

**Refracting Space:
Navigating the Suburban Milieu in Finnish film
1960-1980**

by Essi Viitanen

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

UCL

Department of Scandinavian Studies

January 2015

I, Essi Viitanen confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

Thesis Abstract:

The thesis examines cinematic representations of Finnish suburbs between 1960 and 1980. It demonstrates how filmic strategies are employed to critique welfare state politics and how the films channel popular anxieties about rapid urban change. The research is divided into five chapters each focusing on the analysis of one film. The films are presented in chronological order drawing out a timeline for cinematic, social and architectural change, beginning with the planning of the suburbs and ending with the second generation of dwellers. The films recreate architecture and space on screen in different ways, whilst addressing a variety of themes such as nostalgia, surveillance, mapping and navigation. The analysis of these themes draws on classic and recent critical theory on space and cinema including Henri Lefebvre, Michel de Certeau, Marc Augé, Laura Marks and Giuliana Bruno.

The thesis approaches the spaces through three lenses, each highlighting a dimension of the suburban environment. The first lens excavates the social and political context which led to the building of the suburbs, drawing attention to the policies of the Finnish welfare state, and shifts in social landscape brought on by urbanisation. The second lens regards the architectural designs and urban planning, and ways in which they translated social ideals of the welfare state into physical reality. Finally, and most importantly, the third lens studies how film reinterprets these spaces, infiltrating the choreography of everyday life. Moving through the lenses, the image of the suburb is refracted and transmuted. The potential of the cinematic world to negotiate the intersection of physical environment and lived experience is at the core of the thesis. It introduces new readings of pivotal Finnish films, examines their larger socio-political context and asks broader questions of the relationship of the cinematic spaces to their real life counterparts.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	5
Introduction	6
Chapter 1 Suburbs on Paper: Planning new slums in <i>Yksityisalue</i>	39
Chapter 2 Garden City Trolls: Voyeurism in the woods in <i>Vihreä leski</i>	71
Chapter 3 Nostalgic Maps: Wandering in a disappearing cityscape in <i>Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei</i>	103
Chapter 4 Brick by Brick: Building a haptic home in <i>Jouluksi kotiin</i>	136
Chapter 5 Writing on the Walls: Escaping the suburb in <i>Täältä tullaan, elämä!</i>	164
Conclusion	194
Appendix 1	201
Appendix 2	217
Appendix 3	229
Appendix 4	241
Bibliography	256

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my supervisor Claire Thomson for her belief in this project; for giving space to get lost within research yet also guiding me back on track with utmost kindness. I would also like to thank my secondary supervisor Titus Hjelm for his help in negotiating the interdisciplinary challenges of the project, Andrew Higson for his helpful feedback, and Elettra Carbone for her notes and acting as guide through the PhD process. Many thanks go to colleagues at UCL for creating a stimulating environment for research, with a special mention to Pei-Sze Chow for flooding my email with interesting articles.

I would like to thank Tommi Partanen at the National Audiovisual Archive of Finland for being generous with his time and rounding down the archive material bill, Jorma Sairanen and Heikki Takkinen for granting me rights to borrow copies of films. I would like to express my gratitude to Peter Stadius and Anu Korhonen for inviting me over to test out the ideas of this thesis on students at Helsinki University, and the students on the course whose questions offered new insight into familiar landscapes.

I have been extremely fortunate to have a group of friends and family who have endured the thesis experience alongside me. I would like to thank Renée for being an eternally optimistic cheerleader throughout the process, Alex for stimulating conversation and crisis management, and Satu for her lunch deliveries to the library. I am grateful for my family, including the Pihtipudas faction, for their enthusiasm and support, and for my father for broadening my horizons. Finally I must thank Kaarlo for his inexhaustible patience and compassion.

Introduction

This thesis examines how the constructions of cinematic space in selected Finnish fiction films of 1960-1980 reflect, negotiate and shape the effects of urbanisation on society. It investigates the role of cinema as not only depicting, but also influencing and mediating social change. I argue that the visual language of a number of Finnish films of the time period conveys anxieties surrounding a newly emerging suburban lifestyle and charts its subsequent development. The research project introduces new readings of pivotal Finnish films, examines their larger socio-political context and asks broader questions of the relationship of the cinematic spaces to their real life equivalents. The time period of 1960-1980 marked the development of the Finnish welfare state, saw rapid urbanisation and heralded the era of Finnish New Wave filmmaking. The films examined in the thesis are presented in chronological order drawing out a timeline for social, architectural and cinematic change, beginning with the planning of the suburbs and ending with the second generation of dwellers. The scope of the thesis has been deliberately limited to focus solely on feature length fiction films portraying suburban spaces around Helsinki. This decision has been made in order to allow for both detailed critical analysis of each film and for an examination of the real world referents that the films draw inspiration from. The research therefore draws on film theory, architectural history, welfare state politics and spatial theories to understand the role of the cinematic cityscape at the intersection of these. This interdisciplinary research project is an exploration into how cinema can capture and affect the changing nature of our attitudes and relations to our surroundings.

The introduction chapter provides a road map into the thesis, beginning with an overview of the context of the research, outlining the political, architectural and cinematic background of the project. It then lays out the parameters of the corpus and presents the methodological approach of the research with an accompanying literature review. This overview of the themes of the project is followed by a brief summary of the thesis structure.

1. CONTEXT

This section provides a brief overview of the political and social context in which the films discussed in the thesis were produced. Though the films in question were released between 1962 and 1980, the research period covers the two decades in full, 1960 to 1980, in order to sufficiently chart the roots of social, political and cinematic change. These decades cover a turbulent time in Finnish politics as well as a period of rapid urbanisation. These developments are intrinsically linked to both the building of the Finnish suburbs and the evolution of the Finnish film industry, and therefore must be taken into consideration when discussing the corpus. This compact survey provides an outline of historical context and a starting point for the thesis research. Building upon this foundation the subsequent chapters expand upon and examine in more detail the three themes of socio-political history, urbanisation and film history.

1.1 Welfare State

The birth of the Finnish welfare state was a driving force behind social, political and cultural change in the 1960s and 1970s. The Finnish welfare system followed the precedent of its Nordic neighbours, borrowing most strongly from the Swedish model (Hilson 2008, p. 180), with a social policy system of state-backed pensions, universal healthcare and childcare. The first steps in this development were taken in the 1930s with new laws on old age pension and annual holidays (Jussila, Hentilä and Nevakivi 1999, p.172), but the full extent of social reform was not set into motion until the early 1960s informed by Pekka Kuusi's (1962) book *60-luvun sosiaalipolitiikka*.¹² Kuusi made the case for social policy as rational planning and emphasised 'social reforms as functional needs' (Kettunen 2001, p. 232). The book, which outlined a model for the Finnish system of welfare, received wide media attention and provoked political debate about the direction of social policy in Finland (Tuomioja, 2003, p. 309). Building on this discourse universal childcare, healthcare, pensions, and social security were made available to citizens whilst the state took an active role in shaping an egalitarian society (Paavonen and Kangas 2006, 12). As full employment was a high priority to pay for the costs of the welfare state (Hilson, 2008, p. 66), women began to enter the workforce in greater numbers. This financial necessity, along with urbanisation, resulted in a social

¹ All translations from Finnish and Swedish are by the author unless stated otherwise.

² English title *Social Policy for the Sixties: A Plan for Finland*

³ 'Täyttäköön tähän nouseva puutarhakaupunki siihen kiinnitetyt toiveet ja olkoon se voimakkaana

² English title *Social Policy for the Sixties: A Plan for Finland*

shift which marked a significant change in Finnish family dynamics (Standertskjöld, 2011, p. 12). The example also illustrates the power of welfare state policies as social catalyst, their effects seeping into the private sphere. The scope of policies also extended the reach of the welfare state to cultural life and film industry through new funding structures, allowing Finnish filmmaking to be developed as a national project (Pantti 1999c, p.164). The impact of welfare state policies was felt throughout the realms of Finnish political, social and cultural life. It is therefore crucial to recognise the breadth of influence and fundamental importance of the welfare state in Finnish society, when examining the social issues presented in Finnish cinema of the 1960s-1980s. Thus the welfare state's policies and their cultural impact loom large in the discussion of each film.

1.2 Urbanisation

The period which the films depict (1962-1980) was also a time of mass migration and urbanisation. Employment opportunities in rural areas diminished due to agricultural reforms and structural change, and people congregated to urban centres in southern Finland in search of work (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 12). In addition to internal migration Finnish emigration peaked in 1969 when 'over 54,000 Finnish citizens left the country, mostly to work in Sweden.' (Hilson 2008, p. 158). A generation of Finns was in motion and within a period of thirty years (1950-1980) the population had shifted from a predominantly rural one to one where the majority of people were urban dwellers (Vahtola 2003, p. 410). The stage of everyday life in Finland had changed drastically, leaving behind ancestral farmlands in favour of a modern urban lifestyle. The rapid rate of urbanisation brought on a housing shortage, especially around metropolitan Helsinki (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 16). This dire need for accommodation prompted the welfare state to take action. As a response state-funded suburban housing was developed, and clusters of white high-rise buildings in the functionalist style rose in the forests surrounding Helsinki (Nikula 1993, p. 138-140). These suburbs became known in Finnish as *lähiö*, a word deriving from *lähellä* which means proximity or nearness. In the form *asumalähiö*, adding the prefix 'living', the word was first used in the 1940s by town planners Otto-I. Meurman and Hannes Teppo (Roivainen 1999, p. 11). Architect and professor Meurman assumed a leading role in devising plans for the Finnish suburb drawing inspiration from Ebenezer Howard's garden city and Clarence Perry's neighbourhood unit (Roivainen 1999, p. 11). Meurman's (1947) vision for the suburb or *lähiö* borrowed elements of these and adapted them into a spacious suburban town plan which retained a connection to the surrounding nature. The building of the Finnish

suburb became intertwined with the building of the welfare state, to the point that the clean-cut architectural style of the Finnish suburbs is argued to embody the egalitarian ideals of the welfare state (Connah 2005, p. 182; Wilson 1992, p. 12). The suburbs and their aesthetic were infused with aspirations for a healthier and happier Finnish urban future. 'May the garden city which rises here fulfil the hopes we have for it, and let it be a strong launch for the development of housing policy in the whole nation.'³. These hopeful words form the final sentence of the charter of Tapiola, laid into the ground alongside the foundation stone in the official ground-breaking ceremony of the suburb on the 5th of September 1953 (von Hertzen 1985, p. 53). This initial optimism regarding the suburbs and their position as show home for the welfare state (Itkonen 1985, p. 340) was soon rejected in the media and they were regarded as a symbol of urban alienation and loneliness (Saari 1972, Makkonen 1968, Kortteinen 1982). This dual role of the suburb, as both bright future and symbol for alienation, and the tensions arising from this juxtaposition are a core theme explored in the cinematic examples in this thesis.

The term *lähiö* itself is not a straightforward or consistent one, but the word has taken on a variety of distinctive connotations over time and in different contexts. It evolved from referring to garden cities in the early 1960s (Roiviainen 1998, p. 12) to being interchanged with the word slum in the 1970s (Roiviainen 1998, p. 13). This illustrates that the *lähiö* is as much a physical place as it is a multi-dimensional social construct (Roiviainen 1998, p. 9). As the *lähiö* became an object of sociological study in the 1990s researchers attempted to give the term a clear definition. According to Hankonen (1994, p. 19) the *lähiö* is an area of mainly high-rise housing, which is built and marketed in the tradition of the Meurman forest town. Hurme (1991, p. 177) argues that the word *lähiö* has become to mean areas of housing which form the commuter belt distinctly set apart from the city centre. Others (Seppälä et al 1990, p. 9) define the *lähiö* less by building type and more by its location on the outskirts of larger cities. Aside from referring to location or a certain type of housing, the *lähiö* is also used to convey the social profile of inhabitants often found in the poorer neighbourhoods (Ilmonen 1994, p. 30). Therefore, as Mats Stjernberg (2013) notes, the entire term carries multiple meanings and covers a diverse range of areas and inhabitants. A *lähiö* can have both high-rise and low-rise houses, be located on the outskirts of Helsinki or any other city, and house people from all walks of life. However 'most commonly the

³ 'Täyttäköön tähän nouseva puutarhakaupunki siihen kiinnitetyt toiveet ja olkoon se voimakkaana sysäyksenä asuntopoliittiselle kehitykselle koko maassa.'

lähiö is used to refer to predominantly multi-storey housing areas built outside of the city plan⁴ notes Roiviainen (1998, p. 11). The focus of this thesis is specifically this type of high-rise *lähiö*. As the term *lähiö* carries such specific social and cultural meaning there is no equivalent word in English, therefore when discussing the Finnish suburb in this thesis it is the *lähiö* that the analysis is referring to.

1.3 New Wave of filmmaking

In the 1960s the Finnish state was also taking an active role in shaping the Finnish film industry. By the early 1960s the studio system, a duopoly consisting of two studios Suomi-Filmi⁵ founded in 1919 and Suomen Filmitörmä⁶ 1933, had become unprofitable (Salmi, 1999, p. 7). The studios which had dominated the film industry in previous decades were struggling and cutting down on production. Under intense financial strain the Finnish commercial film industry was shutting down and state intervention to support the arts was called for (Pantti, 1999c, p. 161). Jörn Donner's (1961) essay *Suomalainen elokuva vuonna nolla*,⁷ fuelled the debate surrounding the state of a post-studio Finnish film industry and its future. The essay marked the emergence of the Finnish New Wave of filmmaking, led by a group of young directors taking their cues from the French New Wave (Pantti, 1999a p.121). The work of these directors was made possible by a new government-subsidised funding structure, which replaced the commercial studio system with state funded film production (Salmi 1999, p. 8). This system of support began in 1961 with film prizes and was later centralised to The Finnish Film Foundation in 1969 (Pantti 1999b, p. 136, Toiviainen, 1975, p. 14). In contrast to the previous studio system which could itself determine the objectives of their filmmaking, Pantti (1999c, p. 163) argues that as the state took over funding 'the task of defining national film can be argued to have moved from those making art to those supporting art'.⁸ The Finnish film industry began to operate by a new set of rules, ones less focused on box office figures and more interested in film's significance as a pillar of national culture (Pantti 1999b, p. 144). This more artistically, and less financially, driven approach allowed a young generation of filmmakers to push the conventions of Finnish cinema in both style and subject matter, drawing their inspiration from urban life (Toiviainen, 1975a, p. 12, 31, 34). One paramount duty of

⁴ 'yleisesti lähiöllä viitataan kaupunkirakenteesta erilleen rakennettuihin kerrostalovaltaisiin asuntoalueisiin'

⁵ translates to Finland-Film

⁶ translates to Finnish Film Industry

⁷ title translates to *Finnish Film In The Year Zero*

⁸ 'kansallisen elokuvan määrittämisen voi väittää siirtyneen taiteen tuottajilta taiteen tukijoille.'

cinema in 1960s and 1970s Finland was seen as that of a social commentator (Pantti 1999a, p. 121). This social responsibility combined with having little obligation to woo the audience to the box office, resulted in a shift in genre towards socially critical dramas. In 1962 *Tanttu* (1962, p.12) captured the early 1960s watershed in Finnish cinema as he wrote that:

New producers are ambitious in their thinking (financial greed is of no use): away from the old and the false...Of course they have much to learn, obstacles and possibilities for failure. But bold they are and at some point someone must begin the improvement work... The young generation has claimed film as their own.⁹

Citing the rise in film clubs, film criticism and filmmaking *Tanttu* (1962, p.12) claimed that in Finland in the year 1962 'celluloid is rustling furiously'.¹⁰

Both housing and filmmaking in Finland during this era were thus characterised by significant involvement and influence of the welfare state. Aside from being financed by the welfare state, they were also vehicles that at times encapsulated, reinforced or critiqued the welfare state ethos and ideology. Just as cinema was governed by the Film Political Committee¹¹, a state run body, so too was architecture tied to government policymaking. Film and architecture were both simultaneously part of, and about the same system. They made visible the welfare state ideals and constructed and depicted a new suburban way of life. This intriguing setup and its complexities are investigated throughout the thesis, as the overlapping images of architectural fantasy, real environment and cinematic reappropriation are drawn out.

2. CORPUS

The films examined in this thesis are Maunu Kurkvaara's *Yksityisalue* (*Open Secret*) from 1962, Jaakko Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä leski* (*Green Widow*) from 1968, Risto Jarva's *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* (*The Man Who Could Not Say No*) from 1975, Jaakko Pakkasvirta's *Jouluksi kotiin* (*Home for Christmas*) from 1975 and Tapio Suominen's *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* (*Right on, Man!*) from 1980¹². The films offer five case studies of

⁹ 'Uudet yrittäjät ajattelevat kunnianhimoisesti (rahanhimoisesti ei kannata ajatella): pois vanhasta ja valheellisuudesta... Heillä on tietenkin paljon oppimista, esteitä ja epäonnistumisen mahdollisuuksia. Mutta rohkeita he ovat ja jonkunhan on joskus aloitettava kohennustyö... Nuori polvi on ottanut filmin omakseen.'

¹⁰ 'selluloidin kahisemaan niin kiivaasti'

¹¹ Elokuvapoliittinen komitea

¹² Film details and synopsis in Appendix 4

the history and development of Finnish cinema and the ways in which the suburban milieu has been negotiated on screen. The focus of the thesis is strictly on suburban portrayal, a decision which is reflected in the corpus. The films all deal with the concrete high-rises in and around Helsinki, but as previously discussed the concept of the suburb, or *lähiö*, takes on different meanings at different times. The question of the distinctiveness of the Finnish suburb, its design, development and social connotations, is examined in further detail in the cinematic case studies of the thesis. Each chapter highlights a phase in the development of the suburb: planning the suburbs, the first inhabitants, workers who construct the buildings, those who reject them and finally those who have grown up in them. As the films chosen range over a period of 18 years, 1962-1980, they outline the transition of the Finnish suburb in its various stages. This draws attention to the fact that though documenting a very physically similar environment of nearly identical buildings the cinematic representations of these spaces offer a wide range of interpretations and strategies of representation.

The choice of films used in the thesis started with the process of reading through the *Suomen kansallisfilmografia* (1991, 1998, 1999) film synopses and locations, compiled by the Finnish National Audiovisual Archive, of all the feature length films made in Finland between 1960 and 1980. Based on the criteria of confining the research theme to suburban portrayals, the majority of films were weeded out. Films that were set in a suburb, filmed in one, or touched upon themes of urbanisation were viewed in the National Audiovisual Archives and this selection was subsequently narrowed down to five films that depict various aspects of the suburbs and urbanisation in Finland. The process of selecting films for viewing is illustrated in Appendix 1 where column S stands for suburban set or themed films and column V stands for films viewed. The table reveals the selection process of the corpus, by first listing all of the films of the two decades and their settings, then narrowing down the selection to suburban films, and subsequently recording which ones were viewed. The table also illustrates some overall trends in Finnish film history. The production company column shows the dominance of Suomen Filmitölkki in the early 1960s and the later emergence of smaller production companies illustrating the shift of Finnish film industry from few high-volume producers to several low-volume producers. The setting column charts the development of the suburb as milieu and theme in Finnish cinema. Though central Helsinki remains an important setting for films from the start of the century, it is not until 1962 and Kurkvaara's *Yksityisalue* that filmmakers venture into the suburbs and the suburban theme column receives its first tick. The table shows that after this the suburb and urbanisation become regularly occurring themes with an especially popular year in

1975. Likewise, the listing chronicles how during the latter half of the 1970s, the setting of films increasingly move away from Helsinki to rural areas or more exotic destinations abroad or in Lapland.

The process of listing and viewing films of the two decades brought up several examples that either touched upon the contentious issues of urbanisation or were set in suburbs. The decision to focus on a limited number of case studies was made in order to allow for in depth textual analysis of the film as well as excavating the particular suburban histories of the areas featured in the films. This meant that the initial selection of films that featured a suburban theme or setting had to be narrowed down. The selection process aimed at forming a corpus that reflects both cinematic and societal changes in Finnish filmmaking as well as captures a variety of suburban representations. Each film brings to light a particular part of Finnish film history while illustrating the changing attitudes towards suburbs.

