siis hulganisti. – Edasi, 24 July.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2004. Polish Cinematic Dystopias: Metaphors of Life under Communism – and Beyond. – Kinema: A Journal for Film and Audiovisual Media, Fall, <http://www.kinema.uwaterloo.ca/article.php?id=77&feature>.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2007a. Polish Postcommunist Cinema: From Pavement Level. New Studies in European Cinema, vol. 4. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2007b. Roman Polanski: The Cinema of a Cultural Traveller. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2008. Masculinities in Polish, Czech and Slovak Cinema: Black Peters and Men of Marble. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2010a. Eastern European Cinema: Old and New Approaches. – Studies in Eastern European Cinema, vol. 1 (1), pp. 5–16.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2010b. Jerzy Skolimowski: The Cinema of a Nonconformist. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Mazierska, Ewa. 2010c. My Great Estonian Adventure: An Interview with Marek Piestrak. – Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema. Eds. Eva Näripea, Ewa Mazierska, Mari Laaniste, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/pirx-interview.shtml>.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2010d. Postcommunist Estonian Cinema as Transnational Cinema. – Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema. Eds. Eva Näripea, Ewa Mazierska, Mari Laaniste, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/mazierska.shtml>.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2010e. Rewizje historii polski a “miękka awangarda” filmowa lat sześćdziesiątych. – Kwartalnik filmowy, no. 70, pp. 106–120.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2011. Duel in Contemporary Estonia: *An Affair of Honor* by Valentin Kuik (1999). – E. Mazierska. Nabokov's Cinematic Afterlife. Jefferson, London: McFarland & Company, pp. 125–142.
- Mazierska, Ewa 2012. International Co-Productions as Productions of Heterotopias. – A Companion to Eastern European Cinema. Ed. Anikó Imre. Malden, Oxford: Blackwell. Forthcoming.

- Mazierska, Ewa; Rascaroli, Laura 2003. *From Moscow to Madrid: Postmodern Cities, European Cinema*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- McCausland, Gerald 2009. Katia Shagalova: *Once Upon a Time in the Provinces (Odnazhdy v provintsii, 2008)*. – Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema, no. 24, <http://www.kinokultura.com/2009/24r-odnazhdy.shtml>.
- McGuire, Patrick L. 1985. *Red Stars: Political Aspects of Soviet Science Fiction*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press.
- Mercer, Kobena 1988. *Diaspora Culture and the Dialogic Imagination*. – Black Frames. Eds. Mbye Cham, Claire Andrade-Watkins. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Meri, Hindrek-Peeter 2008. Tagasivaateid veerevast vagunist. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Meri, Lennart 1968. Suur üksiklane. – Sirp ja Vasar, 9 February.
- Merrifield, Andy 2000. Henri Lefebvre: A Socialist in Space. – Thinking Space. Eds. Mike Crang, Nigel Thrift. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 167–183.
- Mikk, M. 1983. Pühapäevane filmielamus. – TRÜ, 25 November.
- Monastireva-Ansdell, Elena 2006. Redressing the Commissar: Thaw Cinema Revises Soviet Structuring Myths. – The Russian Review, vol. 65 (2), pp. 230–249.
- Montgomery, Michael V. 1994. *Carnivals and Commonplaces: Bakhtin's Chronotope, Cultural Studies, and Film*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Mukařovský, Jan 1978. A Note on the Aesthetics of Film. – Structure, Sign, and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský. Trans. and eds. John Burbank, Peter Steiner. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, pp. 178–190.
- Märka, Veiko 1998. Kala hakkas mädanema südamest (Sotsialistlikust realismist ENSV kirjan- duses 1945–53). – Vikerkaar, no. 10–11, pp. 81–111.
- Märka, Veiko 2004. Töö kui eesti kirjanduse püha lehm. Rahvakasvatusekirjanduse aasta- sada 1870–1970. – Vikerkaar, no. 6, pp. 58–76.
- Mückenberger, Christiane 1999. The Anti-Fascist Past in DEFA Films. – DEFA: East Ger- man Cinema, 1946–1992. Eds. Seán Allan, John Sandford. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 58–76.