The corpus begins with the Finnish New Wave's 'first messenger of change'¹³ (Toiviainen, 1975a, p. 82) Maunu Kurkvaara, who introduced the Finnish public to the 'the alienated city dweller'¹⁴ (Toiviainen 1975a, p. 31), a theme which grew to be central in his films of the 1960s. Maunu Kurkvaara's 1962 *Yksityisalue*, was selected as an example of the early Finnish New Wave and as the first film that explicitly dealt with the suburban landscape. *Yksityisalue* illustrates the emerging New Wave aesthetic and mode of production that broke away from the traditional studio system that had dominated previous decades. The non-linear narrative and painterly compositions challenged traditional cinematic conventions, as themes of urban loneliness and alienation captured the plight of the modern Finnish man. Kurkvaara was also a true *auteur* acting as director, producer, cinematographer, scriptwriter, editor and set designer of *Yksityisalue*, illustrating the move towards smaller scale of production in Finnish filmmaking. The film also serves as an introduction to the planning process of suburban housing, highlighting the tensions between architects and builders. Drawing inspiration from the Italian neorealism of De Sica and Rossellini and the French New Wave (Cowie 1990, p. 102), *Yksityisalue* reveals the international influences of the Finnish New Wave. While these reasons made *Yksityisalue* an obvious choice for the corpus, another Finnish New Wave film that would also have explored the changing urban milieu would have been Risto Jarva's *Onnenpeli (Game of Luck, 1965)*. It

¹³ 'muutoksen ensimmäisenä airuena'

¹⁴ 'vieraantuneen kaupunkilaisen ihmisen'

explicitly deals with the regeneration of the capital and its architectural changes, but as Jarva's film focuses exclusively on central Helsinki, the choice was made in favour of Kurkvaara's suburban portrayal.

The second film of the corpus is Jaakko Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä leski* from 1968. The film illustrates the turn to social commentary in Finnish filmmaking and explores the suburban lifestyle through the perspective of a female inhabitant. Jaakko Pakkasvirta's socially critical film follows the growing Finnish trend in the late 1960s and early 1970s of questioning the relationship between society and individual (Toiviainen, 1975a, p. 33). The film highlights the disconnect between the suburban milieu and its inhabitants while making a convincing case against the suburban lifestyle. By this point the suburb had also drawn the interest of other Finnish filmmakers. In 1967 Risto Jarva released his influential film *Työmiehen päiväkirja* (*Diary of a Worker*) which follows a young couple settling into a suburban home. Jarva's film intercuts statistical information and maps with the fictitious storyline drawing attention to the process of urbanisation and the individuals caught within it. In 1968 Jörn Donner released his film *Mustaa valkoisella* (*Black on White*) poking fun at middle-class existence in a low-rise suburban home. Similarly to Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä Leski* Donner's film plays on the juxtaposition of idealised home life and the reality of alienated and unhappy inhabitants. Both Jarva and Donner use the suburban home as their setting for the domestic sphere in a rich and nuanced way. While the low-rise home with a spacious garden in *Mustaa valkoisella* was not quite the typical *lähiö* environment, Jarva's commuter suburb of high-rises sprinkled along the train line to Helsinki certainly fit the criteria of a suburban set film. However a decision had to be made on which film to prioritise in the corpus. One significant factor that made Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä leski* particularly interesting for the purposes of the thesis was the fervent press debate it sparked upon its release. In fact *Vihreä leski* was one of the most debated Finnish films of the decade and more importantly the debate extended beyond film criticism and over to debate on urban design, suburban lifestyle and even the welfare state itself. *Vihreä leski* provides an interesting case study as to how film not only reflected the suburbs, but also contributed to the image of the suburb and initiated wider social debate on urbanisation. While the focus of the second chapter is firmly on *Vihreä leski*, the film historical notes do include discussion on how *Työmiehen päiväkirja* and *Mustaa valkoisella* fit into the emergence of the suburban milieu as theme in Finnish film and the wave of socially critical cinema.

The third film in the corpus is Risto Jarva's *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*.

Jarva was one of the directors who defined the Finnish New Wave style, whilst simultaneously addressing problems ‘most often directly linked to current socio-political debate’¹⁵ (Toiviainen 1975a, p. 65). Jarva’s comedy from 1975 however is a departure in style from his previous social dramas, and an effort to make financially viable films (Toiviainen 1983, p. 258). It serves as an example of the financial struggles the Finnish film industry was facing despite the formalised government subsidies, and how the socially critical dramas that came to dominate the Finnish New Wave failed to reach audiences. Jarva’s film also deals with urbanisation from a different point of view as it introduces the viewer to what is lost when high-rise living becomes the norm. While the majority of the film is set in a Helsinki neighbourhood of old wooden houses rather than a forest suburb, Jarva juxtaposes the traditional wooden idyll with the concrete high-rises being built elsewhere in Helsinki. The film shows the effects the rapid urbanisation in Finland had on communities, and what was being left behind when generations of Finns moved into high-rise suburbs. Jarva’s film also captures a turning point in his career as a director as *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* marked the move to comedy in his work before his untimely death in 1977. Jarva’s film also shows inspiration from Jacques Tati’s films, such as the 1967 *Playtime* or the earlier 1958 *Mon Oncle (My Uncle)*. It illustrates how the Jarva was evolving past the initial New Wave style, returning to genre films and giving a new spin on comedic conventions of the studio system. Several of Jarva’s other films also deal with urbanisation, architecture and town planning. His film *Jäniksen vuosi (Year of the Hare)* from 1977 also features oppressive suburban high-rise rabbit hutches and could have been a suitable film to consider for the corpus, but as the theme of this film is more centred on the urban dweller’s relationship with nature *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* proved to be a more fruitful choice.

The same year as Jarva’s *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* was released Jaakko Pakkasvirta’s film *Jouluksi kotiin* had its debut. However Pakkasvirta’s film took on a radically different aesthetic approach to the issue of urbanisation than *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. *Jouluksi kotiin* tells the story of a man who refuses to move into a high-rise apartment and sets out to build his family a detached house. The film draws attention to the role of the workers building the concrete suburbs. As opposed to Jarva’s comedy Pakkasvirta’s film is in line with the leftist political cinema of the mid 1970s in its bleak portrayal of the working man’s life. It illustrates the party politics and community of activist of the Finnish Communist Party while painting a portrait of a

¹⁵ ‘niiden ongelmanasettelut liittyvät usein kiinteästi ajankohtaiseen yhteiskuntapoliittiseen keskusteluun’

hardworking man driven to the end of his tether. This style of filmmaking, drawing on the experience of the worker and demonstrating the lack of available opportunities, was popular at the time. Only a year earlier in 1974 Jarva's film *Yhden miehen sota* (*One Man's War*) had told a similarly desperate story of a man working on the construction sites of suburbs. Both *Jouluksi Kotiin* and *Yhden miehen sota* are black and white films, used amateurs in lead roles and were concerned with the plight of the working man. What sets *Jouluksi kotiin* apart however is that it deals with the physical environment of the home. As *Yhden miehen sota* concentrates on the financial challenges of a small business owner, *Jouluksi kotiin's* central theme is the yearning for a home. This feature of the film allows the chapter to examine the changing nature of the Finnish home at a time of urbanisation and leaving behind rural roots. It also acts as a case study into the challenges of politicised filmmaking of the time.

The final film of the corpus is Tapio Suominen's 1980 portrayal of teenagers growing up in a high-rise suburb in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*. Suominen draws the two decades to a close as a director of the new generation of filmmakers following from the legacy of the Finnish New Wave (Toiviainen 1975a). This way, the corpus traces the evolution of the Finnish New Wave from its first films in the early 1960s to 1980 when yet another generation of filmmakers with new themes and style was emerging. The body of work examined in the thesis reaches across one of the most exciting and innovative eras of Finnish filmmaking. Although Suominen started his film career already in 1970 with *Narrien illat* (*Nights of the Jesters*) he worked on short films for the decade before his second feature film *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*. The long wait was rewarded as the film became a critical and box office success. It returns the perspective of the suburb from those resisting it to those living their everyday life in the environment. The suburb is shown as a familiar and everyday space, lived in rather than disputed or analysed as in earlier suburban films. In the late 1970s there was also Mikko Niskanen's *Syksyllä kaikki on toisin* (*Autumn Is to Change It All*, 1978), which deals with emptying of the countryside, but does not consider or depict the suburban milieu. *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* offers yet another perspective on suburban life, both as the teenage viewpoint on the suburban experience but also as a more mundane and even homely space in contrast to the suburbs of earlier Finnish New Wave films.

The corpus presents five films which all illustrate different cinematic ways of negotiating the suburb and urbanisation, while also highlighting key themes and developments in Finnish film history. The directors' interest in city dwellers and suburban housing combined with Finnish New Wave cinema's emphasis on film's role as social

commentator (Pantti 1999a, p. 121) makes this body of work especially engaging for examining the theme of suburbanisation. The films chosen for the thesis are all by the new generation of film directors who redefined Finnish filmmaking after the studio system era (Toiviainen 1975a). The corpus loosely follows the development of Finnish New Wave cinema through its various stages as case studies range from art cinema to comedy and political filmmaking illustrating the range of styles that exist under the New Wave umbrella. The cinematic timeline of the corpus is drawn to a close with Suominen's film that marked the end of the Finnish New Wave and the beginning of the next emerging generation of filmmakers in the 1980s (Honka-Hallila, Laine, Pantti 1995, p. 208). Thus the portrayal of the suburb takes a journey from the first director of Finnish New Wave, Kurkvaara to the first film of the 'second new wave'¹⁶ Suominen (Honka-Hallila, Laine, Pantti 1995, p. 208).

Aside from stylistic influences and similarities, each of the films benefitted from new state subsidies for film production. They all received financial aid either in the form of film awards, functioning as financial support for the director's further work, or government funded productions. *Yksityisalue* was awarded the State Film Award¹⁷ in 1962 for 40,000 Finn marks. *Vihreä leski* also received the State Film Award in 1967 for 70,000 Finn marks. *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* received funding both pre and post publication in the form of the State Film Advance Production Support¹⁸ of 400,000 Finn marks, the Finnish Film Foundation support¹⁹ of 12,645 Finn marks, and the State Film Quality Support²⁰ of 50,000 Finn marks. *Jouluksi kotiin* State Film Quality Support of 170,000 Finn marks, and Finnish Film Foundation support for 62,300 Finn marks. *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* was funded by the Finnish²¹ Film Foundation by 791 000mk and received State Film Quality Support in 1979 for 100 000 Finn marks. The funding covered 57% of *Yksityisalue*'s production cost of 7,000,000, old Finn marks, 46% of *Green Widow*'s production costs of 152,000 Finn marks, 68% of *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*'s production costs of 680,000 Finn marks, 68% of *Jouluksi kotiin*'s production costs of 345,129 Finn marks and 48% of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*'s production costs of 1,844,826 Finn marks. All of the films were therefore produced as a part of the state subsidised system of film production, and were made with the support of the welfare

¹⁶ 'toisen uuden aallon'

¹⁷ Valtion elokuvapalkinto

¹⁸ Elokuvatuotannon ennakkotuki

¹⁹ Suomen elokuvasäätiö SES

²⁰ Elokuvatuotannon laatutuki

²¹ A monetary reform took place on the first of January in 1963 and Finnish mark was devalued, therefore the budget of the film was the equivalent of 70,000 Finn marks at the time of handing out the State Film Awards.

state. The fact that all of the films received government funding is however not remarkable, as Finnish film production was almost completely reliant on this financial aid and Spede Pasanen's comedies were the only notable exception that managed to produce financially viable films without government support (Pantti 1999b, p. 137). The division between government subsidised cinema and Pasanen's commercial films is argued by Pantti (1999b, p. 137) to have produced two separate national cinemas, one official and government subsidised and the other chosen by viewers. In this grouping the corpus is firmly within the government subsidised version of 'official' national cinema.

A choice has been made to limit the corpus to fiction films which received a theatrical release. This ensures the films were made for and distributed to the greater public. This leaves out short films, documentaries and material produced for television. The theme of suburban housing and cities facing architectural change was of course explored in these formats over the two decades between 1960-1980. This is especially true in the case of short documentaries. The selection of short documentaries about suburban developments and urbanisation of this time is a very large and diverse one. It includes student works made for the Cinematography Department of the University of Art and Design in Helsinki, such as Heikki Katajisto's 1964 *Nukkumalähiö* (*Dormitory Town*²²) depicting life in the Helsinki suburb of Roihuvuori. There are commissioned short documentaries such as Aito Mäkinen and Virke Lehtinen's 1972 film *Kaupungin synty* (*Birth of a Town*) about the Kivenlahti suburb, funded by housing associations Asuntosäätiö, Keskus-Sato Oy, Polar rakennusosakeyhtiö and Aluerakennus Oy, and distributed by the Foreign Ministry's Press and Culture Department. The Tapiola Housing association commissioned a short documentary about their own area from Erkki Kivikoski, *Tapiola* (1967), distributed again by the Foreign Ministry's Press and Culture Department and Oy Inforfilm Ab. Some documentary shorts were commissioned by banks, such as Risto Jarva's well-known films *Asuminen ja luonto* (*Housing and Nature*) from 1965 and *Kaupungissa on tulevaisuus* (*Town Is Our Future*) from 1967, both commissioned by the savings bank Postisäästöpankki. Short documentaries about urban regeneration were also made for television, such as Arvo Ahlroos' 1967 *Jää hyvästi Amuri* (*Farewell Amuri*²³) about the Tampere worker's district

²² no official English language title, translation of Finnish title

²³ no official English language title, translation of Finnish title

being torn down made for Finnish national broadcast company YLE, or Pekka Parikka's 1969 short docudrama *Tahdon Stadiin (I Want To Go To The City)*²⁴ for YLE TV 1.

The forces that function behind these films, their channels of distribution and sources of funding, vary greatly and affect the ways in which the image of the suburb is created and portrayed to the viewer. This is especially relevant in the case of films commissioned by the housing associations themselves or made for advertisement purposes. Though rich and diverse, adding this body of work to the corpus would have extended the material beyond the scope of this thesis, and brought with it the problem of funders, objectives and agency. By limiting the corpus to feature length fiction films, the project is able to direct its focus to cinematic portrayals without having to veer into the power politics of commissioned film work or advertisement. The choice of focusing on fiction films is also in part due to placing emphasis on the subjective and illusory nature of interpreting real spaces. Although all of films about the suburbs, whether documentary or advertisement, offer a mediated, framed and edited version of space and place, in fiction film the spaces and narratives are decidedly fictional. This fictional quality allows for them to become more than cinematic recreations of physical structures, and provides directors with freedom to reflect interpretations onto these spaces.

The suburban milieu has continued to feature in Finnish films after 1980, especially prominent in the 21st century films, such as Olli Saarela's 2000 *Bad Luck Love*, Johanna Vuoksenmaa's 2003 *Nousukausi (Upswing)*, Aku Louhimies' 2006 *Valkoinen kaupunki (Frozen City)* and 2012 *Vuosaari*²⁵, Petri Kotwica's 2007 *Musta jää (Black Ice)* and Akseli Tuomivaara's 2014 *Korso*²⁶. These films would have provided interesting material for comparison on the suburbs, but a line was drawn on the scope of the research to maintain the historical focus of the project. The developments in later portrayals of suburban spaces could possibly be addressed in future research. Similarly further research on short films and documentaries could provide an interesting project, and a natural expansion and continuation on the themes of this thesis.

3. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

²⁴ no official English language title, translation of Finnish title

²⁵ title and setting of the film is a Helsinki suburb

²⁶ title and setting of the film is a greater metropolitan Helsinki area suburb

The period of Finnish film history (1960-1980) has been meticulously archived and investigated by academics and film critics alike. The *Suomen Kansallisfilmografia*²⁷ series compiled by the Finnish National Audiovisual Institute provides a comprehensive list of all theatrical releases in Finland supported by production details, film synopses, and accompanying essays. The information in these volumes has served as an indispensable source of information on both film history and production history. Historical overviews such as Peter Cowie's (1990) *Finnish Cinema*, Peter von Bagh's *Drifting Shadows: a guide to the Finnish cinema* (2000) and *Suomalaisen elokuvan uusi kultainen kirja* (2005), and Pietari Kääpä's (2012) edited volume *Directory of World Cinema: Finland* chronicle developments in film history and include segments which cover the two decades in question. These works offer filmmaker profiles and analysis on significant films of the era. *Cinema in Finland* edited by Jim Hillier (1975) also offers a short introduction to Finnish film history through a selection of articles and more focused spotlight on key directors. With a similar focus on directors and films Sakari Toiviainen's (1975) book *Uusi suomalainen elokuva* presents an extensive account of the *auteurs* and films of the Finnish New Wave. This is also the only book completely dedicated to the Finnish New Wave, which was still, when Toiviainen was writing an on-going phenomenon. These historical accounts are supported by a wealth of writing on director Risto Jarva. Toiviainen's (1983) biography *Risto Jarva* sketches out Jarva's personal history, artistic development and the history of production company Filminor. Tommi Aitio (1999) and Olli Alho (1999) have done further analysis on Jarva's themes and aesthetic.

The shift in Finnish film production from the studio system to state backed filmmaking has been investigated from an economic perspective with a focus on the changing nature of the Finnish film industry by Kari Uusitalo (1981, 1984). Uusitalo (1980) has also written on the development of the Finnish Film Foundation in the 1970s in *Suomen elokuväsäätiö 1970-1979*. Film funding and the move from the studio system to state funded film production has been thoroughly examined by Mervi Pantti (1995, 1999, 2000). The technological advancements of the time have also been considered in Kari Uusitalo's (1998b) essay on colour film and Pertti Kuusela's (1976) book on the developments in sound technology.

The most comprehensive film historical account of the filmmaking in Finland in the 1960s and 1970s is written by Mervi Pantti (1995) in the book *Markan tähden: yli sata*

²⁷ Volume 6. 1957-1961, Volume 7. 1962-1970 and Volume 8. 1971-1982

vuotta suomalaista elokuvahistoriaa. Pantti links the changes in Finnish film industry and culture to wider social and political changes of the time. She highlights the interdependency of the film industry and society, and the ways in which Finnish cinema reflected and reacted to political and social change. Film is investigated in the broader context of societal change and as a product of this change. Pantti (1995) raises key issues which characterised the era such as the rise of film journalism, restructuring the mode of film production, the state's involvement in film financing, the new interest in portraying youth and working class, and the plight of the working man. Pantti's chapter paints a portrait of Finnish film culture which takes into consideration both economic and artistic aspects of cinema, and the ways in which it functions as a part of wider culture, society and politics. In more detailed articles Pantti has also examined Finnish film culture in the 1960s from the perspective of the social agency of films (1993) and the portrayal of the youth culture and generational conflict in films (1994).

In addition to the academic attention the films of the 1960s and 1970s have been discussed and debated in the press, both upon their theatrical release and during the time of subsequent TV broadcasts. Critics such as Erkki Astala (1980), Jörn Donner (1962), Heikki Eteläpää (1975), Mikael Fränti (1968), Pentti Kejonen (1982), Timo Kilpi (1988), Erkki Lehtola (1968), Inkeri Lius (1962), Pertti Lumirae (1968), Matti Luoma (1968), Velipekka Makkonen (1968), Tarmo Malmberg (1968), Anne Marttala (1980), Harri Moilanen (1988), Matti Pajula (1968), Miska Rantanen (2004), Harri Römpötti (2011), Jorma Sairanen (1980), Leena Salokangas (1967), Kalevi Salomaa (1975), Martti Savo (1968), Veli-Pekka Silius (1975), Leo Stålhammar (1975a, 1975b), Paula Talaskivi (1962, 1968, 1975), Eero Tammi (2006), Juha Tanttu (1962), Eero Tuomikoski (1968), Simo Tuomola (1980), Sakari Toiviainen (1975, 1980), Pekka Virtanen (1968), Peter von Bagh (1968), Tuomo-Juhani Vuorenmaa (1968) and others have made insightful comments about the five films discussed in this thesis. In many cases the film critics' views were further debated in the press broadening the discussion of the films across broadsheets, magazines and film periodicals. The discussion concerning these films was therefore not restricted to the analysis of film historians and academics, but also took place in the form of a lively public debate in the press.

This review demonstrates that Finnish cinema of the 1960s and 1970s has already been covered by various film historians, academics and film critics. The overviews of film history, accounts of changes in film industry and funding structure, and director profiles are already comprehensive. This thesis is not an attempt to rewrite Finnish film

history, but to focus attention on the emerging suburban milieu in Finnish cinema. Though the suburb has been noted emerging as a new theme in Finnish film since the 1960s (Pantti 1995, p. 148), it has not received thorough scholarly attention. Pantti (1995, p. 186) outlines the change in setting in the films of the 1960s and 1970s, and in particular the new relationship between countryside and city. Alho (1999, p. 250) captures Jarva's criticism of urbanisation, as does Toiviainen (1983, p. 263). The debate surrounding urbanisation and the new suburban lifestyle is carried through in the critical debate the films sparked in the press. However in these writings the question of urbanisation and change in milieu are a sideline in the main inquiry. For Pantti the focus of the essay is the overall change in Finnish film industry in the 1960s and 1970s. Aho's (1999) main concern in his article is Jarva's use of colour film. Toiviainen's (1983) discussion of the cinematic interpretations of urban space is a small component in Jarva's overall biography. Due to the limited scope of these articles and essays there is much ground to be covered. Most significantly the suburb as cinematic theme has not been connected to any theoretical framework; film, spatial or otherwise. The emergence of the Finnish suburb as a cinematic theme has not previously been examined in scholarly work. Therefore the original contribution of this thesis is to chart the emergence and development of the suburb in Finnish cinema, the ways in which the films reflect and respond to urbanisation, and to examine this in the light of spatial theories to better understand cinema's role in negotiating the world around it.

Cinematic Helsinki has received its share of academic interest (Kääpä and Laine 2013, Heiskanen and Santakari 2004, Bacon 2007, Tani 1995) which investigates the interdependent nature of the city as location and its cinematic reimagining. However there has not been specific research into the filmic representations of suburbs surrounding the capital. My original contribution to the field is shedding light on how these suburban landscapes are depicted on film and in what ways these portrayals negotiate the social change the areas were going through. The research brings together a selection of both *suburban set* and *suburban centred* films (Muzzio and Halper, 2002, p. 547), definitions that encompass both films that use the suburb as location and films that draw on the suburban environment or lifestyle as a core theme. This variation in approach to the space allows for a diverse variety of cinematic techniques and motifs, which together weave the tapestry of the imagined Finnish suburb. Due to the lack of specific research into cinematic representations of the Finnish suburb, the five films that form the core of the thesis have not previously been analysed as a group. The project also brings focus to films that have been confined to the National Audiovisual Archives for decades and have been enjoyed by a very limited

audience. This group of films forms a distinctive corpus that encourages analysis of the attitudes towards the Finnish suburbs and the welfare state. This way the thesis expands the discourse of previous research on the cinematic Helsinki (Kääpä and Laine 2013, Heiskanen and Santakari 2004) to its urban peripheries. The *Enemmän funkista, Reino!*²⁸ exhibit, curated by Minna Santakari at the Helsinki City Museum February 2012 to January 2013, and Peter von Bagh's 2008 film *Helsinki, Forever* show there is an increasing interest in exploring the history and architecture of Helsinki through its cinematic counterpoints. This thesis adds new perspectives and readings to this discussion, whilst highlighting the position suburban landscape has in Finnish cinema.

Whilst suburban cinema has not been a focus of academic research in Finland, the theme has received interest globally. In the European context both British suburbs (Huq 2013), and the French banlieue (Austin 2009, Tarr 2005) have been examined through cinema, with a focus on social landscape charting alienation and unrest. Across the Atlantic the American suburb has received much scholarly attention (Beuka 2004, Coon 2013, Muzzio and Halper 2002, Vermeulen 2014). This research has centred on how filmic portrayals reflect societal change and shifts in values in the suburban identity and American society as a whole. Muzzio and Halper (2002, p. 559) argue that 'with few exceptions, the portrayal of suburban life was almost from the beginning an object of criticism, moving from light satire in the early 1950s to heavier criticism in the late 1950s to outright scorn, ridicule, and condemnation in the 1960s and 1970s.' Although the Finnish suburb carries very different social connotations to the American equivalent, as a show home for welfare state egalitarianism rather than middle-class aspirations, the critical response to the space follows similar lines. The cinematic re-imaginings of the suburbs in Finland in the 1960s to the 1980s carry an equally pessimistic tone, much like their European and American counterparts. The prior research into suburbs in cinema (Huq 2013, Austin 2009, Beuka 2004, Coon 2013, Muzzio and Halper 2002, Vermeulen 2014) gives valuable insight into and illustrations of cinema's ability to capture the social landscape and its seismic shifts. It demonstrates that the cinematic critique of the urban peripheries is not exclusive to Finland, but a widespread trend that takes on different forms according to its national, technological and film-historical context. Whilst this research offers the thesis a wider global framework, it also for the most part leaves out discussions about the real life

²⁸ There is no English title for the exhibit, but it translates to *More functionalism, Reino!* a line from the 1936 film *Onnenpotku* directed by Glory Leppänen.

counterparts of the suburbs presented on screen. The significance of architecture and town planning is alluded to by Muzzio and Halper (2002, p. 556) as they note that ‘suburbs were viewed as deliberately constructed artifacts, not as phenomena that arose naturally like cities or rural villages’ and thus attributed with ‘the implied curse of inauthenticity’. The planned quality of the suburbs is acknowledged, but the motivations of its design are not explored further. Here is where the methodology of this thesis takes an alternate path.

4. METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The thesis approaches the cinematic spaces through three lenses, each highlighting a dimension of the suburban environment. The first lens excavates the social and political context which led to the building of the suburbs, drawing attention to the policies of the Finnish welfare state, and shifts in social landscape brought on by urbanisation. The second lens regards the architectural designs and urban planning, and ways in which they translated social ideals of the welfare state into physical reality and architectural forms. Finally the third lens studies how films reinterpret these spaces, infiltrating the choreography of everyday life. Moving through the lenses the image of the suburb is refracted and transmuted. The interdisciplinary nature of this approach allows the cinematic spaces to be seen outside the vacuum of the film theatre; commenting upon existing architecture, actively shaping the image of neighbourhoods, taking part in and instigating social debate. The landscape of the suburb extends beyond the screen, especially in the case of films which are set in a recognisable part of Helsinki. In these cases film not only redefines the physical properties of a place, but also mediates the social and political conditions of the space. Due to its interdisciplinary nature, the research project is informed by a range of sources beyond film studies, spanning across political history, social policy, sociology, architectural history and theory, and spatial theories. The methodology of the project relies on close reading of the primary material, the filmic text itself, and is supported by secondary reading material across architectural history, politics, film theory and criticism. In what follows, each methodological lens is accompanied by a literature review introducing relevant texts that have guided and informed the primary film analysis. The accompanied illustrations depict the varying ways in which each of the three lens approaches and imagines the suburban space; from policy documents to town plan to film screen.

4.1 Social and political

This lens investigates the birth of the Finnish welfare state and the wide-ranging effects its policies had on Finnish society. It charts the stages of this social reform and the increasingly active role the state took in shaping an egalitarian society. It addresses the power of the welfare state as a social catalyst, illustrating that the effects of the welfare state policies went beyond the national and seeped into the private sphere. Hilson's (2008) book *The Nordic Model: Scandinavia since 1945* has been a key source in providing the historical context to welfare state policy and development. This context has been vital in understanding the significance and impact of seminal writings such as Kuusi's (1962) *60-luvun sosiaalipolitiikka*. It has been supported by texts which provide a broader overview of Finnish history (Jussila, Hentilä and Nevakivi 1999, Kirby 2006, Alapuro and Stenius 1989), politics and welfare policy (Pesonen and Riihinen, 2002, Paavonen and Kangas 2006) and more societal and cultural overviews (Meinander 2011, Vahtola 2003). The lens also delves into the reasons driving mass migration and urbanisation between the 1960s and 1980s (Standertskjöld 2011, Vahtola 2003, Nikula 1993). This work emphasises the agricultural reforms and structural change, which restricted the employment opportunities in rural areas and drew people to the urban centres of southern Finland (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 10-12). The scale of this migration, the subsequent housing shortage and its links to social policy, are integral to understanding the connotations the suburbs carry. This investigation also answers the question of what a Finnish suburb or *lähiö* is, and what sets it apart from other suburbs across the globe.

The Finnish suburb has been explored in depth in Kortteinen's (1982) sociological study *Lähiö: Tutkimus elämäntapojen muutoksesta*,²⁹ which examines the validity of negative associations attached to Finnish suburban lifestyle through interviews with inhabitants in a Helsinki suburb. Kortteinen's (1982) study is vital in entangling the deeper social and personal factors behind the problematic relationship with the suburbs by directing the focus of study from policies to inhabitants. Similarly Irene Roivainen's (1999) thesis *Sokeripala metsän keskellä - lähiö sanomalehden konstruktiona*³⁰ investigates the suburban milieu as constructed in newspaper writings, how the image of the suburb has been created in the media and how this has changed over time. Both Kortteinen (1982) and Roivainen (1999) emphasise the state of the suburb as one which is in flux, taking different meanings at different times as attitudes towards it shift

²⁹ No English title available, translates loosely to *Suburb: An Examination Into Changes In Lifestyle*

³⁰ No English title available, translates loosely to *A Sugar Cube In The Middle Of The Forest: The Suburb As Constructed By Newspapers*

and adjust. Rather than viewing the suburban milieu as a collection of buildings, or realisation of welfare state policies, they focus on the suburb as a lived space, an imagined place of personal and collective narratives that give the place its meaning. This approach of considering the suburb as physical as well as social and political space which is subject to change is parallel to this research project. This first lens and the literature it employs explains the context from which the suburbs emerged and what role they were built to play in the newly charted welfare state.

4.2 Architectural

The second lens is that of the architectural design of the suburbs. This draws on several sources which examine broader trends in Finnish architectural history and is supported by accounts of local history which chronicle the development and transitions of specific areas. Historical overviews, such as Connah's (2005) *Finland: Modern Architectures in History* which examines architecture as a definer of national identity and its social dimensions, serves as a useful introduction to Finnish architecture and its cultural and political significance. This approach is supported by Quantrill's (1995) historical review, which includes a particularly useful chapter on the issues surrounding standardisation and mass scale housing projects. The issue of how architecture responds to and shapes Finnish society is well addressed in Standertskjöld's (2011) book *Arkkitehtuurimme Vuosikymmenet: 1960-1980*³¹, in which she examines the intertwined nature of politics, society and architecture and the effects rapid urbanisation had on these. Connah (2005), Quantrill (1995) and Standertskjöld (2011) all address both the architectural design and visual aesthetic without neglecting the forces that guide it and its significance to Finnish society in a wider sense. Other historical overviews, such as Poole (1992) focus primarily on the work of individual architects and provide a more detailed account of the people and industry of the time. These historical insights and personal profiles show how architects such as Aarne Ervi, Aulis Blomstedt, Viljo Revell and Aarno Ruusuvuori updated the welfare state's tradition of social housing from wooden-clad single-family homes into high-rise mass-produceable concrete designs. Insight into urbanisation and the architectural development of the Helsinki area in general are offered by Nikula (2005), Hannula and Salonen (2007), Laakso and Loikkanen (2004) and Mattila (2006). In addition to these sources, which cover a rather broad scope, research material includes writings on the particular areas in which the films are set. These local histories give background to Tapiola (von

³¹ No English title available, translates loosely to *Decades of Our Architecture: 1960-1980*

Hertzen 1985 and Itkonen 1985), Puu-Vallila (Koivumäki 2001) and Kontula (Kokkonen 2002). All of these accounts cover both architectural style and life within the areas. Koivumäki (2001) and Kokkonen (2002) place particular emphasis on the stories of residents, narrating the local history through the experiences of those with intimate knowledge of the spaces. Though urbanisation or modernist architecture are by no means uniquely Finnish phenomena, it is not in the scope of the thesis to delve very deeply into the various currents of international architectural and urban research. The research is informed by writings on modernist architecture (Markus 2006, Castle 1999, Colquhoun 2002) and the anthology *Suburban Constellations: Governance, Land and Infrastructure in the 21st Century* (Keil 2013) which provides a global look at the suburb and offers compelling ways of examining suburbs. Although the focus of this lens remains on Finnish architecture, these sources provide insight into their international counterpoints. It is also important to note the influence the Finnish architect Juhani Pallasmaa's writings on architecture have had on the thesis. Pallasmaa's way of highlighting the haptic qualities of architecture in *The Eyes of the Skin: Architecture and the Senses* (2005) has been especially helpful in charting the multi-sensory and interdisciplinary dimensions of architecture. In *The Architecture of the Image: Existential Space in Cinema* (2007) Pallasmaa provides a compelling approach to architecture in film which has been an immensely useful example of successfully bridging the two disciplines.

4.3 Cinematic

Finally the third lens relies on close analysis of the films, to draw out the variety of cinematic techniques used to conjure and shape the cinematic suburb on screen. The theme of the city in film has received much scholarly attention such by Barber (2002), Lamster (2000) Shiel and Fitzmaurice (2001, 2003), Clarke (1997), Thomas and Penz (1997), Koeck and Roberts (2010), and specifically on European cinema Konstantarakos (2000). These writings explore how the city is portrayed in film and reflect upon the role architecture or set design play in constructing a cinematic world. While these have been useful in demonstrating the multitude of possibilities, theoretical underpinnings and analytic readings accessible through studying cinema and the city, they also mainly deal with the cityscape and architecture within the film. This distinction is small but significant, as Koeck (2013, p. 4) argues: 'conversely, the *filmic significance and properties* of architecture and urban environments - in other words using film as a lens through which we look at architecture and cities - is a field of research that by comparison is still relatively unexplored.' Here the methodology of this

thesis follows Koeck's (2013, p. 4) approach in 'considering film, film history and film theory as a means of making sense of the *places* in which we live' (original emphasis). It will perhaps come as no surprise that several of the scholars driving a more multidisciplinary approach to cinematic space are architects (Koeck 2013, Pallasmaa 2001, AlSayaad 2006, Fear 2000). The third lens of the thesis does precisely this by using film and spatial theory to unpack the cinematic themes the films use to communicate space, architecture and most of all the human interaction with these. This type of investigation into the cinematic city has also been done in the Finnish context, most recently by Kääpä and Laine (2013) in their edited volume *World Film Locations: Helsinki*. Kääpä and Laine (2013) cover a vast amount of cinematic examples of Helsinki, drawing attention to the diverse roles the capital has played in films each providing 'a set of particular insights into the constantly in-construction archive that is the cinematic city' (Kääpä and Laine 2013, p. 5). This approach is parallel to Koeck's (2013) argument for film 'as a means of making sense of the *places* in which we live.' Kääpä and Laine (2013) however draw attention to the illusory nature of the cinematic city and as a space of interaction, varying and at times conflicting interpretations and experiences. The book offers engaging insight into the cinematic Helsinki, also featuring short pieces on *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* and *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*. Another account of cinematic Helsinki, this time from the perspective of a set designer, is provided by Heiskanen and Santakari (2004) in their book *Asuuko neiti Töölössä?*³² The book focuses on studio system era films set in Helsinki and successfully brings together strands of visual reading and historical context. These books provide a Finnish context of excellent research into the cinematic city, an exploration this thesis expands to the capital's suburban peripheries. The theme of architecture and cinema has been discussed earlier in articles by Wilhelmsson (1999) and Tani (1995). In addition to the writings on the cinematic city, this lens of analysis draws from film historical accounts of the Finnish New Wave filmmaking (von Bagh 2005, Toiviainen 1975a) and is supported by archival material of film reviews and newspaper articles which chronicle the debate surrounding the films. So rather than how architecture functions within the film, this lens focuses on how and what the cinematic suburb tells about the world it depicts.

³² No English title available, translates loosely to *Does the Lady Live in Töölö?*

4.4 Between the lenses

These three lenses imagine the suburb in different ways. They produce multiple visions of the suburban space formed through policy guidelines, architectural blueprints and cinematic reimaginings. As each lens refracts the suburb in a different way, for different purposes, the images produced can grow strikingly different. This distortion between the lenses is central to this thesis, especially as the filmmaker's version of the suburban milieu is often in direct opposition to the policymaker's and architect's vision of the same space. The assumption that suburban space is developed and moulded by the political process, imagined by architects and planners and reimagined by artists, such as filmmakers, is of course indebted to Lefebvre's (1991) seminal work *The Production of Space*. As Thacker (2009, p. 16) summarises 'Lefebvre's conception of 'social space' is designed to introduce questions of society, history and politics into thinking about space.' Lefebvre's (1991, p. 33) three aspects of social space; spatial practices, representations of space and representational spaces, are indeed echoed in the three methodological lenses of the thesis. The political and architectural lenses seek to uncover the representations of space; the ideology, codes and signs of the suburban space. The filmic image functions as a part of the representational space which in turn illustrates the experience of the suburb and its spatial practices. Lefebvre's (1991) writings also inform the other spacial theories utilised in the thesis.

Using de Certeau's (2011) essay *Walking in the City* as a theoretical anchor the thesis investigates the gulf between planned space and that of the experience of lived space. Placing an emphasis on the ways in which spatial choreographies of daily life reinterpret spaces de Certeau (2011, p. xiv) cites the example of walking through a cityscape as one of the 'innumerable practices by which users reappropriate the space organized by techniques of sociocultural production.' Though de Certeau (2011) never wrote directly about film, his concepts of a personal spatial practices can be adapted to reading the filmic text. Film offers a unique viewpoint to the experience of space. The camera shifts the viewpoint to the streets, adopting the perspective of those living and using the spaces, moving around buildings, touching their concrete surface and embedding memories into their surroundings. Examining this contrast between the planned and the lived experience offers insight into the critique the films direct towards the suburban milieu and its lifestyle. Film's spatial and temporal qualities allow it to explore both real and symbolic spaces of the welfare nation and bridge the gap between public architecture and private experience. In addition to Lefebvre (2011) and de Certeau (2011) the research draws on the work of other spatial theorists (Lynch

1960, de Certeau 2011, Augé 1995, Pallasmaa 2005, 2007) to help draw together the social, architectural and cinematic variants of the suburbs. Themes which arise from this approach are interdisciplinary, weaving film theory with spatial theory and cultural theory, moving through the three lenses, and revealing the tensions and conflicts between them. Themes featured in this analysis include voyeurism (AlSayaad, 2006 Virilio 1997, Foucault 2002), nostalgia (Boym, 2001), navigation (Borden 2013, Benjamin 1985, Bruno, 2002), and the haptic (Pallasmaa 2005, Marks 2000, Barker 2009). These themes direct focus to the experience of the suburb and film's ability to capture this lived space.

This methodology of combining film analysis with political history, architectural history and spatial theories does pose challenges. By venturing across disciplinary boundaries the parameters of the research become less clear cut, and the wealth of material and theoretical approaches grows vastly. However the aim of this thesis is not to cover all architectural or spatial theories, film theories or nuances of welfare policy, but to provide original and thought-provoking readings of the cinematic suburbs of Finland. The incentive of an interdisciplinary approach is to bring together strands of research and thought that can enrich, inform and support film analysis. The objective is to bring the various disciplines into dialogue and result in insight which is more than a sum of its parts.

5. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS AND THE *AUTEUR*

5.1 Textual analysis

The thesis is committed to close textual analysis of the films. It considers the mise-en-scène, camera movement, use of sound, editing, and set design to understand the cinematic world of the film. This close analysis is especially crucial when examining the construction of space within film. It investigates the film for ways in which camera movement can draw the perimeters of a space, how the texture of film can evoke the sense of running one's hand along the side of the building, or editing can reveal multiple facets of the architecture of a building. Marilyn Fabe (2004, p. xv) argues that shot-by-shot analysis is the best way to learn about 'the filmmaker's art'. Fabe (2004, p. xv) goes on to claim that 'viewers trained in close analysis of single film sequences are better able to see and appreciate the rich visual and aural complexity of the film medium. Close analysis unlocks the secrets of how film images, combined with sound, can have such a profound effect on our minds and emotions.' According to her the best

way to appreciate film is through close textual analysis.