- Naficy, Hamid 2001. *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Natter, Wolfgang 1994. The City as Cinematic Space: Modernism and Place in *Berlin, Symphony of a City*. – Place, Power, Situation, and Spectacle: A Geography of Film. Eds. Stuart C. Aitken, Leo E. Zonn. Lanham, London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp. 203–227.
- Neimar, Reet; Visnap, Margot (eds.) 1988. Lõikuskuu 1968. – Teater. Muusika. Kino, no. 8, pp. 70–74.
- Neumann, Dietrich (ed.) 1997. *Film Architecture: Set Designs from Metropolis to Blade Run- ner*. Munich, New York: Prestel.
- Nirk, Endel 1963. Mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega? Arupidamisi uue romaani puhul. – Keel ja Kirjandus, no. 12, pp. 705–712.
- Norberg-Schulz, Christian 1984. *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli.

- Nowell-Smith, Gregory 2008. *Making Waves: New Cinemas of the 1960s*. New York, London: Continuum.
- Näripea, Eva 2002. Kaadreid modernistlikust ideaallinnast: "Viini postmark" ja Mustamäe. – Kohandumise märgid. Eds. Virve Sarapik, Maie Kalda, Rein Veidemann. Tallinn: Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus, pp. 142–160.
- Näripea, Eva 2003. Home and Away: Urban Representations in 1980s Soviet Estonian Cinema. – Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics, no. 3. Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Arts, no. 14. Eds. Virve Sarapik, Kadri Tüür. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts, pp. 405–430, http://eki.ee/km/place/pdf/kp3_27_Naripea.pdf.
- Näripea, Eva 2004. Medieval Socialist Realism: Representations of Tallinn Old Town in Soviet Estonian Feature Films, 1969–1972. – Place and Location. Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics, no. 4. Ed. Virve Sarapik. Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum, http://www.eki.ee/km/place/pdf/kp4_07_naripea.pdf, pp. 121–143.
- Näripea, Eva 2005a. Dissonant Heritage and the Tourist Gaze: Concerning the Restoration of Tallinn's Old Town and Its (Cinematographic) Representations. – Ehituskunst. Estonian Architectural Review, no. 43/44, pp. 56–70.
- Näripea, Eva 2005b. Soviet Camp: Cultural Conformation and Resistance in Don Juan in Tallinn. – Kunst.ee: Estonian Quarterly of Visual Culture, no. 4, pp. 37–40.
- Näripea, Eva 2005c. Tallinna vanalinn representatsioonid Eesti NSV filmikunstis 1960.–1970. aastail. MA thesis. Tallinn: Eesti Kunstiakadeemia.
- Näripea, Eva 2005d. Turistlik eskapism ja sümfoonilised variatsioonid: Tallinna vanalinn vaatefilmides 1960.–1970. aastail / Tourist Escapism and Symphonic Variations: The Old Town of Tallinn in the scenics of the 1960s and 1970s. – Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi, vol. 14, no. 2–3, pp. 69–91.
- Näripea, Eva; Trossek, Andreas (eds.) 2008. *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Special issue of Koht ja paik / Place and Location. Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics, no. 7. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts; Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum.
- Näripea, Eva 2010. Transnational Spaces of Science Fiction: An Estonian-Polish Co-Production *The Test of Pilot Pirx* (*Test pilota Pirxa / Navigaator Pirx*, 1978). – Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema. Eds. Eva Näripea, Ewa Mazierska, Mari Laaniste, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/estonian.shtml>.
- Näripea, Eva; Mazierska, Ewa; Laaniste, Mari (eds.) 2010. Kinokultura: New Russian Cinema, Special Issue 10: Estonian Cinema, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/10/estonian.shtml>.
- O'Connor, Kevin 2006. *Culture and Customs of the Baltic States*. Westport: Greenwood; Oxford: Harcourt Education.
- Olesk, Sirje 1999. Jää all ja peal. Eesti nõukogude luule kontekst aastatel 1956–1962. – Mis on see ise: tekst, tagapõhi, isikupära. Eds. Maie Kalda, Õnne Kepp. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia, Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus, pp. 390–402.
- Orav, Õie 1977. *Jüri Järvet*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.

- Orav, Õie 2003. Tallinnfilm I. Mängufilmid 1947–1976. Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus.
- Orr, John 2000. *The Revival of the Cinematic City*. – J. Orr. *The Art and Politics of Film*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 136–154.
- Orr, John; Ostrowska, Elżbieta (ed.) 2003. *The Cinema of Andrzej Wajda: The Art of Irony and Defiance*. London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Ostrowska, Elżbieta 2004. *Landscape and the Lost Time: Ethnoscape in the Work of Andrzej Wajda*. – *Kinoeye*, vol. 4 (5), <http://www.kinoeye.org/04/05/ostrowska05.php>.
- Oudart, Jean-Pierre 1977–1978. *Cinema and Suture*. – *Screen*, vol. 18 (4), pp. 35–47.
- Oukaderova, Lida 2010. *The Sense of Movement in Georgii Daneliia's Walking the Streets of Moscow*. – *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, vol. 4 (1), pp. 5–21.
- Owen, Jonathan L. 2011. *Avant-Garde to New Wave: Czechoslovak Cinema, Surrealism and the Sixties*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Paas, Veste 1980. *Olnud ajad. Kinematograafia Eestis 1895–1932*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Paas, Veste 1982. *Varasemaid vaatefilme Eestist: märkmeid ühe žanri kujunemisest*. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 2, pp. 63–67.
- Paas, Veste 2002. *Oli kunagi Tallinna kinostuudio I*. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 6, pp. 70–75.
- Palang, Hannes; Mander, Ülo 2000. *Maastiku muutused Eestis*. – *Kaasaegse ökoloogia probleemid. Loodusteaduslikud ülevaated Eesti Maa päeval*. Ed. Toomas Frey. Tartu: Eesti Põllumajandusülikool, Tartu Ülikool; Tallinn: EV Keskkonnaministeerium, pp. 169–179.
- Paljasmaa, Aivo 2009. *Raul Tammet – filmimees, kes selja pööras*. – *Lääne Elu*, 25 April.
- Pallasmaa, Juhani 2007. *The Architecture of Image: Existential Space in Cinema*. Helsinki, Rakennustieto.
- Peil, Tiina 1999. *Islescapes: Estonian Small Islands through Three Centuries*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Peil, Tiina 2008. *Kodu maastikus*. – *Vikerkaar*, no. 7–8, pp. 145–151.
- Peil, Tiina; Sooväli, Helen 2005. *Estonian National Landscapes – the Sum and Its Parts*. – *Landscape, Law and Justice. Proceedings of a conference organised by the Centre for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, Oslo, 15–19 June 2003*. Eds. Tiina Peil, Michael Jones. Oslo: Novus, Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, pp. 49–60.
- Penz, François; Thomas, Maureen (eds.) 1997. *Cinema & Architecture: Méliès, Mallet-Stevens, Multimedia*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Petric, Vlada 1989–1990. *Tarkovsky's Dream Imagery*. – *Film Quarterly*, vol. 43 (2), pp. 28–34.
- Pily, Aare 2007. *"Sa oled mul teine"*. Teisesusest eesti kultuuri eneseanalüüsis. – *Vikerkaar*, no. 3, pp. 77–92.
- Pomerance, Murray (ed.) 2007. *City that Never Sleeps: New York and the Filmic Imagination*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Pospíšil, Tomáš 2008. *The Bomb, the Cold War and the Czech Film*. – *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, vol. 6 (2), pp. 142–147.
- Post, Eda 2008. *Andrzej Wajda: maailm küll teadis, aga ei hoolinud*. – *Eesti Päevaleht*, 16 February.

- Preston, Ward 1994. *What an Art Director Does: Introduction to Motion Picture Production Design*. Los Angeles: Silman-James Press.