Borrowing from literary theory textual analysis approaches the film as a text, which 'conceptualizes film not as an imitation of reality but rather as an artifact, a construct' (Stam 2000 p. 186). It calls for the careful analysis of the filmic text to uncover its meaning and inner workings. As a part of this approach to film analysis Christopher Metz (1974) developed the notion of the textual system in his book *Language and Cinema*. Rather than analysing plot, characters or performance Metz focused on the 'undergirding structure or network of meaning around which the text coheres' (Stam 2000, p. 187). Metz (1974, p. 21) argued that the 'only principle of relevancy capable of defining, at present, the semiotics of the film is [...] the desire to treat films as *texts*, as units of discourse, consequently forcing itself to study the different *systems* [...] which give form to these texts and are implicit in them.' This drew attention equally to both the form and content of film, as 'all films, for Metz, are mixed sites; they all deploy cinematic and non-cinematic codes' (Stam 2000, p. 188). The cinematic codes, such as camera movement, editing or sound, and non-cinematic codes, such as gender and ideology, exist within a single text (Stam 2000, p. 188). The way the cinematic language was used to communicate the themes of the film is as important as the themes themselves. Significantly Metz's textual analysis drew attention to the importance of film's formal elements and what these contribute to the film itself.

The approach taken to film analysis in this thesis draws on textual analysis like Metz's in terms of reading the filmic text and considering how the formal qualities of the film function and what they contribute to the overall themes of the film. It allows for the detailed exploration of ways in which the cinematic space is constructed on screen. However the films are also cultural products of their time, which are read in different ways at different times, as is made clear from the vastly different critical reception when the films are screened decades later compared to the reception at the time of their initial release. In order to understand the film text in the social, political and cultural context in which it was made, the textual analysis is anchored to broader discussion of Finnish social, political, film historical and architectural history. This way the film analysis is invited out of the theatre and seen as a part of the cultural dialogue of the time.

5.2 Director as *auteur*

The approach of focusing on the film text as a cultural product is rather in contrast with

the director-as-*auteur* ethos of the Finnish New Wave. Finnish critics and filmmakers were drawing inspiration from the French New Wave where the *cinéma d'auteurs* was championed on the pages of *Cahiers du Cinéma* in the 1950s (Caughie 2001, p. 9). The director as '*auteur* was the artist whose personality was "written" in the film' battling between the urge of pursuing artistic freedom and pressure of complying with industrial interference' (Caughie 2001, p. 9). The *auteur's* discernable style was embedded into the *mise-en-scène* of the film, even if the film was a product of the Hollywood studio system (Hayward 1996, p. 13). While this focus on the stylistic and formalistic qualities of film shifted film theory away from sociological analysis, it also sidestepped the context of filmmaking and ideology (Hayward 1996, p. 13-14). The concept of the *auteur* has gone through various adaptations over time. In the 1960s American Andrew Sarris used *auteur* theory to elevate the work of a select few directors, and in the late 1960s it was picked up by the structuralists, such as Metz, seeking to uncover the underlying structures of the filmic text (Hayward 1996, p. 15-16). Over time *auteurism* took different forms, *Cahiers* in France, *Movie* in Britain, Andrew Sarris in America, but the overall notion prevailed: that 'a film, though produced collectively, is most likely to be valuable when it is essentially the product of its director' (Caughie 2001 p. 10). This also meant that directors that did not rise to the artistic demands of an *auteur* were considered lesser filmmakers, for being an *auteur* called for individual style and personality that shone through the director's films.

Taking their cues from French New Wave the Finnish filmmakers of the 1960s also adopted the director as *auteur* and the 'maker's film'³³ became one of the key concepts of Finnish cinema in the 1960s (Pantti 1999a, p. 121). The director was seen as the key factor in determining the quality of a film (Pantti 1999c, p. 167). However though Finnish New Wave film is often discussed in terms of the artistic contribution of its directors (Toiviainen 1975, Cowie 1990, von Bagh 2000), the style of individual directors evolved over time. As one of the first directors of the Finnish New Wave Maunu Kurkvaara fits the profile of an *auteur* best. Caughie's (1981, p. 9) definition of film as an expression of the *auteur's* 'individual personality' certainly applies to Kurkvaara's distinctive style in *Yksityisalue*. Aside from directing the film Kurkvaara also acted as producer, cinematographer, scriptwriter, editor and set designer. The press called the film a one-man film (Jaantila 1962) assigning the creative vision of the film solely with Kurkvaara. Financing the film himself with the proceeds from his film processing company, Kurkvaara also enjoyed exceptional freedom in his creative

³³ 'tekijän elokuva'

process. In this case the question of artistic vision and autonomy is clear. This concept of Kurkvaara as *auteur* is discussed further in Chapter 1 section 1.2.

In other cases the title of *auteur* does not fit quite as easily. The often-held view of the romantic concept of *auteur* as an artist struggling between artistic self-expression amid commercial constraints, as described by Caughie (1981, p. 2), does resemble Pakkasvirta's trials in producing *Jouluksi Kotiin*. However Pakkasvirta's style evolved from the socially critical black and white films based on his own script such as *Vihreä leski* and *Jouluksi kotiin* to rich historical period dramas, in part due to financial demands. Similarly *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* was a stylistic departure for Jarva, one not in line with his previous works. As a hugely popular comedy *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* does not fit into what Maule (2008, p. 14) describes as the art house mould of *auteur* cinema. By the 1980s when the Finnish New Wave was giving way to a new crop of filmmakers such as Tapio Suominen, the role of the director had moved further away from the director/producer/scriptwriter/cinematographer/editor renaissance men of earlier times. When discussing the framing of a shot in *Täältä Tullaan, Elämä!* it is likely that in some cases the credit should go to cinematographer Pekka Aine rather than director Tapio Suominen. Distinguishing where one creative contribution ends and another begins, is not only impossible, but also fruitless for the purposes of this thesis. The focus of the film analysis is rather on examining the finished product as a whole.

Nevertheless in the writing of this thesis the creative decision has been made to attribute the creative control of the film to the director. This is not because the directors in question are considered *auteurs* in a Romantic sense, their genius transcending the terms of production and efforts of the crew. Naturally the individual directors, their stylistic preferences and ideologies are present in the film, but how and to what degree is not the focus of this research. Rather the director is seen as a champion of the overall vision of the film, as they were in the 1960s and 1970s (Pantti 1999a, p. 121 and Toiviainen 1975, p. 31). However the films are considered as a snapshot or biopsy of time and space rather than as products of their directors' artistry and biography as in *auteur theory* (Sarris 1968, p. 30). Similarly some of the films were more art house in style and were seen by a limited audience, while some films such as *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* and *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* found success with the mainstream audience. Ascribing all of the films in question to 'art cinema' would also be incorrect. Therefore it is most accurate to situate the films as case studies that illustrate the trends and currents of Finnish filmmaking during the two decades of the 1960s and 1970s.

6. THE REAL

Lastly it must be noted that despite comparing and contrasting the physical environment of the suburbs with its cinematic reimagining, the thesis does not seek to unveil a singular truth or reality of the suburb. As Koeck (2013, p. 1) writes 'the spaces of architecture and cities in film are fundamentally different from those in real life' and that 'it is critical to bear in mind that spaces and places seen in movies never truly mirror spatial reality, but are mediated and altered by the medium itself; a *filmic illusion* at best, regardless of whether we watch an actuality, newsreel, documentary, fiction or movie belonging to any other genre.' Despite being shot on location, utilising the suburban architecture as backdrop, films presented in this thesis offer a composed, framed and edited version of that environment. They offer a cinematic version of the suburb, which at times conflicts and competes with visions of place and space, produced by architects, town planners and policymakers. These visions of place and belonging are not straightforward, or uniformly complementary, but rather contribute to a shared process of building the identity of the suburb. This mediated quality is especially important to acknowledge as the films discussed are uniformly negative in their characterisation of suburban milieu and its lifestyle. These fiction films represent the viewpoint of a select group of directors, cinematographers, producers and other crew. The films do not mirror reality, but rather interpret anxieties and attitudes towards the suburbs.

7. STRUCTURE OF THESIS

The research is divided into five chapters that each focus on the analysis of one film. The films are presented in chronological order as a way to draw out a cinematic timeline for social and architectural change, beginning with the planning of the suburbs and ending with the second generation of dwellers. Each of these films represents a different way of recreating architecture and space on screen, ranging from the dystopian to the nostalgic. Though interrelated, each chapter has its own critical and theoretical focus drawing from the themes of the film. Thus each of the five chapters contributes a distinct case study and theoretical underpinning to the overarching argument. Each film also highlights a different development or key theme in Finnish film history. The question of how film negotiates the surrounding world, reimagines it, recreates it and contributes to the image of the suburb carries throughout the case studies.

The first chapter examines the role of the architect and the compromise between design and profitability in Kurkvaara's film *Yksityisalue* (*Open Secret*, 1962). As the first film of the corpus it also serves as an introduction to the beginnings of the Finnish New Wave, its international influences, modes of production and stylistic innovation. The film captures the conflicting interests of architects and developers building the suburbs and compromises this imposes on the design. It introduces the early international architectural influences that guided the Finnish suburban building project and the shifts in the role and responsibilities of the architect. The chapter also analyses the parallels in the way Kurkvaara uses lighting to create an effect of flatness on screen and depictions of drawing on paper. These themes of loss of dimension, the act of drawing and whiteness of the screen are discussed in relation to the film's portrayal of the suburb as a planned space.

The second chapter on Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä leski* (*Green Widow*, 1968) draws on film theories on surveillance, voyeurism and reimagined myths when navigating the dystopian suburb of Tapiola. It utilises de Certeau's (2011) notions of planned and lived spaces in investigating how Pakkasvirta juxtaposes a cinematic dystopia with the polished facade of the suburb. The theme of planned versus lived space and voyeurism bring up questions of power and ownership of the new suburban landscape. The chapter also introduces the suburb of Tapiola giving a brief history of Finland's first garden city. *Vihreä leski* also acts as an example of the disillusionment in Finnish film following the 1966 turning point of cultural radicalism and rise of left-wing politics. The chapter examines ways in which the film first sets up a façade of suburban bliss and then tears it down. The chapter also analyses the reception of the film and in particular the lively debate concerning suburban housing it sparked.

The third chapter looks at regeneration of housing through the nostalgic fictive village of Kivimäki in Jarva's *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* (*The Man Who Could Not Say No*, 1975). This chapter illustrates how themes of navigation, memory and nostalgia are intertwined to juxtapose the old and new housing stocks in Jarva's film. This theoretical discussion draws from theorists such as Giuliana Bruno, Kevin Lynch, Fredric Jameson and Walter Benjamin. It also picks out the ways in which Jarva reworks traditional cinematic tropes into the narrative to invite the memory of times gone by. A key theme in the chapter is movement and the body's experience of space. The chapter also introduces the historical context for the government subsidised Finnish Film Foundation and the struggles small production companies were facing with dwindling audience

numbers. It also introduces a brief history of Puu-Vallila in which the film is set with particular attention to the civil activism that saved it from being torn down.

The fourth chapter draws on haptic film theory to explain the building project of Urho Suomalainen in Pakkasvirta's *Jouluksi kotiin* (*Home for Christmas*, 1975). It investigates how housing and living conditions are related to social class, and how the process of building one's house is tied to ideas of ownership and heritage. This analysis draws on theorists such as Laura Marks, Jennifer Barker, Juhani Pallasmaa and Graeme Turner. This discussion touches upon the scars of the Civil War and political divisions in Finland. The chapter also highlights the ways in which the film is an example of the politically and socially conscious style of filmmaking in Finland. Both film and chapter continue the theme of rejecting the high-rise housing that was raised in chapter three, but the focus here is on the meaning of home in a time of urbanisation and leaving rural roots.

The last case study in chapter five analyses issues of access and reclaiming space through tagging in Suominen's hit film *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* (*Right on, man!*, 1980). The protagonists of this chapter are teenagers who have grown up in the suburbs, the first generation of dwellers brought up with a suburban identity. This chapter addresses alienation and social exclusion with the help of Augé's (1995) *non-places* and examines the precarious position of teenagers continuously in motion through the suburb. Social themes such as the school reform and youth culture are examined in light of the film. The chapter also introduces the history of the suburb of Kontula, which functions as the setting of Suominen's film. As an example of a film by a director of the next 'young generation'³⁴ (Toiviainen 1975, p. 157) it also draws to a close the timeline of Finnish New Wave cinema.

After the five case studies which cover a span 18 years of suburban life in Finland the key findings are compared and contrasted in the conclusions. Here the themes of the chapters are drawn together to highlight the various forms that the suburb has taken on screen, how these have changed over time and why. It raises the question of why the suburb is shown in such an overwhelmingly negative light, and how the lived experience of the suburb changes from film to film. It reflects upon the role of the cinematic suburbs in the process of place-making and asks broader questions about the capacity of cinema to serve as a lens through which to gain better understanding of

³⁴ 'nuori polvi'

the surrounding world. The conclusions tie the findings from the films to the wider discourse around the Finnish suburb, and how as over time the suburban high-rises become commonplace, familiar homes with personal memories and histories attached, the cinematic renderings take different shapes as well. Ultimately the conclusions also address the issue of the ever evolving nature of suburban portrayals in Finnish cinema.

Parts of this thesis have been published in two peer-reviewed publications, copies of which are supplied in Appendix 2 and 3:

Chapter in book (in press). Viitanen, Essi and Chow, Pei-Sze, 2014. Under the Scaffolding: Cinematic Representations of High-rise Buildings in Tapiola and Malmö. In: Broome, Agnes et al eds., 2014. *Illuminating the North: Proceedings of the Nordic Research Network 2013*. London: Norvik Press.

Article in journal. (2012). Viitanen, Essi, 2012. The Cinematic Land of Tapio: Suburban Finland Reimagined. *Opticon 1826 Special Issue: Fragile Realities*. (13)12. pp. 6-13.

Suburbs on Paper: Planning new slums in *Yksityisalue*

'What more are those than slums?

And we are a part of that business. One has to be, they say. Money forces us.

*It is so damn easy to blame money when you don't have a spine.'*³⁵

Architect Koski, *Yksityisalue* (*Open Secret*)

dir. Maunu Kurkvaara 1962

This chapter examines Maunu Kurkvaara's 1962 film *Yksityisalue*³⁶ and ways in which it negotiates themes of architecture and urban change. *Yksityisalue* is one of Kurkvaara's most critically acclaimed films (Tammi 2006) that follows the aftermath of an architect's suicide in Helsinki. The deceased architect Koski's younger colleague, Pena, begins to investigate the events leading to the death of his mentor and uncovers the professional and personal agonies in Koski's life. The film features architecture as a central theme and narrative force, problematising the profession of architects and critiquing the design of current suburban housing developments. The film is immersed in the world of architecture; set in an architect's office, visiting construction sites and Niemeyer exhibits, leafing through books on Le Corbusier. The theme of architecture and design however is not only a superficial one, but one that resonates throughout the film's cinematic style. The construction of architecture goes beyond the thematic and seeps into the *mise-en-scène* of the film frame. This chapter introduces Kurkvaara's work in the larger context of Finnish New Wave filmmaking and follows how architecture is developed both as theme and style in *Yksityisalue*. The chapter explores

³⁵ 'Mitä muuta nuo ovatkaan kuin slummeja? ... Ja me olemme mukana tuossa touhussa. Täytyy olla, sanotaan. Raha pakoittaa. On niin hiton hyvä syyttää rahaa kuin ei ole selkärankaa.'

³⁶ Although the official English title of the film is *Open Secret*, the direct translation from Finnish is *Private Property*.

the tensions between forms of representation of architecture: drawing and filming, two-dimensional and three-dimensional. It also raises the question of the role of the architect and how Kurkvaara contributes to the debate surrounding suburban developments. The concern *Yksityisalue*'s raises regarding the quality of new-built housing and the financial restraints posed by developers was a timely one at the time of the film's release in 1962. Urbanisation in Finland was gaining speed and suburban housing was being built at an increasingly fast pace, often at the expense of design and quality (Connah 2005, p. 182). Social and political changes were underway as Kuusi's (1962) outline for welfare state policies was being implemented. Kurkvaara therefore captures a moment of restructuring in Finnish society and in doing so he himself plays a part in the watershed of Finnish filmmaking.

1. KURKVAARA AND EMERGENCE OF THE FINNISH NEW WAVE

1.1 Turning point for the Finnish film industry

In the early 1960s the film industry in Finland was undergoing a massive structural change. Toiviainen (1975b, p. 24) described the time as the culmination of the 'long economic crisis of Finnish cinema'. The vertically integrated mode of studio production and film distribution was struggling to stay profitable while film critics were calling for a move from film as entertainment to more socially aware cinema (Pantti, 1995, p. 146). Large film studios such as Suomen Filmitöollisuus³⁷ and Suomi-Filmi,³⁸ that had dominated the Finnish film industry in the previous decades were closing or significantly downsizing their business (Toiviainen 2008). The first television broadcast in 1957 marked the beginning of a drastic shift in the way people consumed entertainment and the change this would have on the profile of film audiences (Pantti 1995 p. 142). The studio produced musicals and screwball comedies such as Jack Witikka's *Suuri sävelparaati*³⁹ (1959) or Ville Salminen's *Oho, sanoi Eemeli*⁴⁰ (1960) were an attempt to reconnect with audiences, but these types of films failed to draw in the crowds. The fall of the large film studios was attributed to the increasing popularity of television, which decreased the number of cinema-goers (Toiviainen 2008) and for not reaching their new younger more socially aware audience (Pantti 1995, p. 147).

³⁷ English translation Finnish Film Industry

³⁸ English translation Finland-Film

³⁹ No English title available, but name translates to *Great Hit Parade*

⁴⁰ No English title available, but name translates to *Golly said Eemeli*

The struggle to maintain a profitable and vibrant film industry in a small nation, which relied mainly on domestic markets for revenue and had very little international distribution of films, was according to Toiviainen (1975b, p. 24) a problem 'common in the cinemas of all small capitalist countries'. Indeed Sweden and Denmark had been earlier going through similar large-scale reforms of restructuring film industry and its financing (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 24). By the early 1960s the future of the Finnish film industry, and the role of Finnish film culture and national cinema were being called into question.

The aspirations of a new Finnish film culture were captured in filmmaker and film critic Jörn Donner's 1961 essay *Suomalainen elokuva vuonna 0*.⁴¹ In the essay Donner (1961) outlines the aim of a new state funded Finnish cinema as one of exploring the reality of Finnish life (Pantti, 1999a, p. 121). Donner's (1961) essay addressed the tension between art and business, tapping into a wider debate of the time. Donner called for a rebirth of the Finnish film industry, a new state supported funding structure and a development of a new more artistically inclined and socially aware film culture. Though Pantti (1995, p. 153) has questioned how much debate and introspection Donner's essay sparked in film circles when it was first published, it is often seen as a line marking the divide of old and new Finnish cinema (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 24). The future of Finnish filmmaking, which Donner had outlined in his essay, was in part realised the same year with a new funding structure of state-funded film prizes, which relied on direct government financing.

While during the studio system the state's role in film industry was limited to censorship and taxation, the 1960s saw the start of direct government support (Uusitalo 1998a). The first state film awards were given in January 1962 to Ritva Arvelo's *Kultainen vasikka*⁴² and Jack Witikka's *Pikku Pietarin piha* (*Little Peter*) (Uusitalo 1999, p. 26). Though the first year both of the awards went to the larger studio productions, the state film award developed into a crucial element in supporting the new generation of directors that emerged in the 1960s (Uusitalo 1998a). The state support of film prizes influenced production creating a 'livelier and more ambitious atmosphere' between 1962-1964 which made possible several debut films by new directors (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 24). Filmmakers such as Risto Jarva, Jaakko Pakkasvirta, Mikko Niskanen and Eino Ruutsalo all released their first feature films, and Maunu Kurkvaara got his

⁴¹ English title *Finnish Cinema in the Year Zero*

⁴² No English title, translates to *The Golden Calf*

cinematic breakthrough during this period. The new style of films by these directors became known as the beginning of the Finnish New Wave. During this time advances in film technology also allowed for lighter and more affordable filming equipment, which in turn offered the filmmakers increased independence in terms of production (Toiviainen 2008). The first Finnish New Wave films were decidedly smaller in scale than the previous studio productions, and in many cases the films were directed and produced by the same person. Financially films were still made at great risk with very little return and the small production companies were continuously on the brink of bankruptcy, but Uusitalo (1998a) claims it was the artistic freedom provided by state support that spurred directors and producers to take such risks. According to Uusitalo (1998a) the time was ripe for smaller production companies and directors with a strong artistic vision, *auteurs*.

'Foreign film trends such as early 1950s neorealism or late 1950s French New Wave were the new Finnish film critic generation's aesthetic and ideological role models'⁴³ claims Pantti (1995, p. 141). International film magazines, such as the Italian *Cinema Nuovo*, British *Sight and Sound*, and the French *Cahiers du Cinéma*, had a strong influence on the development of Finnish film culture (Pantti 1995, p. 141). According to Eriksson (1982, p. 438-445) these magazines introduced the Finnish directors and critics to film's potential as a social commentator and the concept of the *auteur*. They inspired the style, themes and way of filmmaking, offering an alternative to the screwball comedies the studio system was turning out. During the early 1960s in Finland 'there was a divide between art cinema and the trade, or film as art versus film as business' (Historical Dictionary of Scandinavian Cinema 2012, p.166). Pantti (1995, p. 142) claims that the films of the new generation of Finnish filmmakers were promoting film culture over film industry. The move from studio system to Finnish New Wave filmmaking was therefore not only a matter of restructuring the film industry financing system, but also redefining the style and role of Finnish cinema at large. Pantti (1995, p. 142) distinguishes the break from tradition and the ensuing conflict in Finnish film culture as three-pronged consisting of a generational conflict, a political conflict and an aesthetic conflict. The Finnish New Wave filmmakers were set apart from the studio system veterans by their age, political leanings and cinematic aesthetic. The older generation that had seen Finland through wars was giving way to the younger generation that was more concerned with social reform and the effects of

⁴³ 'Ulkomaiset elokuvasuuntaukset, kuten 1950-luvun alusta neorealismi ja 1950-luvun lopulta ranskalainen uusi aalto, olivat uuden suomalaisen kriittikopolven esteettisiä ja ideologisia esikuvia.'

urbanisation. Though the Finnish New Wave redefined Finnish filmmaking in both terms of industry and style, the time should not be seen as a 'total break, but rather the new wave should be seen as the diversification of all sectors of filmmaking'⁴⁴ (Pantti 1995, p. 140). Despite the start of state backed filmmaking and the strong international influence, Finnish New Wave was not a neatly contained or clearly cut move to new art cinema. The move away from studio films was gradual and the Finnish New Wave took many shapes and forms over time. This changing nature of the New Wave is discussed throughout the thesis, as each chapter acts as a case study to the cinematic trends prominent at the time.

1.2 Kurkvaara as a New Wave director

One of the earliest directors of the Finnish New Wave was Maunu Kurkvaara. Kurkvaara had long been involved in the film industry as director and scriptwriter, but also as the owner of a laboratory which processed colour film (Cowie 1990, p. 100). Kurkvaara's background, similarly to Ruutsalo's, was in painting. He studied at the Kuvataideakatemia,⁴⁵ but went on to work for T.J.Särkkä's Suomen Filmiteollisuus, one of the leading film studios in Finland where he worked his way up to director (Römpötti 2011, B11). Kurkvaara started his own feature film production with the 1955 film *Onnen saari (Island of Happiness)* but had to wait for his real break through until the trilogy he directed between 1961 and 1963 (Uusitalo 2013). His films *Rakas..*⁴⁶ (1961), *Yksityisalue* (1962) and *Meren juhlat (Feast by the Sea, 1963)* form a trilogy in which the protagonists are 'our film's new type of heroes, or rather anti-heroes, members of the intelligentsia, whose problems are seen from the inside and whose difficulties in life are sensed as a vague shapeless angst' (Toiviainen 1975a, p. 84).⁴⁷ The three films all feature a non-linear structure which allows for its urban young protagonists to look back at past events in hopes of understanding the current situation. It is through these introspective and experimental films that Cowie (1990, p. 100) argues that Maunu Kurkvaara became the first man to bridge the gap between traditional cinema and the experimental New Wave.

⁴⁴ 'totaalisen katkoksen sijasta uusi aalto tulisi nähdä pikemminkin elokuvakulttuurin kaikkien sektoreiden hajaantumisena.'

⁴⁵ Academy of Fine Arts

⁴⁶ No English title, but name translates to *Darling..*

⁴⁷ 'ovat elokuvassamme uudentyypisiä sankari- tai pikemminkin antisankarihahmoja, älymystön edustajia, joiden ongelmat on nähty sisältäpäin ja joissa on aistittavissa jonkinlainen elämisen vaikeus epämääräisenä hahmottomana angstina.'

In line with the French New Wave ethos Kurkvaara was 'an auteur in the most complete sense of the word' (Cowie 1990, p. 102). In addition to directing, Kurkvaara acted as scriptwriter, cinematographer, editor and set designer in his films claiming full creative control of the process (Cowie 1990, p. 102). He set up his own production company Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy in 1955 that went on to finance and produce his feature length films. In a break from traditional studio film style Kurkvaara decidedly moved away from the theatricality that had defined much of earlier Finnish film production. None of Kurkvaara's actors or crew came from a theatrical background (Cowie 1990, p. 102). In addition to this Kurkvaara's films were shot on location with sound added later to ensure the reactions of actors were as spontaneous as possible. Kurkvaara admired the work of Rossellini and De Sica, but although critics often compared his films with those of Antonioni, Kurkvaara claims he had not seen any of Antonioni's films by the time he had finished *Yksityisalue* (Cowie 1990, p. 102). Nonetheless ambiguous narrative and modern alienation were shared themes in Antonioni and Kurkvaara's cinematic oeuvre. Similarly the theme of suicide in Kurkvaara's *Yksityisalue* brings to mind Antonioni's earlier films such as *Tentato suicidio* (*Suicide Attempt*) from 1953 and *Le Amiche* (*The Girlfriends*) from 1955. Kurkvaara's trilogy shows an interest in exploring the time and space conventions of cinema through the play on narrative structure and subjectivity of memory. Though Kurkvaara's characters were distinctly middle-class intelligentsia rather than the poor workers of Italian neorealism, his insistence on filming on location with minimal interference to surroundings and interest in capturing the dramas of everyday life echo his favourites Rossellini and De Sica.

Aside from the international influences on Kurkvaara's cinematic style Toiviainen (2008) argues that it was his background in painting that guided his style as a director towards striking visuals, often at the expense of narrative. The bold experimental style and non-linear narrative of *Yksityisalue* gained praise for its camerawork and for breaking free from the conventions of classic film style (Donner 1962, Talaskivi 1962, Tervasmäki 1962). However Kurkvaara's role as *auteur* of the film, writing, directing, producing and editing, also raised skepticism; as Kirsti Jaantila (1962) bitinglly wrote 'one-man films are risky - unless the man in question is a genius'.⁴⁸ Later Marjatta Soras (1990) claimed of Kurkvaara that 'in the 60s he was considered an incomprehensible experimenter but also an acknowledged member of the New

⁴⁸ 'Mutta yhden miehen filmit ovat vaarallisia - ellei kysymyksessä ole nero.'

Wave'.⁴⁹ Kurkvaara's career as a director outside the studio system included films with innovative narrative structure, such as *Meren Juhlat* which has been compared to Alain Resnais' *Last Year in Marienbad* (1961) (Römpötti, 2011, B11), and reportage style films featuring controversial and topical issues such as the sexual indiscretions of young women in *Autotytöt (Car Girls, 1960)*⁵⁰ and *Raportti eli balladi laivatyöistä (A Report, 1964)*. As one of the first directors of the Finnish New Wave Kurkvaara most significantly directed focus to urban surroundings (Römpötti, 2011).

'Society had changed and it was a time when it no longer felt meaningful to make *Katariina ja Munkkiniemen kreivi (Catharine and the Count of Munkkiniemi)*⁵¹ or barn houses. I took the themes from the present, I showed realism.'⁵²

Kurkvaara commented on his move away from the studio system and into New Wave filmmaking (Soras 1990). The film *Katariina ja Munkkiniemen kreivi* he refers to was a hit film from 1943, directed by Ossi Elstelä and produced by Suomen Filmitoimisto, Kurkvaara's previous employer. The romantic drama starred studio system favourites, Regina Linnanheimo and Leif Wager, and was set in an idyllic rural mansion in the 1860s. Suomen Filmitoimisto was known for producing rural melodramas, as mentioned in Kurkvaara's comment about barn houses. Kurkvaara's own independently produced films broke away from this rural tradition and focused on portrayals of life in the capital. In *Yksityisalue* Kurkvaara introduced the audience to a dynamic and modern Helsinki with a distinctly urban lifestyle. French New Wave cinema's portrayals of urban professional life complete with café culture (Thompson and Bordwell 2003, p. 445) is reflected in the way characters wander through busy streets, cafés and galleries in *Yksityisalue*. The film's debt to the French New Wave was also noticed by the press; as Bengt Pihström (1962) raved 'for the first time with Kurkvaara's "Open Secret" are we presented with a film that stylistically follows and develops disruptions in modern film similar to the ones that we have experienced in

⁴⁹ '60-luvulla häntä pidettiin käsittämättömänä kokeilijana ja toisaalta tunnustettuna uuden aallon edustajana.'

⁵⁰ the film has no official English language title, *Car Girls* is a direct translation from Finnish and follows the line of the Swedish title of the film

⁵¹ the film has no official English language title, *Catharine and the Count of Munkkiniemi* is a direct translation from Finnish and follows the line of the Swedish title of the film

⁵² 'Yhteiskunta oli muuttunut ja aika sellainen, ettei tuntunut mielekkäältä tehdä Katariinaa ja Munkkiniemen kreiviä tai heinälatoa. Minä otin aiheet tästä päivästä, tein realistista.'

French cinema'.⁵³ Pihlström's enthusiasm was shared by Lius (1962) who declared that 'Kurkvaara has the spontaneity of French new filmmakers.'⁵⁴ This enthusiasm for the French New Wave was not shared by all. Paula Talaskivi (1962) commented on *Yksityisalue*, 'the camera language is natural, although at times very obvious in its influence from French young directors - even in shots that feel included for their picturesque qualities (not always substance) and therefore spliced on or shallow.'⁵⁵ Despite the criticism Kurkvaara's experimental aesthetic dovetailed well with the funders' interest in French art cinema, and he became the most awarded director during the years 1961-1969, receiving the state film funding award five times (*Historical Dictionary of Scandinavian Cinema* 2012, p. 166). While Kurkvaara's films were produced by his own Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy and financed with the income of his film processing laboratory, state funding covered a significant portion of the overall budget. In the case of *Yksityisalue* the film prize of 40,000 Finn marks accounted for 57% of the film's budget. Despite Kurkvaara's affinity to French cinema, the French subtitles of *Yksityisalue* or even his 1965 short film entitled *Pourquoi?*, according to the National Audiovisual Archives database none of Kurkvaara's films were released in France. For *Yksityisalue* the international distribution consisted of being sold to Sweden and Denmark and taking part in German film festivals.

Kurkvaara's films such as *Yksityisalue* in many ways embody the ethos and trends of the early Finnish New Wave cinema. He was most definitely an *auteur*, an artist with a distinct individual style working in the field of cinema. Kurkvaara was also very aware of developments in international film industry and style, taking inspiration from foreign films. He outwardly rejected the studio system mode of production by working through his own production company and his films relied heavily on the state film prizes for financing. He also left behind the theatrical style of filmmaking in favour of a more pared down realistic take on modern life. Most crucially for the purposes of this thesis he also turned his interest to the urban milieu and the social factors that dominated the suburban building project.

⁵³ 'Först med Kurkvaaras "Privatområde" presenterar vi en film som stilistiskt följer och utvecklar strömningarna i modern film sådana vi t. ex. upplever dim in fransk film.'

⁵⁴ 'Kurkvaarassa on jotain Ranskan uuden filmin tekijöitten välittömyyttä.'

⁵⁵ 'Kameran kieli on luontevaa, joskin välillä hyvin ilmeisenä tuntuu ranskalaisten nuorten ohjaajien vaikutus - jopa sellaisina kuvajaksoina, jotka vaikuttavat mukaanotetuiltakin ensi sijassa kuvauksellisen otollisuutensa (eikä aina asian) takia ja siksi joskus irtonaisilta tai teennäisesti valituilta.'

2. THE SUBURBS OF *YKSITYISALUE*

2.1 Context of urban expansion

‘Finally Kurkvaara has something to say to us all and he says it boldly without shying away from anger. The subject of the film could not be more timely: modern Finnish architecture caught in the crossfire between the demands of the developers and its own socially aware artistic self.’⁵⁶

(Femina, 1962)

Considering the Finnish New Wave cinema’s interest in urban portrayal and providing social commentary (Toiviainen 1975a, p. 31), it is perhaps no surprise that Kurkvaara chose the theme of urbanisation and suburban housing developments for his film. In the early 1960s the flow of people migrating from the countryside to southern cities was creating considerable pressure for metropolitan Helsinki to build new housing (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 28-30). The suburbs, first built to alleviate the cramped living conditions of families living in central Helsinki, now received an increasing amount of inhabitants moving there from the countryside (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 28). The capital was expanding to the urban greenbelt and Finns were adapting to a new suburban lifestyle. Kääpä (2013, p. 6) argues that this ‘migration from the rural areas to Helsinki became a concrete social problem as alienation and the changes in lifestyle were captured by the ‘New Wave’ films of the 1960s and the 1970s.’ As an early example of such a trend, Kurkvaara’s film focuses on the planning process of the suburbs and the moral dilemmas of mass housing. *Yksityisalue* does not show inhabitants occupying any of the new buildings, but instead draws attention to the problematic role of the architect and the construction process. The characters in *Yksityisalue* journey to three different suburban cityscapes, each showing a different facet of the suburban milieu.

2.2 Tapiola

One of these suburbs Kurkvaara introduces the viewer to is the architectural landmark of Tapiola, Finland’s first garden city. The suburb Askokorpi (1970, p. 45) once described as ‘a model for success’ in the field of social planning. This suburb of white high-rises on the outskirts of Helsinki was known as a showcase of Finnish

⁵⁶ ‘Kurkvaaralla vihdoin on jotain sanottavaa meille kaikille ja hän tekee sen rohkeasti vihaa väistämättä. Filmin aihe ei voisi oll aktuellimpi: moderni suomalainen arkkitehtuuri rakennuttajien vaatimusten ja oman sosiaalisesti valveutuneen taitelijaminänsä puristuksessa.’

architectural skill and an attraction to show foreign visitors (Itkonen 1985, p. 340). Koski and his muse drive to Tapiola to enjoy the views from one of its central high-rises. As they arrive at their location the camera pans down along the high-rise facade to reveal Tapiola's central shopping plaza, designed by architect Aarne Ervi. The following shots incorporate the recognisable skyline of iconic Tapiola high-rises. The wide angle of the shots and vertical camera movement draws attention to the picturesque quality of the buildings and their upward reaching lines. The scene also gives one of the film's few glimpses of modernist architecture in its finished form. The sequence of Tapiola introduces the finished architectural product in all its measured and pristine glory.

For Jaakko Tervasmäki (1962) the buildings of Tapiola play an active role in the scene, as he described how 'Kalervo Nissilä goes to the Tapiola restaurant with his "muse" Sointu Angervo as high-rises watch with their ears pricked up'.⁵⁷ Indeed Viljo Revell's famous residential buildings known as the *taskumatti* or flask houses (von Herten 1985, p. 103) appear to have their eyes set on the characters and ears cocked. Here buildings are not insignificant backdrops, but the main attraction. The vantage point of the shot allows for Tapiola's famous town plan to be inspected from an elevated perspective. The camera pulls away from the characters reducing them to dark silhouettes and directing the gaze to the architectural splendour outside of the window frame. The buildings take centre stage hovering over the couple, a visual reminder of the type of architectural inspiration Koski's finds from these meetings with his muse. Tapiola was after all an area where the work of architectural theorists came to life; where Otto-livari Meurman's (1947) theories on suburban settlements outlined in *Asemakaavaoppi* were tested. It was also an opportunity where Heikki von Herten could realise his vision for bringing the city into nature, which he had first published in the 1946 book *Koti vaiko kasarmi lapsillemme*.⁵⁸ Tapiola saw these plans realised in a habitable environment which embodied Finnish architecture at its best, an environment which Kurkvaara's fictional characters explore and enjoy. Through snapshots of its most iconic buildings *Yksityisalue* showcases Tapiola's design as a brief architectural spectacle.

Using modern architecture as a cinematic feature was by no means a new conception in Finnish cinema. Kääpä (2013, p. 6) notes that Helsinki has 'featured as the pinnacle of modernism in early documentary and fiction films. The city has been used as a way

⁵⁷ 'Kalervo Nissilä vain menee "muusansa" Sointu Angervon seurassa Tapiolan näköalaravintolaan, tornitalojen seuratussa korvat pystyssä tapahtumaa.'

⁵⁸ No English title, translates loosely to *A Home or Barrack for our Children?*

to support Finnish self-conceptions of cosmopolitanism (or ‘worldliness’), displaying a range of design styles and architectural wonders.’ The Tapiola tower in which Koski and his muse enjoy the view from the 13th floor restaurant was in fact only finished in one year before *Yksityisalue* was released in 1962 (von Hertzen 1985, p. 111). Similarly the steps and plaza were brand new examples of high profile Finnish design by Aarne Ervi (von Hertzen 1985, p. 116). The Tapiola centre was lauded in international press as J. Holmes Perkins described in 1965 (in von Hertzen 1985, p. 116):

‘One cannot feel but a spiritual elevation and emotional connection when entering this town. The architects of Tapiola have created a truly beautiful centre, where nature and buildings come together with exceptional success. Its open spaces, its walkways, its humanistic architecture and especially its sensitively crafted general plan create a setting for a happy living, which is free from the monotony and rundown effect of many older cities.’⁵⁹

By including Tapiola Kurkvaara showcases an example of modern Finnish architecture at its finest. As an architect who has lost his inspiration, it is therefore not surprising that Koski enters this space accompanied by his muse. Tapiola is a rare example of a positive suburb in *Yksityisalue* displaying the height of Finland’s architectural innovation. The suburb of Tapiola and its history are discussed in greater detail in chapter two, as it takes a central role as the setting of Jaakko Pakkasvirta’s film *Vihreä Leski*. In only six years the suburb had changed from architectural marvel of *Yksityisalue* to a bleak symbol of urban alienation in *Vihreä Leski*. This highlights the transient quality of the suburban portrayal, as same buildings can take on dramatically different roles at different times.

2.3 Echoes of Le Corbusier

The other instance when Kurkvaara shows a completed suburban building is when Koski takes his old friend and fellow architect Mäkinen to see new houses on the coast just outside of Helsinki. The camera pans along the side of the building horizontally,

⁵⁹ ‘Ei voi olla kokematta henkistä ylentymistä ja liikutusta tullessaan tähän kaupunkiin. Tapiolan arkkitehdit ovat luoneet todella kauniin keskustan, missä luonto ja rakennukset yhtyvät harvinaisen onnistuneesti. Sen avomet tilat, sen kävelytiet, sen humaninen arkkitehtuuri ja erityisesti sen herkästi toteutettu yleissuunnittelu luovat puitteet onnelliselle elämiselle, joka on vapaa monien vanhempien kaupunkien yksitoikkoisuudesta ja nuhrisesta vaikutuksesta.’

surveying its geometric lines. It is a finished, but empty building. The camera angle stays with the men, observing the shape of the building from a distance. The surroundings of the building are left outside of frame giving the house center stage. The surrounding trees are the only objects that link the building to a larger landscape. The white of the walls blends into the snow and sky, the foundation drawing an artificial horizon. The open structure of the house draws in the surrounding nature and creates frames around it. The men are in agreement that the design is good.