- Prokhorov, Alexander 2001. *The Unknown New Wave: Soviet Cinema of the 1960s*. – *Springtime for Soviet Cinema: Re/Viewing the 1960s*. Ed. A. Prokhorov. Pittsburgh, pp. 7–28, <http://www.rusfilm.pitt.edu/booklets/Thaw.pdf>.
- Prokhorov, Alexander 2002. *Inherited Discourse: Stalinist Tropes in Thaw Culture*. PhD thesis. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, <http://etd.library.pitt.edu/ETD/available/etd-07242002-135513/>.
- Prokhorov, Alexander 2007. *The Adolescent and the Child in the Cinema of the Thaw*. – *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, vol. 1 (2), pp. 115–130.
- Pöldroos, Enn 2001. *Mees narrimütsiga*. Tallinn: Kunst.
- Pärnapuu, Georg 1989. *Film propaganda teenistuses*. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 6, pp. 34–39.
- Radvanyi, Jean 1997. *Cinema in the Soviet Republics*. – *The Oxford History of World Cinema*. Ed. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 651–656.
- Radynski, Oleksiy 2009. *The Corman Effect: A Give-and-Take between Soviet and American Cold-War Science Fiction Film*. – *KinoKultura, Special Issue 9: Ukrainian Cinema*. Ed. Vitaly Chernetsky, <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/9/radynski-corman.shtml>.
- Ramírez, Juan Antonio 2004. *Architecture for the Screen: A Critical Study of Set Design in Hollywood's Golden Age*. Jefferson, London: McFarland.
- Ramp, Ülle [Tormis, Lea] 1969. *Teatrikihermeid*. – *Noorus*, no. 1, p. 46.
- Relph, Edward 1976. *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion.
- Remsu, Olev 1986. *Aastad ja filmid. Essee Leida Laiusest*. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 11, pp. 20–33.
- Remsu, Olev 2009. "Kogu" Tammet. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 2, pp. 102–113, <http://www.temuki.ee/numbers/2009/2/article4832.pdf>.
- Rhodes, John David 2007. *Stupendous, Miserable City: Pasolini's Rome*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Richardson, Michael 2006. *Surrealism and Cinema*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Rieder, John 2008. *Colonialism and the Emergence of Science Fiction*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Rimmel, Rudolf 1973. *Tapja nimi on tõusik*. – *Sirp ja Vasar*, 17 August.
- Robinson, Chris J. 2003. *Between Genius & Utter Illiteracy: A Story of Estonian Animation*. Tallinn: Varrak.
- Robinson, Chris J. 2010. *Geniaalsuse ja täieliku kirjaoskamatus vahel: eesti animatsiooni lugu*. Trans. Kristjan-Jaak Kangur. Tallinn: Varrak.
- Ronduda, Łukasz; Piwowska, Barbara (eds.) 2008. *Polish New Wave: The History of a Phenomenon That Never Existed / Polska nowa fala. Historia zjawiska, ktorego nie było*. Warsaw: Adam Mickiewicz Institute.
- Rosen, Philip (ed.) 1985. *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ross, Jaan; Lehiste, Ilse 2001. *The Temporal Structure of Estonian Runic Songs*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Ruus, Jaan *s.a.* "Tallinnfilm" kui monument, <http://www.tallinnfilm.ee/index.php?page=67>.
- Rähesoo, Jaak 1976/1995. Hermaküla ja Tooming. – J. Rähesoo. Hecuba pärast. Kirjutisi teatrist ja draamast 1969–1994. Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 62–74.
- Rähesoo, Jaak 1994/1995. Tagasivaade: kraamimispäev. – J. Rähesoo. Hecuba pärast. Kirjutisi teatrist ja draamast 1969–1994. Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 267–312.
- Rähesoo, Jaak 1997. Eessõna. – Thespis. Meie teatriuendused 1972/1973. Ed. Vaino Vahing. Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 9–21.
- Rähesoo, Jaak 2002. Mõtisklus Hermakülast. – Hermaküla. Eds. Luule Epner, Mati Unt, Vaino Vahing. Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 447–451.