The building bears a resemblance to Le Corbusier's Pavilion de l'Esprit-Nouveau, unveiled at the International Exhibition of Decorative Arts in 1925. The Pavilion de l'Esprit-Nouveau consisted of two parts: an L-shaped house with an adjoining garden and a city-planning exhibit (Rybczynski, 2010, p. 42). In the politically laden exhibit Le Corbusier proposed a new way of ordering both domestic and city space (Cohen 2004, p. 31-32). The Pavilion showcased the potential of mass-produced concrete housing and how this could be utilised in town planning. The concrete structure of the villa could be standardised for mass-production and 'agglomerated in long, lofty blocks of villa-flats' (Le Corbusier 1937, p. 104). Le Corbusier also sought to integrate nature in an approach which 'combines the open and closed spaces: it lets closed spaces protrude into the open, inserts open space into the building, and, because of the open construction looks as if it was floating in the air' (Markus 2006, p. 179). This arranging of white concrete modules in long blocks and opening up of the space to its surroundings are echoed in the modernist building Koski and his friend admire in *Yksityisalue*. In fact the suburban building in the film closely follows Le Corbusier's design ideology, as outlined in his *Five Starting Points for the New Architecture* from 1926 (Markus 2006, p. 178). Le Corbusier's architecture and design principles were well known in Finland, since in 1930 'the building for Turun Sanomat was the first project in Finland to realize Le Corbusier's five-point plan: a building supported on columns, an internal reinforced concrete framework, horizontal strip windows, a free plan and roof garden' (Salokorpi 1970, p.25). The horizontal lines, flat roof and incorporated garden are all featured in the suburban building in *Yksityisalue*, their aesthetic further enhanced by the horizontal pans that glide across the crisp lines of the building.

The house which the two architects are surveying follows in the tradition of modernist design and reflects the fact that Le Corbusier's architectural ethos had a great influence on modern Finnish architecture (Salokorpi 1970, p. 42). The scene also captures the changes Finnish architecture was facing at the time. Salokorpi (1970, p.

42) notes that 'at the beginning of the 1960's Finnish architecture found itself, in many respects, in the same ideological position as in 1927' and as a reaction young architects formed new links to modernism and Le Corbusier. The harmonious low-rise design incorporates an alternative vision of suburban living devised by a younger architect. Despite being a suburban building, the house in question is set apart from the high-rise slums Koski detests and designs himself. After the flashback Mäkinen mentions that the not-yet-30-year-old architect who designed the building in question was the same person Koski beat in an architectural competition just before his suicide. Mäkinen recalls Koski's reluctance to discuss his competition win and upon Pena's confusion notes laconically 'have you asked anyone which one they consider better, the first or second place winner?'⁶⁰

2.4 Unfinished slums

The third suburb the film introduces is the only one which features buildings designed by architect Koski. A far cry from the measured beauty of the Tapiola landscape or the balanced line of the Le Corbusier style house, Koski's suburban building is unfinished and looks shambolic. It is here that Pena walks up to a half finished apartment to discuss new amendments to the design with the developer. The walls of the room are stained and the plastic cover protecting the door is tatty and worn out. Building materials are piled in heaps and the room is not only unfinished but untidy. The view outside to the forest is coated in dirty plastic rendering the landscape a milky grey. Standing in front of a dirty window they debate the cost of adjusting the drawings to improve the design of the building.

'It is not *only* three percent, it is *as much as* three percent! And why put this strain on people who need an apartment? Only because of Koski's whim?' the developer retorts continuing 'Besides I couldn't care less if it is maybe more stylish. As long as we can build as cheaply as possible and as much as possible.'⁶¹ The camera moves to a shot reverse shot framing the developer against the milky surface of the window. Behind the window paint drips and scaffolding rods echo the slender tree trunks of the forest in the distance. The lightness of the shot is juxtaposed with a cut to Pena standing in front of

⁶⁰ 'oletkos kysynyt joltakin kumpaa pitää parempana, ensimmäisen vai toisen palkinnon voittanutta?'

⁶¹ 'Ei se ole vain kolme prosenttia, se on jopa kolme prosenttia! Ja miksi tämä rasitus ihmisille, jotka tarvitsevat asuntoa? Vainko Kosken päähänpiston vuoksi?' 'Sitä paitsi minua ei kiinnosta tippaakaan onko se ehkä tyylikkäämpi. Pääasia, että pystymme rakentamaan mahdollisimman halvalla ja mahdollisimman paljon.'

a black corner. The white window frame of shared space is cut into two, light and dark, reflecting the shift in tone in their conversation. The developer schools the young architect: 'Listen here young man, you would be wise to change your views or you will not design a single house in this country. We give, or don't give, you work and you do as we want, not the other way around! Koski too had to learn this in his time, and he always found work.'⁶² Pena is forced to alter the drawings to their original form, discarding the last changes Koski made before his suicide.

Walking away from the debate Pena stops to look back at the building he has just exited. For a moment of pause his entire body is trapped in a box within a grid of scaffolding. The tightness of the frame around him adds a sense of entrapment and echoes his earlier comments of suburban housing not offering air or space. The scaffolding structure mimics the look of the high-rise building with its grid of windows, much like the one Pena was just looking out of. This time looking out at him, he is suspended within a framework of rigid lines.

The visit to a construction site of one of Koski's buildings is a distinctly different environment from the building designed by his young rival. Here instead of horizontally, the camera pans upwards reaching towards the top of the building. The buildings extend towards the sky, not along the horizon. The entrance to the building is through a makeshift timber scaffolding that draws a chaotic jumble of lines on the screen. The haphazard nature of the scaffolding makes the milieu look more like a junk yard than a new building. This effect of dilapidation is also used indoors, where materials are already worn, torn and dirty. Scraps of rubble and plastic dull every surface. Although allowed indoors and able to pan around, the camera does not capture the shapes or spaces of the building itself. As opposed to the building designed by the young rival architect, Koski's building frames nature through a dusty pane of window glass. The view is further obstructed by a fallen rod. His architectural vision is isolated from the nature by a grey film, a worlds apart from Le Corbusier's ethos of framing and incorporating nature into the design.

⁶² 'Kuulkaas nuori mies, teidän on viisainta ajoissa muuttaa käsityksenne tai ette tule piirtämään ainoattakaan taloa tässä maassa. Me annamme teille työtä, tai olemme antamatta, ja te teette meidän tahtomme mukaan eikä päin vastoin! Koskikin sai sen oppia aikanaan ja hänelle riitti töitä.'

In a final glance around the high-rise construction site the camera looks up at the building and pans around to its edges. The design of the building however is abstracted by the protruding scaffolding and trees. Instead of clean modernist lines the screen is filled with layers of overlapping and cutting rods, planks and tree trunks. The building arches over the viewer, an effect further emphasised by the panning camera movement. The resulting visual cacophony is far removed from the crisp minimalist aesthetic of the architectural drawings pinned to Koski's office wall. Kurkvaara does not show any of Koski's finished buildings and in the few construction sequences the buildings are always obstructed and abstracted by surrounding mess. The design does not stand on its own, but is overshadowed and interrupted by unaesthetic yet practical necessities, much like the architect's vision compromised by the developer's demands. The professional constrictions Pena is experiencing with the developer follow the architectural developments in Finland in the early 1960s.

The 1960s in Finland were defined by massive construction projects, of which a tremendous 40% was for housing (Standertskjöld 2011, 16). Tapiola, the first garden city of Finland, had already defined the modernist high-rise aesthetic of suburban developments (von Herzen 1985, 85). This initial design ethos of Finnish suburbs as ones where high-quality architecture complimented the existing landscape and were structured according to a carefully devised town plan soon suffered under the pressure of constant housing shortage. The ever increasing rate of urbanisation 'induced Helsinki, Espoo and Vantaa to plan ever larger suburbs' (Nikula 1993, p. 146). In 1959 new legislation was put in place which 'gave local authorities a monopoly on planning within their jurisdiction' (Nikula 1993, p. 146). To keep up with growing demand municipalities handed over construction of the suburbs to large developers which became known in Finnish as *grynderit* (Standertskjöldt 2011, p. 28).⁶³ This outsourcing resulted in commercial developers being given free reign over large areas and the design of housing drifting away from architects and into the hands of engineers and technicians (Standertskjöldt 2011, p. 28). The garden city aesthetic was pared down and standardised to cut costs. Nikula (1993, p. 146) argues that during the 1960s 'town planning shifted from a respect for terrain contours to a new predominance of the grid. Prefabrication was developed solely with a view to reducing construction costs. Buildings were larger than ever and increasingly monotonous.' Efficiency became key, which in turn took its toll on the quality and design of housing. In the 1960s the garden city suburbs considered as ideal living environments in the 1950s became scorned and

⁶³ Finnish word for housing developers

even considered as a detriment to mental health (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 28). The tone in the press moved from celebratory to critical in the mid 1960s outlining the faults in suburban architecture which caused alienation and unhappiness in inhabitants (Roivainen 1999, p.53). Kurkvaara's critique captures the early stages of this development and chronicles the restrictions architects were facing as suburban housing drifted further away from its garden city ideals. The polished beauty of Tapiola and the young architect's low-rise design are far removed from the construction site Pena visits. They exemplify the design ideals of modernist design, while Koski's construction site offers a rare glimpse to the realities of the majority of suburban housing developments and reflects the disillusionment of architects working on these.

3. HELSINKI

3.1 Street scenes

Despite the film's theme of suburban housing the predominant milieu of *Yksityisalue* is that of central Helsinki. It is the bustling streets of the capital which Pena wanders through in search of answers to Koski's sudden suicide. Although the film includes shots of recognisable landmarks such as the Kallio church or Töölönlahti bay area, signaling to the viewer that we are indeed in Helsinki, the majority of the cityscape remains rather disjointed. The camera does not track along Pena's movement, but remains at a fixed point, slowly panning across the street scene displaying a facade of shop windows and cafes as he walks by. Cropped to a close mid shot the building fills the screen entirely, immersing the viewer and severing the sense of direction or scale from the world that continues outside of the frame. Diving in and out of this facade, from the office into a cafe, the city remains a flat, two-dimensional surface observed at eye-level. The connection to the city at large is provided only in at the end of the shot, where the viewer catches a glimpse of the end of the road, the shape of the building and relation to other structures.

At other times Kurkvaara blends the private and public spheres of city space. An argument and brief chase is followed by tightly cropped extreme close-up of Pena pressing his eyes shut. As he blinks and opens his eyes we are jolted to a wide shot of him standing alone at a street corner. The intimacy of reading his expressions, being drawn to the reactions and emotions playing on his face, is interrupted by the sudden shift in perspective. Pena's personal turmoil is lost and he is reduced to one more dark figure standing in the cityscape. The shot is one of the few in *Yksityisalue* which offers

a raised perspective to the Helsinki street scene, showing the characters in their wider surroundings. This is of great contrast, not only to the previous close-up of Pena's face, but also to the flatness of other street scenes in the film. Kurkvaara's Helsinki is simultaneously one of crowded busy streets and solitude. This effect of solitude within a fragmented city is further emphasised by the lack of establishing shots of the city. The tight framing of the mid-shots, flatness of the facade backdrop and shots disconnected from wider views of Helsinki leave the viewer unconnected with the milieu in which the film is set.

3.2 Designer Homes

Helsinki also houses the homes, private spheres, of the cast of characters. These immaculately furnished and decorated homes exude their inhabitants' sense of style and love of design. Koski's spacious open plan living room is decorated with paintings and design classics. His collection includes Arne Jacobsen's iconic Egg chair, designed in 1958, and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and Lilly Reich's Barcelona chair, first designed for the German Pavilion of the International Exposition held in Barcelona in 1929. These expensive pieces of furniture emphasise Koski's image as a wealthy design enthusiast and display his affinity to international design. The room functions as a reception where guests enter and meet with Mrs. Koski about practical and official matters regarding her husband's death. There is an unease about how guests move in the room, they remain standing and shuffle within the space ill at ease. It is also the only space Koski and his wife are seen together. Surrounded by guests they act out the choreography of a cordial relationship before going their separate ways. As an apartment without its own exterior entrance or unique features, the designer living room is the facade of the home and also the stage upon which the facade of Koski's marriage is played out.

In stark contrast to the sparse design of the open plan living room, is Koski's bedroom. Upon returning from discovering her husband's suicide, Mrs. Koski retreats to her bedroom. She pushes her bare feet into the shaggy rug and begins stroking her legs. Her back to the camera we follow her actions from a distance, looking in on an intimate moment in the private sphere of the home. Sound connects her to Pena, as she calls out to the living room and we hear Pena's voice replying from behind us. No-one else enters this private sanctuary, but we observe Mrs. Koski on the phone. This time she speaks openly about her unhappiness about a particular image used for the obituary and allowing herself to rant on the phone she offers insight into her real emotions about

her husband's death. These feelings and reactions are quickly smoothed over as she returns to the living room and faces others. The short sequence displays the intimate life of Mrs. Koski that is lived one closed doorway away from the social space of the living room.

An alternative style of living room is introduced by the help of Koski's younger colleague Pena. His compact living room incorporates a working area, but does not have any soft furnishings. Instead Pena lays down on the rug and throw pillows scattered on the floor. This casual lounging is described by Standertskjöld (2011, p. 38) as 'floor living'⁶⁴, something which was popular among the youth of the 1960s. Pena's furniture is more modest, a floor-level shelf even looks homemade, and includes Alvar Aalto's popular wooden chairs. Drawings are pinned directly onto the wall and the room reflects his interests and hobbies. In fact its aesthetic bears a resemblance to the style of the office in which he works. For Pena his professional life and personal interests come together in his private sphere. In addition to the stylistic echoes of the Le Corbusier in the suburban low-rise, his work also makes a more explicit appearance in *Yksityisalue* in Pena's bookcase. At home and lost in thought Pena walks to his bookshelf and picks up a book on Le Corbusier's architectural designs between the years 1929-34. He flicks through the pages until moving back to thinking about Koski's final days. In Pena's home the passion for design is not expressed through pieces of status furniture, but through using the space in an alternative way and filling it with books, papers and sketches. In Pena's home architecture is something which invites interaction and engagement, whilst in Koski's home guests hesitate to sit down on the designer furniture. Aside from design tastes the interiors reflect the generational and perhaps ideological gulf between the two men.

3.3 Niemeyer and nothing new

Another example of how architecture is present in Kurkvaara's Helsinki and intertwined with the lives of the character is the Niemeyer architectural exhibit. *Yksityisalue*'s Helsinki features an exhibit of Brazilian architecture which Pena and Kaisu visit together. According to *Satakunnan Kansa* (Anon, 1962) the filming coincided with the exhibit rather than was staged: 'Kurkvaara has once again chosen to shoot in real environments in order to capture the necessary multidimensional modern city life as the backdrop of his film - the shooting has already started. The events require winter

⁶⁴ 'lattia-elämään'

images, and the recently opened exhibit on Brazilian built environment was suitable as one setting of the film which deals with architecture.⁶⁵ The exhibit therefore follows Kurkvaara's ethos of un-staged settings and events, depicting a real Helsinki at that moment in history. By utilising the exhibit in the film *Yksityisalue* also reflects on and takes part in the cultural debate taking place in Helsinki at the time. The walls of the exhibition are filled with photographs and architectural drawings. The images include several of Oscar Niemeyer's designs. Pictures include Palácio da Alvorada, Presidential residence, built in 1957-58, and the Cathedral of Brasília, groundbreaking in 1958 and inauguration in 1970, both designed by Oscar Niemeyer. His take on modernist architecture include curves and carry a sculptural quality. Many of the architectural photographs shown in *Yksityisalue* are from Brasília, a city Niemeyer designed the city plan and many buildings for. Brasília's first phase was built from 1957 to 1960 'in a frenzy of nationalist modernization' (Williams 2012). Architectural designs embodied political hopes as 'the magical and monumental architecture of Brasília was to reflect the ambitious, even surreal project of the city's founders: to lift Brazil out of underdevelopment and advertise the achievement of "fifty years of progress in five"' (Underwood 2004, p. 16). The striking architecture of Brasília is according to Underwood (2004, p. 100) 'the purest and most refined vision of the modernist utopia to take actual form.' Despite the groundbreaking nature and massive scale of Niemeyer's work in Brasília Pena remains unimpressed with the exhibit. Despite the obvious popularity of the exhibit- the crowds are so great they prevent Pena from getting in on the opening night- he remarks to Kaisu laconically 'nothing new'. The images are not marveled at or appreciated, but dealt with a rather lighter approach as the Cathedral of Brasília is rendered as a crown on top of Kaisu's head.

According to Williams (2012) early critics drew attention to the shortcomings in the performance of Niemeyer's buildings in the capital's design. Williams (2012) critiques the rigidly zoned urban plan of the Brasília, and city's the large-scale freeways built for a population which did not yet own cars as one of the city's problems. Niemeyer's lack of attention to practical aspects of architecture leads Williams (2012) to claim Brasília was 'a city that was already falling to pieces less than a decade after it was built.' Niemeyer's monumental and large-scale designs do not impress Pena, who is all too

⁶⁵ 'Kurkvaara on päättänyt jälleen suorittaa kuvauksen oikeissa tapahtumaympäristöissä tavoittaakseen tarpeellisen monivivahteisesti modernin kaupunkilaiselämän elokuvansa taustaksi - on kuvaus jo alkanut. Tapahtumat edellyttävät nimittäin talvikuvia, ja juuri äsken oli avoinna Brasilian rakennustaiteen näyttely, joka sopi erääksi taustaksi arkkitehtimiljöössä liikkuvaan elokuvaan.'

familiar with the downsides of massive concrete constructions and the drawbacks of town plans that rely on the automobile.

These examples of Helsinki streets, domestic interiors and exhibits highlight the importance of architecture and the urban milieu as themes in *Yksityisalue*. They illustrate the generational gulf between Koski and Pena through subtle hints of their interiors and show how immersed in architecture the character's lives are. The references to the work of famous architects, which are sprinkled throughout the film, enforce the sense of a cinematic world that is full of architectural knowledge and understanding of design. As these architectural ideals are set against Koski's unfinished high-rise the contrast between design and reality is stark. Though Koski and Pena inhabit a world filled with architectural innovation they are unable to pursue this in their work. The theme of architecture is a dominant part of *Yksityisalue*, but simultaneously it also seeps deeper into the film form in ways which add to and enrich the experience of milieu and theme of urbanisation.

4. THE PAINTERLY SCREEN

4.1 Two-dimensional interiors

The settings of *Yksityisalue* range from the bustling central Helsinki streets and the minimalist architect's office to suburban construction sites and the ocean front milieu of Koski's cabin. The only design by Koski we are shown is the tatty and dirty setting of the construction site which is in stark contrast to the ever-present architectural designs of the film. Drawings of buildings are everywhere: they decorate the walls of the office and books on architecture fill Pena's bookcase at home. Even the desk at Koski's holiday cabin is scattered with sketches of houses. On paper architecture is celebrated, yet in the suburban construction zone it represents a reluctant compromise. In *Yksityisalue* Koski's architecture is in its purest most beautiful form when it is restricted to two dimensions. Architecture is the main theme of *Yksityisalue*, but alongside the narrative references and visual reminders, it seeps into the very fabric of the film itself. Within the architectural office, the directorial choices Kurkvaara makes with lighting, camera movement and editing, create a curiously flat world. For a film that deals with three-dimensional space there is remarkably little done to employ cinema's capability to conjure up a sense of depth on a two-dimensional screen. In fact the effect of milieu is one of flatness and solid white surfaces, creating an impression that the characters are

caught living on one of the white architectural sheets that crowd on every tabletop of the film.

Ulla Leskinen (1962, p. 19) noted that 'Kurkvaara does not accept facades or artificial setups. He believes an environment should feel lived in, and be preferably exactly like the one people such as the film's characters would live in reality. Although the content of his films differs from pure realism, the framework should be as truthful as possible.'⁶⁶ In light of Kurkvaara's desire to show the reality of everyday settings as truthfully as possible it is surprising that in several shots of *Yksityisalue* he employs a degree of distortion which abstracts the milieu.

4.2 Shadows on white walls

The predominant colour of the film is white. The walls of the architect's office are a bare stark white. The white of snow covered ground meets the white of the overcast sky in the winter landscape. The walls of the architectural office are left bare with the odd unframed architectural drawing pinned to them. There are no other elements of interior decoration that clutter the view. In shots of the interiors the lighting is harsh and often directed from the side casting bold black shadows on the office walls. The characters are followed around by their shadows, haunted like ghosts. This strong direct lighting creates an effect that the characters are floating midair, as Eero Tammi (2006) notes. Against the stark white walls the clearly drawn black figures become reminiscent of a shadow play. Instead of real three-dimensional characters they become two-dimensional cutouts inhabiting a stage, rather than a room. This lack of depth in the interior is made even more distinct when characters move through doorways. In some shots rather than showing the world beyond the room in which the action is set, the characters often enter from darkness. What lies behind the doorway is left unexplored, literally a black hole. Tammi (2006) argues that 'the camera's close relationship to architecture and painting is rarely as dominant as in the modern interiors of *Open Secret*, against which the characters float as they were trapped in a cubist painting. Rarely can one call a black and white film a study in colour, but in *Open Secret* the

⁶⁶ 'Kulisseja ja lavastusrakennelmia Kurkavara ei juuri hyväksy. Hänen mielestään ympäristön pitää olla todella eletyn ja koetun tuntuista, mielummin juuri sellaista, missä elokuvan henkilöiden kaltaiset ihmiset todellisuudessakin elävät. Vaikka hän filmiensä sisällön suhteen haluaakin poiketa puhtaasta naturasta, pitää kehysten kuitenkin olla mahdollisimman todentuntuiset.'

shades of black, grey and white exude a startling attention to detail'.⁶⁷ The flatness of the interiors takes the focus away from shape or form and onto light itself.

As lighting designer Gustavo Avilés (2011, p. 210) comments: 'Light is constructive. But it can also be destructive. If a lamp is not positioned properly, you break everything. It is visual destruction.' The ghostly shadows are achieved simply by directing one lamp, but the effect is jarring and surreal. Avilés (2011, p. 210) continues, 'If used incorrectly, it destroys space. It doesn't shape space, but runs away from it and turns it into something it is not. Spherical becomes flat and flat becomes scratched; a lack of space interpretation can destroy the space.' The room itself loses its form and is reduced to a blank piece of paper. When Pena stands in front of a white wall, he becomes framed within the paper, similar to the photos and drawings hanging on the wall. The flattened canvas also plays with his dimensions, Pena becomes a figure, a miniature alongside the other objects on the wall.

A mid-shot of Koski shows him in the middle of the screen and against a flat background. He is the only object on the screen, suspended in emptiness. The painterly composition is reminiscent the flatness in Godard's film *Vivre sa vie* from the same year, 1962. Thompson and Bordwell (2003, p. 447) state that 'one of Godard's most influential innovations was to design shots that seem astonishingly flat.' This 'painterly flatness' (Thompson and Bordwell, 2003, p. 447) is similar to the flatness Kurkvaara uses in *Yksityisalue*. A scene at Koski's cottage starts with a wider establishing shot of a recognisable interior, and jumps to a closer mid-shot and the world behind Koski disappears. He is left floating in darkness, this time without shadows. His character is removed from his surroundings, breaking the connection to the room and transforming the scene from cinema to painterly portrait. It severs the tie to the cinematic surroundings and reality, placing the character in a suspended existential space. Roos Molendjik (2011, p. 394) argues that 'the fundamental objective of great lighting design is to provoke an emotional response from the users of buildings and spaces. When generating an emotional reaction, lighting designers aim to offer an interpretation of a place.' When opting out of shades, textures and shapes, Kurkvaara

⁶⁷ 'Kurkvaaran kameran läheinen suhde arkkitehtuuriin ja kuvataiteeseen on harvoin yhtä hallitseva kuin *Yksityisalueen* modernin viivoittamissa sisätiloissa, joiden litteää vaikutelmaa vasten henkilöahmot leijuvat kuin vangittuna kubistiseen maalaukseen. Harvemmin voi mustavalkoista elokuvaa luonnehtia tutkielmaksi väreistä, mutta *Yksityisalueessa* mustan, harmaan ja valkoisen sävyistä hohkaa hämmäntävää huomiontunnetta.'

removes the emotional connection with the surrounding world and leaves the viewer with a flat canvas against which the characters play out their lives.

Kurkvaara as a painter would have been particularly aware of the intricacies of representing light. In his earlier short film *Pääkaupunki aamusta iltaan* (*The Capital from Dawn till Dusk*), Kurkvaara distinctly singles out light as a feature which determines the enjoyment of the city. Finnish modernist buildings were already built to be stark white, the curves of buildings diffusing the different shades of grey in between. As a black and white film *Yksityisalue* would be perfectly suited to capture and explore this quality of shape and form. However it does not. Taking into account *Yksityisalue*'s focus on modern architecture it is surprising that Kurkvaara chooses to use white as flat panels, rather than to expose the three-dimensional contours of the objects and buildings by employing the multiple shades of grey available to him.

This limited use of light is odd, especially as the film is set in winter time, when Nordic light is at its most unique. 'The low slant of sun at high latitudes is also remarkable, transforming human perception with long shadows and strikingly refracted colours—especially in winter, when sunshine arrives at glancing and often peculiar angles.' (Plummer 2012, p. 6). In his book about architecture and the Nordic light Plummer (2012) notes how in winter light reflects upwards from snow, drawing shadows on top of rather than below mouldings. Plummer (2012, p. 6) 'More than the landscape, it is this dreamlike atmosphere that tells people at once that they have reached the outermost rim of the earth. These bewitching effects of light were absorbed into Nordic saga and myth, and have permeated the arts.' Plummer (2012, p. 7) cites an influence from Le Corbusier and J.J.P. Oud on the work of Nordic architects in the 1920s and 30s, but argues that 'Scandinavian architects loosened their buildings from the formal and machined stress of Modernism, and sought instead to naturalize simple volumes by suffusing them with a light distinct to the North'. The winter setting and architectural theme of the *Yksityisalue* would have been ideal for this exploration in light and form. While the suburban low-rise Koski and his colleague visit uses the wintery landscape in a striking way, blending the white of the snow with the white of the building and creating a sharp contrast against black lines. However this effect of light and snow is limited to the external lines of the building and the surface of the building itself remains flat. The contours of the building are not captured. Plummer (2012, p. 7) uses Alvar Aalto's Viipuri Library from 1935 as an example of this type of 'a shadow-free, diffuse light'. The Nordic lack of light, particularly in the winter, posed a problem for architects. 'By transforming architecture to an optical instrument, a proficient use could be made of

scarce daylight and every room exposed to the sky' (Plummer 2012, p. 8). Nordic architecture features a heavy use of pale materials and reflecting surfaces, which function both to illuminate the space and also as a type of screen upon which daylight can be exhibited, and even intensified (Plummer 2012, p. 8). Kurkvaara's buildings do not cast shadows, in fact they appear as lines rather than forms. In fact his winter landscape is lacking in long shadows just as as the buildings are lacking in volume and contour. Walls are pure, flat white. Plummer (2012) also notes the trend for use of sharp-edged and repetitive shapes to create a monochrome effect. This type of design fractures light and creates dramatic shades. For Plummer (2012) this calls to mind a Cubist painting, a comment echoed in Eero Tammi's (2006) description of the film. But where Cubism explored a form from its variable perspectives in the process exposing something about the nature of vision itself, Kurkvaara films the three-dimensional world in a very two-dimensional way.

4.3 Screen as canvas

The two-dimensional quality of the film is taken further when the screen itself is rendered into a canvas. The film starts with a white blanket of snow upon which the film credits appear. This flat white surface is then replicated on the office walls, sheets of paper and the icy white landscape. This theme is brought to a conclusion as the film ends by fading, not to black, but white. The winter landscape becomes superimposed until it disappears to one last blank page. The principal method of structuring the world and communicating for the architects, drawing, is brought into the structure of the film itself. Aptly the story of Koski's loss of inspiration and his professional self, a designer's block of sorts, ends with a clean white canvas.

The allegory of the cinematic canvas as a type of blank page is underlined with the use of a drawing hand. This aesthetic of clean white with black lines and shapes echoes the architectural drawings that are ever present in the film. They follow the characters from office to home, to cabin to museum. The act of making a mark on paper is shown when the camera fills the screen with a close-up of white paper where Pena's hand writes up notes of Koski's final days. The act of writing, of noting and drawing is emphasised. It becomes a way of thinking through using one's hands. Pallasmaa (2009, p. 89) describes the act of drawing as 'spatial and haptic exercises that fuse the external reality of space and matter, and the internal reality of perception, thought and mental imagery into singular and dialectic entities.' The significance of drawing the timeline of Koski's last week, or of designing the architectural blueprints for future

buildings, is one of ordering the world with the use of drawing. Pena thinks by drawing, or as Pallasmaa (2009, p. 93) puts it, 'One cannot know whether it emerged as a result of a seamless collaboration of the hand and the drawer's mental space. It is often the act of drawing itself, the deep engagement in the act of unconscious thinking through making, that gives rise to an image or an idea.' When Koski struggles to sketch the outlines of his new design, it is his inspiration and vision that are lost. Mäkinen recalls walking into Koski's office, 'he was by his desk on which there was a paper with only a few strong strokes. The lines stood out from the white, they were too bold and he rolled it up.'⁶⁸ Koski's lack of inspiration is reflected in his inability to communicate through drawing, his lines are too bold and jarring.

'One stands before an empty sheet, and what one writes on it is the unadulterated product of one's self; this calls for acceptance of one's responsibility, and for a candid concession of what one is; it means to expose oneself to the public judgement and not to hide behind contingencies which one holds liable in case of failure, but does not mention in the event of success.'
(Le Corbusier 1930, p.10 in Boesiger and Girsberger 1999)

Koski is in the daunting position of standing before an empty sheet unable to create, having lost his professional identity in the midst of catering to the demands of the developers.

The effect of drawing a line through white canvas is one that is utilised in other scenarios in the film as well. This time instead of a wall, or piece of paper, the canvas is nature. The frozen lake outside of Koski's cabin becomes a large sheet of paper, lines trodden into the snow by footsteps. Crisscrossing paths cut through the white expanses of ice creating lines which form shadows in the recesses of snow. The orderly line of people walking away from the cabin and Koski's corpse chime with the geometry of the film. Nature becomes the ultimate canvas upon which people make their mark. This is echoed in the final shot of the film, as Pena walks down towards the vantage point of a tree-lined street and the shot fades to white. Koski's story ends with a blank sheet.

⁶⁸ ' Hän oli pöytänsä ääressä ja pöydällä paperi, jossa vain muutama voimakas veto. Viivat piirtyivät hyvin esiin valkoisesta, ne olivat liian selviä ja hän kääri rullan kokoon.'

5. ROLE OF THE ARCHITECT

5.1 Troubled artists

Milieu and architecture play an important role in the film, and being an architect is portrayed as a crucial part of a person's identity. Koski's life centres around his work, which becomes an all-consuming profession. When Pena hears Mäkinen is also an architect, he is visibly startled and has to re-evaluate him completely. This reaction reminds of what Asko Salokorpi (1970, p. 28) describes as the 'very respected social position that architects had enjoyed in Finland ever since the beginning of the century.' Laine (2013, p. 26) notes that several Finnish films of the 1960s featured architects, such as Jörn Donner's 1965 *Täältä alkaa seikkailu* (*Adventure Starts Here*) or Risto Jarva's *Onnenpeli* (*Game of Luck*), all of whom equally troubled by their profession. As in *Yksityisalue* the architects take considerable pride in their work and allow their work to dominate their private lives as well. But as in *Yksityisalue* the architect's role was also problematic and morally challenging. This is clearest in Pena's meeting with the developer. The future of Pena's architectural career is shown linked to his ability to amend the designs according to the builders' specifications. Kurkvaara captures the debate between business and design in Finnish architecture. This tense relation between the *grynderit*, who would buy the land and take charge of the construction process (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 28), and architects was historically accurate.

Salokorpi (1970, p. 28) recalls that 'it had been suggested within C.I.A.M.⁶⁹ that the architect's position and responsibilities be established in law.' This proposition sparked debate also in Finland. In response to this suggestion Pauli E. Blomstedt argued 'that since "the architect designs buildings and town plans only as the entrusted agent of the person who commissions them" it is his duty "to the best of his ability, to further those interests of his employer that have, with complete confidence, been entrusted to him."' (Salokorpi 1970 p. 29). The role of the architect was to follow the aims of the client regardless of their motives. 'According to this view the architect had no right to pass a moral judgement on the commissions that he accepted' (Salokorpi 1970 p. 29). This passing of responsibility and artistic vision is something that is at the core of *Yksityisalue* and Koski losing the will to live. Looking at the harmonious lines that echo Le Corbusier's aesthetic, designed by his young competitor, Koski notes defeated,

⁶⁹ Les Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne

'nothing more, just that it is good'.⁷⁰ Having defeated the competitor in a design competition provides little solace, when Koski sees that his designs are better than his own. In conforming to the demands of the developers Koski has lost his own vision as an architect and is tormented by the low quality of housing he is building.

5.2 Losing Hope

A shot in which Koski bids farewell to his lover and muse telling her he is leaving sees her look back. Standing in Koski's office we see the architect's name plaque on the wall. Until then Koski has been known by his surname. Now the camera reveals his first name, Toivo, Hope. Standing in front of the plaque, the black square melding into her scarf, the text becomes directed towards the young woman. She is the hope that is leaving the architect's life and what he is losing, both professionally and personally. Koski tells her he is leaving, that she came into his life too late.

'Architecture demands a clear formulation of its tasks - therein lies the decisive impulse. Are we to restrict these task to the purely utilitarian? Is there room in the household of modern man for poetry, beauty, harmony? Or is it dominated by the mechanical function of the machine for living? It seems to me that the striving for harmony is the loftiest human emotion.'

(Le Corbusier, in Boesiger and Girsberger, 1999, p.10)

Le Corbusier was faced with similar issues in his career as an architect and his 'uncompromising attitude has lost him many an order' (Boesiger and Girsberger, 1999, p. 10). Therefore a large proportion of his work are unrealised designs that were never carried out, but as Boesiger and Girsberger (1999, p. 10) note 'however, they are by no means less valuable than many of the buildings actually executed.' In *Yksityisalue*, Koski had compromised his work and lost his inspiration as an architect, with detrimental results. This conflict of art and business was something that was increasingly present as the need for cost-efficient housing grew rapidly in Helsinki (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 28). The idealistic trend of suburban settlements started by Tapiola did not last long. Quantrill (1995, p.135) argues that in the 1960s 'there was a distinct decline in the quality of much Finnish architecture'. A new wave of rationalisation began to replace the values of architectural modernism with an emphasis on technique resulting in a loss of a more humanistic approach (Quantrill

⁷⁰ 'ei muuta kuin että se on hyvä'

1995, Standertskjöld 2011). Modern architecture and the use of modular units were stretched to their limits. The results of standardised designs, increasingly large units and the dictatorship of the developers that Koski struggles became reality for much of Finnish suburbs. Despite the humanist approach of Aalto and even Le Corbusier, Salokorpi (1970, p. 29) argues that ‘despite all the talk about social responsibility, functionalism in Finland showed little sign of class consciousness’. The role of the architect was to deliver as much as possible, as cheaply as possible, a sentiment directly echoed in *Yksityisalue*.

5.3 Koski’s monologue

The film’s critical tone towards dense, high-rise housing is crystallised in Koski’s monologue. Driving through the Kallio district in Helsinki he passes old houses and new ones being erected beside them. ‘Supposedly good architecture, that is only propaganda. If there is one percent of that in this country, then fine! Everything else is worse. Be it the town plan or the buildings.’⁷¹ : Koski remarks. To Hannula (1962, p. 334) the scene carried echoes of Alvar Aalto’s concerns: ‘in the car Koski speaks like Alvar Aalto at the Culture Fair; the association is somewhat annoying.’⁷² Annoying or not, Koski’s lecture on the perils of housing developments being controlled by greedy developers in Finland was recognised as a timely topic by most critics (Pihström 1962, Lius 1962, Kataja 1977, Moilanen 1988, Lindqvist 1988). ‘Housing policy, that the film addresses even somewhat superficially, was relevant a decade and a half ago and still is.’ (Kataja, 1977, p. 12).⁷³ Although housing policy was considered a topical and valuable theme, critics also noted Kurkvaara’s shallow treatment of it. ‘Professional discussions in the film sound childishly theoretical and the mark of work is not seen aside from the construction site’ (Talaskivi, 1962).⁷⁴ The architectural debate was described as something superficial and sloppy. ‘The story itself, which follows the timely topic of slums, is in need of better reasoning’ (J-I 1962).⁷⁵ Koski’s monologue, however explicit in its argument is seen as shallow and more a narrative vehicle than a complex and multifaceted theme. The pathos of his words do not amount to any

⁷¹ ‘Muka hyvää arkkitehtuuria, se on vain propagandaa. Jos tässä maassa on hyvää yksi prosentti, niin hyvä on! Mutta kaikki muu onkin sitten sitä huonompaa. Oli sitten kyseessä asemakaava tai rakennuspuolesta.’

⁷² ‘Autossa Koski puhuu kuin Alvar Aalto kulttuuripäivillä; assosiaatio on hiukan ärsyttävä.’

⁷³ ‘Asuntopoliittiset kysymykset, joita elokuva selvii, tosin jokseenkin pintaliitoisesti, olivat ajankohtaisia puolitoista vuosikymmentä sitten ja ovat sitä yhä.’

⁷⁴ ‘Ammattikeskustelut filmissä kuulostavat lapsekkaan ohjelmallisilta eikä työnteon leimaa näy juuri muualla kuin rakennuksilla.’

⁷⁵ ‘Itse tarinakin, joka sivuaa aktuellia slummikysymystämme, kaipaisi parempaa perustelua.’

change nor are the wider reasons driving the housing situation explored. Koski attests: 'And new slums are created, business is business and studios and one bedroom apartments generate the best price, although they are no family homes for this part of the century, they are rabbit hutches. They should be banned.'⁷⁶ One factor that adds to this shallowness is that the viewpoint on the slums remains that of the architect; the experiences or reasons of those forced to move into these rabbit hutches are not presented. In *Yksityisalue* the slum problem is an architectural problem, not a social or political one, which stunts the perspective and reasoning.

Though the film is preachy and narrow in scope, the contrast of the architectural ideal in the face of market demands is an interesting one. As Ahlava and Ketola (1999, p. 30) write: 'ugly, dangerous and impersonal milieu is considered to be developed only when financial issues guide the design, as has been usual in different industrial settings. Some housing developments of the 1960s have also been described as repellent, as politics and business overtook design skills.'⁷⁷ They consider this unease with the 1960s housing developments especially interesting as architecture is traditionally considered as homeliness, safety, shelter and a symbolic tool with which to reflect the ideals and values of a society (Ahlava, Ketola 1999, p. 30). Kurkvaara debunks these traditional assumptions of architecture as a field with a social conscience and the architect as artist. The corner Koski is driven into by the development process is made utterly clear in his comment to Pena:

'What else are these besides slums? New or old, that does not matter much after a few years. The apartments are only smaller. And we are a part of that business. One has to be, they say. Money forces us. It is so damn easy to blame money when you don't have a spine. Although it wouldn't change much even if we refused. There is so much mediocrity, legions of designers, builders, buyers, inhabitants, people...'⁷⁸

⁷⁶ 'Ja uusia slummeja vaan syntyy, bisnes on bisnestä ja yksiöstä ja kaksiosta saa suhteessa parhaan hinnan, vaikeivät ne mitään perheasuntoja olekaan ei tällä vuosisadan puoliskolla, koirankoppeja ne ovat. Ne pitäisi kieltää.'

⁷⁷ 'Rumaa, vaarallista ja epäinhimillistä miljööä on ajateltu syntyvän vain, kun taloudelliset kysymykset ohjaavat suunnittelua, kuten erilaisissa teollisuusympäristöissä on ollut tavallista. Luotaantyöntäviksi on luonnehdittu myös joitakin kuusikymmenluvun asuntorakentamisen huippuvuosien tuotoksia, joissa politikointi ja taloudellisuus ajoivat suunnittelutaidon edelle.'

⁷⁸ 'Mitä muuta nuo ovatkaan kuin slummeja? Uusia tai vanhoja, sillä ei ole paljoakaan eroa muutaman vuoden jälkeen. Huoneistot vain entistäkin pienemmät. Ja me olemme mukana tuossa touhussa. Täytyy olla, sanotaan. Raha pakoittaa. On niin hiton hyvä syyttää rahaa kuin ei ole selkärankaa.'

Even as an architect, the planner and visionary, he is powerless to challenge the direction of suburban housing developments.