- Rähesoo, Jaak 2003. Estonian Theatre. Tallinn: Estonian Theatre Union.
- Rähesoo, Jaak 2007. Estonian Theater Loosens the Soviet Straightjacket. – History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe, vol. 3, The Making and Remaking of Literary Institutions: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries. Eds. Marcel Cornis-Pope, John Neubauer. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 247–250.
- Salvesroni, Simonetta 1987. The Science-Fiction Films of Andrei Tarkovsky. – Science Fiction Studies, vol. 14 (3), pp. 294–306.
- Sanders, James 2001. Celluloid Skyline: New York and the Movies. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sang, Joel 1986. Peatnägija tunnistus. – Teater. Muusika. Kino, no. 12, pp. 64–74.
- Sardar, Ziauddin; Cubitt, Sean 2002. Aliens R Us: The Other in Science Fiction Cinema. London, Sterling: Pluto Press.
- Sconce, Jeffrey 2004. "Trashing" the Academy: Taste, Excess, and an Emerging Politics of Cinematic Style. – Film Theory and Criticism. 6th ed. Eds. Leo Braudy, Marshall Cohen. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 534–553.
- Šein, Hagi 2005. Suur teleraamat. 50 aastat televisiooni Eestis 1955–2005. Tallinn: TEA Kirjastus.
- Sennett, Robert S. 1994. Setting the Scene: The Great Hollywood Art Directors. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Shaal, Hans Dieter 1996. Learning from Hollywood: Architecture and Film. Stuttgart, London: Axel Menges.
- Shiel, Mark 2001. Cinema and the City in History and Theory. – Cinema and the City: Film and Urban Societies in a Global Context. Eds. Mark Shiel, Tony Fitzmaurice. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell, pp. 1–18.
- Shiel, Mark; Fitzmaurice, Tony (eds.) 2001. Cinema and the City: Film and Urban Societies in a Global Context. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell.
- Shiel, Mark; Fitzmaurice, Tony (eds.) 2003. Screening the City. London, New York: Verso.
- Shields, Rob 2004. Henri Lefebvre. – Key Thinkers on Space and Place. Eds. Phil Hubbard, Rob Kitchin, Gill Valentine. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage, pp. 208–213.
- Shonfield, Katherine 2000. Walls Have Feelings: Architecture, Film and the City. London, New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Anthony 1999. Myths and Memories of the Nation. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Smith, Graham; Law, Vivien; Wilson, Andrew; Bohr, Annette; Allworth, Edward 1998. *Nation-Building in the Post-Soviet Borderlands*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sobchack, Vivian 1997. *Screening Space: The American Science Fiction Film*. 2nd ed. New York: Rutgers University Press.
- Sobchack, Vivian 1998. "Lounge Time": Post-War Crises and the Chronotope of Film Noir. – *Refiguring American Film Genres: History and Theory*. Ed. Nick Browne. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 129–170.
- Sobchack, Vivian 1999. *Cities on the Edge of Time: The Urban Science-Fiction Film*. – *Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science-Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Annette Kuhn. London, New York: Verso, pp. 123–143.
- Sobchack, Vivian 2004. *Post-Futurism*. – *Liquid Metal: The Science Fiction Film Reader*. Ed. Sean Redmond. London, New York: Wallflower Press, pp. 220–227.
- Sobolewski, Tadeusz 2008. *Poola filmikunsti kuldsed aastad*. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 11, pp. 118–125, <http://www.temuki.ee/numbers/2008/11/article4780.pdf>.
- Soldovieri, Stefan 1998. *Socialists in Outer Space: East German Film's Venusian Adventure*. – *Film History*, vol. 10 (3), pp. 382–398.
- Sontag, Susan 2004. *The Imagination of Disaster*. – *Liquid Metal: The Science Fiction Film Reader*. Ed. Sean Redmond. London, New York: Wallflower Press, pp. 40–47. Originally published in Sontag, Susan 1994. *Against Interpretation*. London: Vintage Press.
- Sooväli, Helen 2008. *Maastiku kirurgia*. – *Vikerkaar*, no. 7–8, pp. 130–137.
- Sorlin, Pierre 1980. *The Film in History: Restaging the Past*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sorlin, Pierre 1991. *The Blurred Image of Cities*. – P. Sorlin. *European Cinemas, European Societies 1939–1990*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 111–137.
- Sorlin, Pierre 2005. *Urban Space in European Cinema*. – *Revisiting Space: Space and Place in European Cinema*. Eds. Wendy Ellen Everett, Axel Goodbody. Oxford: Peter Lang, pp. 25–36.
- Staiger, Janet 1999. *Future Noir: Contemporary Representations of Visionary Cities*. – *Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science-Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Annette Kuhn. London, New York: Verso, pp. 97–122.
- Stam, Robert 1989. *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film*. Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stam, Robert 2000. *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stam, Robert 2011. *Filmiteooria. Sissejuhatus*. Trans. Eva Närepea, Mari Laaniste, Andreas Trossek. Tallinn: Eesti Kunstiakadeemia.
- Stam, Robert; Burgoyne, Robert; Flitterman-Lewis, Sandy 1992. *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics: Structuralism, Post-Structuralism and Beyond*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Šukaitytė, Renata (ed.) 2010. *Baltic Cinemas after the 90s: Shifting (Hi)stories and (Id)entities / Baltijos šalių kinas po 90-ųjų: kintančios istorijos ir tapatumai*. *Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis*, no. 56. Vilnius: Vilniaus dailės akademijos leidykla.
- Sutcliffe, Anthony 1984. *The Metropolis in the Cinema*. – *Metropolëis 1890–1940*. Ed. Anthony Sutcliffe. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 147–171.
- Säde, Enn 2008. *Enn säde silmist ja meelest*. – *Sirp*, 6 June.

- Tammer, Enno (ed.) 2008. Nõukogude piir ja lukus elu. Meie mälestused. Tallinn: Tammerraamat.
- Tashiro, C. S. 1998. *Pretty Pictures: Production Design and the History of Film*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Taylor, Richard 1991. Ideology as Mass Entertainment: Boris Shumyatsky and Soviet Cinema in the 1930s. – *Inside the Film Factory: New Approaches to Russian and Soviet Cinema*. Eds. Richard Taylor, Ian Christie. London: Routledge, pp. 193–216.
- Teinemaa, Sulev 2009. Unustatud vana hõbe. Esimene valik eesti lühimängufilme DVD-l. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 8/9, pp. 142–156, <http://www.temuki.ee/numbers/2009/8-9/article4942.pdf>.
- Thompson, Kristin 1988. *Breaking the Glass Armor: Neoformalist Film Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Thompson, Kristin 2004. The Concept of Cinematic Excess. – *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 6th ed. Eds. Leo Braudy, Marshall Cohen. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 513–524.
- Thompson, Kristin; Bordwell, David 1976. Space and Narrative in the Films of Ozu. – *Screen*, vol. 17 (2), pp. 41–73.
- Tigane, L. 1951. Film kolhoosikorra võidust eesti külas. – *Sirp ja Vasar*, 1 September.
- Tobro, Valdeko 1962. Neorealismi jälgedes. – *Edasi*, 7 August.
- Tobro, Valdeko 1967. “Keskpäevane praam”. – *Õhtuleht*, 7 June.
- Tode, Emil. 2000. *Border State*. Trans. Madli Puhvel. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Tomberg, Donald 2006. Tühirand ja maailma äär. Mati Undi “Tühirand” ja “Võlg” filmis. – *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 3, pp. 95–103, <http://www.temuki.ee/arhiiv/2006/03/lugu12.pdf>.
- Tomberg, Donald 2009. Väljumine kapist või siis riulist. – *Sirp*, 11 September, http://www.sirp.ee/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=9340:vaeljumine-kapist-voisiis-riulist&catid=4:film&Itemid=3&issue=3266.
- Torop, Peeter 1988. Mängufilmiaasta 1988. – *Teater. Muusika Kino*, no. 9, pp. 16–28.
- Tooming, Jaan 1976. Kõnelus Jaan Toomingaga. – *Kultuur ja Elu*, no. 3, pp. 23–24.
- Tooming, Peeter 1995. Ikka fotost. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Treier, Elem 1988. “Viini postmargist”, teravatest nurkadest, kastidest ja suurpaneelmajadest. – *Noorte Hääl*, 19 January.
- Трояновский, В. А. (ред.) 1996. *Кинематограф оттепели. Книга первая*. Москва: Материк.
- Трояновский, В. А. (ред.) 2002. *Кинематограф оттепели. Книга вторая*. Москва: Материк.
- Trossek, Andreas 2006. Rein Raamatu ja Priit Pärna joonisfilmid nõukogude võimudiskursuses. Ambivalents kui allasurutu dominantne kultuurikood totalitarismis / *Animation Films of Rein Raamat and Priit Pärn in the Discourse of Soviet Power: Ambivalence as the Dominant Cultural Code of the Oppressed in Totalitarianism*. – *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi*, vol. 15 (4), pp. 98–128.
- Trossek, Andreas 2008. When Did It Get Political? Soviet Film Bureaucracy and Estonian Hand-Drawn Animation. – *Koht ja paik / Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics*, no. 7. Special Issue: *Via Transversa: Lost Cinema of the Former Eastern Bloc*. Eds. Eva Näripea, Andreas Trossek. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts; Tartu: Estonian Literary Museum, pp. 31–46.

- Trossek, Andreas 2009. Eesti popanimatsioon 1973–1979. Joonisfilmist lähikunsti ajaloo kontekstis / Estonian Pop Animation 1973–1979: Hand-Drawn Animation in the Context of Recent Art History. – Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi, vol. 18 (1–2), pp. 69–107.
- Trumpener, Katie 1997. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tunbridge, E. J.; Ashworth, G. J. 1995. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Turovskaya, Maya 1989. *Cinema as Poetry*. London: Faber.
- Tuumalu, Tiit 2008. “Navigaator Pirx” – 30 aastat hiljem. – Postimees, March 22, <http://blog.postimees.ee/300308/esileht/ak/319037.php?navigaator-pirx-30-aastat-hiljem>.
- Tüür, Kadri 2002. Those Who Love (in) the Woods. – Koht ja paik / Place and Location, no. 2. Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Arts, no. 10. Eds. Virve Sarapik, Kadri Tüür, Mari Laanemets. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts, Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus, pp. 488–498, http://eki.ee/km/place/pdf/KP2_26tyyr.pdf.
- Unt, Aune 2005. Televisioon Eestis. – Estonian Broadcasting Museum, <http://www.rhmuuseum.ee/?page=61>.
- Unt, Liina 2005. Meri ja mere pilt. – Eesti looduskultuur. Eds. Timo Maran, Kadri Tüür. Tartu: Eesti Kultuuriloo ja Folkloristika Keskus, Eesti Kirjandusmuuseum pp. 120–150.
- Unt, Mati 1965. Mis suunas areneb kaasaegne kinokunst? – Küsimused ja vastused, no. 4, pp. 35–38.
- Unt, Mati 1966. Romaan ja film ehk mis juhtus Andres Lapeteusega. – Edasi, 26 March.
- Unt, Mati 1967. “Tütarlaps mustas”. – Edasi, 5 February.
- Unt, Mati 1968. Kiri teatri kohta. – Noorus, no. 11, pp. 61–62.
- Unt, Mati 1972. Teater: siin ja praegu. – Teatrimärkmik 1968/69. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, pp. 128–136.
- Unt, Mati 1972/1997. Minu teatriglossarium. – Thespis. Meie teatriuendused 1972/1973. Ed. Vaino Vahing. Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 117–158.
- Unt, Mati 2002. Teatriuenduse algusest Nõukogude Eestis. – Sirp, 25 January.
- Unt, Mati 2004. *Theatrum mundi*. Ed. Luule Epner. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Urbla, Peeter 1988. Teel ekraanile. Tallinnifilmi kaheseerialine mängufilm “Ma ei ole turist, ma elan siin”. – Ekraan, no. 12, p. 10.
- Urry, John 1990. *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Urry, John. 1992. The Tourist Gaze “revisited.” – *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 36 (2), pp. 172–186.
- Вайль, Петр; Генис, Александр 2001. 60-е: мир советского человека. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение.
- Vahing, Vaino (ed.) 1997. *Thespis. Meie teatriuendused 1972/1973*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Vaher, Vaapo 2009. Kino on saatan, kes imeb su rinda. Vene kino katekismus. Tallinn: Pegasus.
- Valgemäe, Mardi 1995. Linn ja teater. Lavamärkmeid mitmelt maalt. Tallinn: Vagabund.
- Vallak, Peet 2005. Lodjavahi surm. – Õudne Eesti. Valimik eesti õudusjutte. Ed. Indrek Hargla. Tallinn: Varrak, pp. 159–169.

- Veidemann, Rein 1991. Kuuekümnendate põlvkond Eesti kultuuris ja ühiskonnas. – Sirp, 16 August.
- Veisaitė, Irena 1979/2002. Otsingute teel. Eesti režissööride noor põlvkond. – Hermaküla.
Eds. Luule Epner, Mati Unt, Vaino Vahing. Tartu: Ilmamaa, pp. 198–199.
- Velsker, Mart 1999. Mis on kuuekümnendad eesti kirjanduses? – Looming, no. 8, pp. 1210–1216.
- Vice, Sue 1997. The Chronotope: Fleshing out Time. – S. Vice. *Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, pp. 200–228.
- Viitung, Raul 2007a. UFO-eri: “Soolo” (Tallinnfilm, 1979), “Pulmapilt” (Mosfilm, 1981) ja “Hukkunud Alpinisti Hotell” (Tallinnfilm, 1979). – Eesti filmid, <http://eestifilmid.blogspot.com/search/label/UFO-eri>.
- Viitung, Raul 2007b. “Võlg” (Eesti Telefilm, 1966). – Eesti filmid, <http://eestifilmid.blogspot.com/2007/04/vlg-eesti-telefilm-1966.html>.
- Vitali, Valentina; Willemen, Paul (eds.) 2006. *Theorising National Cinema*. London: British Film Institute.
- Walsh, Michael 1996. National Cinema, National Imaginary. – *Film History*, vol. 8 (1), pp. 5–17.
- Wang, Ning 2000. *Tourism and Modernity: A Sociological Analysis*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- Webb, Michael 1987. The City in Film. – *Design Quarterly*, no. 136, pp. 3–33.
- Webber, Andrew; Wilson, Emma (eds.) 2008. *Cities in Transition: The Moving Image and the Modern Metropolis*. London, New York: Wallflower Press.
- Widdis, Emma 1996. An Unmappable System: The Collapse of Public Space in Late-Soviet Film. – *Film Criticism*, vol. 21 (2), pp. 8–24.
- Widdis, Emma 2000. Borders: The Aesthetic of Conquest in Soviet Cinema of the 1930s. – *Journal of European Studies: Literature and Ideas from the Renaissance to the Present*, vol. 30 (4), pp. 401–411.
- Widdis, Emma 2003a. To Explore or Conquer? Mobile Perspectives on the Soviet Cultural Revolution. – *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*. Eds. Evgeny Dobrenko, Eric Naiman. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, pp. 219–240.
- Widdis, Emma 2003b. *Visions of a New Land: Soviet Film from the Revolution to the Second World War*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
- Willemen, Paul 1989. The Third Cinema Question: Notes and Reflections. – *Questions of Third Cinema*. Eds. Jim Pines, Paul Willemen. London: British Film Institute, pp. 1–29.
- Williams, Alan (ed.) 2002. *Film and Nationalism*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Woll, Josephine 2000. *Real Images: Soviet Cinema and the Thaw*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Wollen, Peter 2004. The Two Avant-Gardes. – *Film Theory: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies*. Eds. Philip Simpson, Andrew Utternson, Karen J. Shepherdson. London: Routledge, pp. 127–137.