6. CONCLUSION

In *Yksityisalue* planning the suburbs is equated with drawing, flatness, the planned and two-dimensional. Not the explored, lived, touched or experienced three-dimensional space. By limiting the cinematic style to flatness, white, drawing, Kurkvaara does not utilise cinema's capacity for three-dimensional spatial exploration. The ability to communicate spatial experience, touch, navigation, or moving around a structure are left out. The camera does not move through, or around the buildings. They are not explored to the full extent of the capabilities of the medium. This renders the architecture of the film theoretical, unexplored, viewed on paper rather than as shapes or homes. Architecture remains on the page, a flatness echoed in the film's cinematic compositions. This shallowness of architecture is present to a degree in Kurkvaara's treatment of the theme as well. Though clear in its argumentation the theme of the film remains a theoretical and existential problem. In *Yksityisalue* Kurkvaara makes a passionate case against the greed of the suburban housing developers. He shows the architect as a victim of consequences and unable to affect the course of change in the cityscape. Powerless and disillusioned he is driven to ultimately give up on his profession and his life. The issue and its reasons for the worsening suburban sprawl are left behind unresolved.

Tammi (2006) sees Koski's inner anxiety reflected on screen as 'Kurkvaara continuously positions him entrapped by spaces and structures.'⁷⁹ Kurkvaara's painterly flatness and rigid lines trap the characters onto a sheet of paper, unable to move around or to go through spaces; they are left living in a type of architectural blueprint themselves. One of the few places where Koski escapes this predicament is at his cottage. There he moves through the environment, climbs the contours of the rocky landscape and takes a refuge in a cabin. The dark wooden walls of the cabin are in stark contrast to the white flat surfaces of his office. The room is small, cosy and secluded. The furniture is traditional, hand crafted from timber. It is the antithesis of the modernist concrete Koski is faced with in his day to day life. The ocean front cabin is a space to escape the urban environment and personal conflicts. Again in contrast to Koski's home or architectural office, the windows open up onto the surrounding world.

⁷⁹ 'Kurkvaara sijoittaa hänet jatkuvasti tilojen ja rakennelmien vangiksi'

Nature is present both inside and outside the cabin. The name of the cabin, Kiirala, derives from the word Kiira which derives from the Swedish word *skära*, to cleanse. 'In folk stories *kiira* was a bad creature around the house that needed to be expelled' (Kaisa Häkkinen 2004).⁸⁰ For Koski his cabin is where he can leave behind troubles, a space he only shares with his muse. The small cosy cottage with its log walls is a traditional Finnish dwelling, a modest home in old rural communities. When struggling to deal with the modernisation and urbanisation of the capital, Koski escapes to his own rural idyll. It is also where he chooses to die. Koski returns to a place that is close to nature, modest and small in scale, the opposite of his architectural practice.

At the end of the film, we see Koski's corpse for the first time. He is laid against a grid of vertical lines, reaching upward like the lines in his sketches of high-rise houses, but this time white on black. The background was not a part of the wall in earlier shots of the cabin nor had the interior been altered as Pena tells the police, but the background only appears as a backdrop for Koski's death. The white flatness which dominated the earlier film is replaced by a black sheet, his body enveloped in the dark. The edge of the dark sheet cuts across his closed eyes. The top of Koski's head is set against the textures of the wooden wall. Although his body is lost to the darkness, a part of his head remains with the natural wooden materials. In the final sentence of the film Mäkinen watches Koski's funeral from afar and remarks 'He did what he did, but he also made the Merijoki church and university campus. And they will remain. That is enough for one man'⁸¹ Pena takes this last advice with him as he walks away with Koski's muse and his surroundings fade into one final flat white surface.

Yksityisalue offers a starting point to the discussion on the Finnish suburb and urbanisation by showing how their modernist architectural style was compromised by developer demands. It provides a look at the architectural ideals and international influences that guided the Finnish suburban design while highlighting the problematic role of the architect. The way the film plays with dimensions, shadows and uses the screen as canvas creates flatness to the film, which accentuates the planned quality of the cinematic spaces. While the film neglects to open up the reasons behind the rapid urbanisation and fervent speed of housing developments, it voices concerns regarding the quality of suburban homes. *Yksityisalue* also serves as an example of early Finnish New Wave, *auteur* driven filmmaking and how international film influences were

⁸⁰ 'Kansankertomuksissa kiira oli pihapiirissä vaikuttava paha olento, joka karkotettiin.'

⁸¹ 'Teki hän mitä teki, mutta teki hän myös Merijoen kirkon ja korkeakoulukompleksin. Ja ne tulevat pysymään. Siinä on tarpeeksi yhdelle miehelle.'

reworked in Finnish cinema. In *Yksityisalue* the viewpoint to the suburb is filtered through the eyes of the planner and architect, rather than the people inhabiting the suburban spaces or making their homes in Koski's buildings. In chapter two the viewpoint travels from the architectural drawing board to the streets of the suburb, as Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä Leski* reveals the lived experience of suburban Tapiola.

Garden City Trolls: Voyeurism in the woods in *Vihreä leski*

'Thank you, I do enjoy living here. It is so nice to walk around here, a good place to live.

*With a husband and a child, what more is there to want?'*⁸²

Interviewee, *Vihreä leski* (*Green Widow*)

dir Jaakko Pakkasvirta 1968

Yksityisalue offered a brief look into the suburb of Tapiola, marvelling at the beauty of its buildings, as we saw in chapter one. In this second case study, Jaakko Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä leski* transforms the garden city suburb into a dark and oppressive place. The perspective on the suburb moves from the architect planning it to the housewife living her daily life among the buildings. Kurkvaara's painterly flatness is left behind as *Vihreä leski* takes the viewer on a tour through the suburb's more sinister areas. The film also illustrates how changing political currents influenced Finnish filmmaking and charts the emergence of the suburban milieu as a cinematic theme in the latter half of the 1960s. The case study also addresses the role of cinema as taking part and instigating social debate.

1. POLITICS AND THE NEW SUBURBAN FRONTIER

1.1 New Wave and political cinema

The years before the release of *Vihreä leski* were turbulent in both Finnish culture and

⁸² 'Kiitos, kyllä minä viihdyn oikein hyvin täällä. Täällä on niin hauska kävellä ja on hyvä asuinpaikka. Mies ja lapsi, niin mitä muuta kaipaa?'

politics. 'The year 1966 was an obvious turning point both culturally and politically'⁸³ in Finland (Pantti 1995, p. 143). The theatre received a new radical manifesto in the form of the *Lapualaisooppera*⁸⁴ in March 1966. The musical play, which dealt with political divisions and history, was written by Arvo Salo and had its theatrical debut at the Vanha ylioppilastalo in Helsinki on election day. The historical election result in which the left won a majority of parliamentary seats was also the night that Arvo Salo became a member of parliament. Toiviainen (1975b, p. 29) described the play as a 'breakthrough of committed theatre' which had a lasting effect on cultural life. Culture and politics had come intertwined and there was a new optimistic mood developing in Finnish society (Pantti 1995, p. 143). *Lapualaisooppera*'s overwhelming popularity soon inspired a cinematic adaptation in the form of Mikko Niskanen's 1967 film *Lapualaismorsian* (*Girl of Finland*). The film followed university students in Helsinki debating politics and trials of modern life, offering a portrait of a young urban activist. Pantti (1995, p. 143) argues that both theatrical play and film epitomise the most important cultural theme of the 1960s; taking part in social and political debate.

Another significant change in 1966 that affected Finnish film culture was when the liberal movie critic Jerker A. Eriksson took over from Arvo Paasiovuori as head of the Finnish Board of Film Classification easing the restrictions of film censorship and allowing filmmakers to explore more controversial and sensual subject matters (Toiviainen 1975a, p. 32). This allowed filmmakers to approach sex with openness, and also gave way to a 'sex wave' in Finnish cinema (Toiviainen 1975a, p. 30). The same year also saw the release of Mikko Niskanen's film *Käpy selän alla* (*Skin, Skin*). The film 'brought focus to urban youth' depicting their sexual relationships and social discomfort (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 30). The film was an enormous success reaching over 600,000 viewers and spurred the production of more youth oriented films (Pantti 1995, p. 182). The rise of youth films became increasingly popular in the 1960s, as the film industry recognised the change in viewership and began to target a younger demographic (Pantti 1995, p. 181). These films captured the political activism and optimism of the generation. Political radicalism, youth and sex became the selling points of the Finnish film industry.

⁸³ 'Vuosi 1966 on ollut ilmeinen käännekohta sekä kulttuuri- että poliittisessa elämässä.'

⁸⁴ The name translates to *Lapua Opera* and refers to the fascist anti-communist Lapua movement active in Finland between 1929 and 1932.

1.2 Pakkasvirta and the emerging suburb

It did not take long however for the optimism of 1966 to wane and soon films became increasingly disillusioned with society. Pantti (1995, p. 143) argues that this was a reaction to the rapid speed of economic and technological growth in Finland over the 1960s. Filmmakers began to question the price of such a breakneck speed of development and individual people's position within it. As one aspect of this lifestyle critique the newly built suburbs began to emerge as the setting of action and as a problematised domestic sphere. In 1967 Risto Jarva's film *Työmiehen päiväkirja (Diary of a Worker)* was released to critical acclaim. It was hailed as the first 'worker's film' in Finland (Toiviainen 1975a, p. 68). The story follows a newlywed couple setting their home in the suburb and struggling through increasing responsibilities at work. The society it portrays is one that is still recovering from the scars of the Civil War and the generational gulf between those who have experienced it and those who have learned about it on television. The couple move to a suburb outside of Helsinki and begin to build their domestic life, which soon deteriorates along with their relationship.

In 1968 *Mustaa valkoisella (Black on White)* Jörn Donner's first Finnish feature film delivered a humorous but biting critique of the Finnish lifestyle in a low-rise suburb. Cowie (1990, p. 110) describes how the film is 'superficially a commercial for Finnish standards of living, but more subtly a condemnation of society that draws its sustenance from glamour and egocentricity.' The suburban home fitted with gadgets houses an unhappy disconnected family, though to others their 'life looks opulent and seductive - the bourgeois dream come true' (Cowie 1990, p. 110). In a similar manner as Donner had 'delved keenly beneath the surface of the Finnish welfare dream' (Cowie 1990, p. 110), Jaakko Pakkasvirta revealed the darker side of the suburban middle-class lifestyle in his 1968 film *Vihreä Leski*.

Jaakko Pakkasvirta had started out directing student theatre in the 1950s and acting in Kurkvaara's films *Rakas..* (1961) and *Meren juhlat* (1963). Pakkasvirta met Risto Jarva while working with him on the short film *Työtä ylioppilasteatterissa (Students' Theatre Workshop)* in 1962 and the two built a strong working relationship. Jarva and Pakkasvirta both wrote for the *Teekkari* student magazine and worked for the production company Filminor (Toiviainen 1983, p. 64 and 47). Pakkasvirta began his career as film director by co-directing *Yö vai päivä (Day or Night)* and *X-Paroni (The Baron X)* with Jarva. Pakkasvirta was quickly immersed into the Finnish New Wave and took a particular interest in the role of women in the new welfare state (Toiviainen

1975a, p. 106). Pakkasvirta's solo directorial debut *Vihreä Leski* was produced by Risto Jarva and Filminor at the cost of 152,000 Finn marks and it received a state film prize covering 70,000 Finn marks of the production costs. Without the state film prize the film would have lost 26,000 Finn marks, as its viewing figures were the second lowest of that year's feature films (Uusitalo, 1998). Despite the poor performance at the box office *Vihreä leski* sparked a fervent debate in the press regarding the suburban lifestyle it depicted. Pakkasvirta's film was the first to spark such widespread debate and most significantly it was the first film with which debate extended beyond the film critical realm and took on urban design, suburban lifestyle and women's role in society (Pantti 1995, p. 156). Toiviainen (1975b, p. 31) claims Pakkasvirta 'created the fiercest visions of Finnish reality' and it is this vision of Finnish suburban life this chapter delves into. *Vihreä leski* acts as a case study into the trend of disillusioned and politically conscious filmmaking of the Finnish New Wave as well as an example of the emergence of the suburb as theme in Finnish cinema. It also shows the potential of film in capturing the Zeitgeist and initiating debate about urbanisation and the suburban lifestyle.

The film examines the Finnish suburban milieu in an equally critical tone to that of Kurkvaara in *Yksityisalue*, but rather than providing the planner's viewpoint Pakkasvirta approached the environment from the perspective of a suburban housewife. *Vihreä leski* features drug use, peeping toms and a lesbian couple, prompting film critic Yrjö Kemppe (1962, p.6) to claim 'it is merely a slutty film'.⁸⁵ However it was not the moral character of the film which sparked the public debate around the film. It was the cinematic setting and Pakkasvirta's depiction of the new suburban landscape that caused such uproar in the press. Jukka Kangasjärvi (2007) described *Vihreä leski* as Finland's first suburb drama which 'upon its release sparked a controversy greater than any other modern Finnish film had seen before'.⁸⁶ Martti Savo (1968) described the theme of Pakkasvirta's debut as topical and important, as 'suburbs which not so long ago were considered as ideal solutions to the overcrowding and soot of urban growth have in practice proven problematic'.⁸⁷ Eero Tuomikoski (1968) praised the film stating that 'Jaakko Pakkasvirta's *Green Widow* is the deepest critical take on Finnish reality that cinema has to offer. ... Its emotionally dead, enslaved and enslaving relationships and dull suburban everyday burst to the surface like black blood through the

⁸⁵ 'Se on ainoastaan huorahtava elokuva.'

⁸⁶ 'aiheutti aikanaan polemiikin, jonka veroiseen ei moderni suomalainen elokuva ollut aiemmin yltänyt'

⁸⁷ 'Asumalähiöt, joita ei niinkään kauan aikaa sitten pidettiin miltei pä ihanneratkaisuna vastapainona ylikansoitettujen, nokisten kantakaupunkien kasvulle, osoittautuivatkin käytännössä kyseenalaiseksi.'

schizophrenic gap formed between obsolete rural and misguided urban lifestyles.⁸⁸ Others (Lius 1968, Nordberg 1968, Lehtola 1968) were less impressed and considered the film a random example which could not be seen as representative of the suburban lifestyle. *Vihreä leski* was set and filmed on location in Tapiola, the same suburb Koski visits with his muse in *Yksityisalue*, a then new suburb just west of Helsinki. It follows the daily life of housewife Helinä Lehmusto as she cares for her family in increasing isolation from the society surrounding her. The setting of the film, Tapiola, was at the time of filming the epitome of new modern architecture of the welfare state; Finland's first garden city.

This chapter goes into more detail about the Tapiola suburb and outlines ways in which the garden city was planned and marketed as an ideal living environment. This is then compared and contrasted with Pakkasvirta's cinematic counterpart with the help of Michel de Certeau's (2011) differentiation between planned space and lived space, whilst addressing themes of surveillance and voyeurism. The core concern of the chapter is film's ability to translate the lived experience of space onto the screen and open up new dimensions to familiar spaces. Despite being shot on location with minimal interference in the physical surroundings, the cinematic suburb Pakkasvirta conjures up is a world apart from the glossy images of Tapiola showcased in architectural posters. *Vihreä leski* takes the viewer behind the facade of familiar Tapiola monuments showing ominous forests, unfinished construction sites and alienated everyday life in the garden city. The Finnish welfare state's process of building space, identity and belonging through architecture and design is challenged within the film. Pakkasvirta blends the reality of Tapiola's architecture with elements of surveillance and mythology to form a new emotional and personal landscape of Finnish suburban life. Cinema can reveal the subtle tension between the planned environment and the lived experience of the suburb. In film, Tapiola's inhabitants can enter the space and interact with their surroundings, revealing how planned environment and lived experience have very little overlap. The built and the cinematic environments struggle to find common ground. Discrepancies between these conflicting representations of space draw up questions of power and access within the welfare state. This chapter begins by introducing the design and development of the Tapiola suburb and moves on

⁸⁸ 'Jaakko Pakkasvirran 'Vihreä leski' on syvin suomalaisen todellisuuden kriittinen kouraisu mitä elokuvallamme on esitettävänä. ... Sen emotionaalisesti kuolleet, orjuutetut ja orjuuttavat ihmissuhteet ja nihkeä lähiön arki pulpahtavat kuin musta veri suoraan suomalaista todellisuutta leikkaavasta jakomielisestä halkiosta, joka on syntynyt jälkijättöisen agraarisuuden ja vinosuunnatun kaupunkilaisuuden välille.'

to examine how Pakkasvirta's cinematic Tapiola manipulates the image of the suburb by blending documentary and fiction styles. This is followed by analysis of the chapter's other major themes; surveillance and gender. The suburb, which in *Yksityisalue* is exclusively a planned one, gets its first cinematic inhabitants and is transformed to an arena in which social power is exerted and gender roles are played out.

2. THE PLANNED TAPIOLA

2.1. Making the model

Tapiola, as briefly outlined in the previous chapter, was a model suburb located some 8 kilometres from central Helsinki where cutting edge architecture met careful town planning. As the setting of *Vihreä leski* the suburb takes a central role in the film and calls for more in depth analysis regarding its history and design. It was Finland's premier garden city designed with a unified town plan. The building works began in 1952 and it was planned and financed by Asuntosäätiö,⁸⁹ a building society made up of a number of welfare and housing organisations (Nikula 2005, p. 154). The layout for the town plan was chosen by a public design competition that was won by architect Aarne Ervi. Ervi's design consisted of 'three residential neighbourhoods of approximately equal size, each with a mixture of terrace houses and tall flats built to a fairly low overall density among trees and winding roads' Richards (1966, p. 90) writes. In the 1960s the population of Helsinki was growing annually by 10 000 new inhabitants and this type of 'dormitory town' was seen as a modern answer to housing needs (Kokkonen, 2002, p. 28). It was built as a beacon of modern Finnish housing development. Richards (1966, p. 18) compliments Tapiola for its high standard of architecture and landscaping and cites it as providing 'reassuring evidence that forethought is being exercised' in managing the sprawling urban population of Helsinki and its surrounding areas. The development of this modern area was tinted with idealism, a new home for the welfare nation. The selling points of this welfare state show home were clean lines, spacious layouts and close proximity to nature (von Herten 1985, p. 62-63). The crisp white high rises were surrounded by forest, as 50 percent of the town plan was to be kept in its natural state. Roads and paths between houses were wide creating a spacious layout with ample parking. There were playgrounds for children sheltered between the houses. Tapiola was built as a model town.

⁸⁹ Housing Foundation

Tapiola however was not an isolated building project, but a major component in the development of the Finnish welfare nation, receiving a 100 million mark long term loan from the Finnish government (von Hertzen 1985, p. 11). In the 1960s Finland went through a period of rapid change marked by a shift in social structure, as the mechanisation of traditional farm work forced people to leave their rural homes in search of work in the cities, as Standertskjöld (2011, p. 11-12) notes. According to Vahtola (2003, p. 410) in the year 1950 67% of Finns lived in the countryside, but by the year 1970 the figure had dropped to 49%. The emptying of the countryside paralleled the development of new social policy to build Finland into a welfare nation. Women joined the workforce in greater numbers driving more extensive and readily available childcare facilities, which according to Standertskjöld (2011, p.12) marked a significant change in family dynamics. The Finnish family was moving away from the rural extended family and into an urban nuclear family. Cars became commonplace after the automotive industry was released from government control in 1962 (Standertskjöld 2011, p.12). This again placed new demands on the urban infrastructure and began to alter the Finnish landscape. Writing in 1970 Asko Salokorpi (1970, p. 46) claimed that 'the private car has become the most important factor in social planning and it has been assumed, in placing housing areas far from the centre of towns, that every family will one day own a car'. The combination of building the welfare state, urbanisation and changes in technology drastically altered the everyday life and family dynamics of Finnish people. It was this combination of lack of housing in Helsinki, the rise of private motoring and development of social services that laid the groundwork for Tapiola. As a state-funded development it played a part in quite literally building an identity for welfare state ideals.

The construction and development of Tapiola, aided by 'von Hertzen's diligent public relations work' (Nikula 2005, p.154), can usefully be described as an act of 'placemaking'. Richard Marback (2001, p. 58) describes placemaking as 'a material act of building and maintaining spaces that is at the same time an ideological act of fashioning places where we can feel we belong, where we create meaning, and where we organize our relationships to others.' This objective echoes the Asuntosäätiö's first manifesto: 'We do not wish to build apartments and houses, but a modern community for modern people and their families.' (von Hertzen 1985, p. 120).⁹⁰ In the case of

⁹⁰ 'Me emme halua rakentaa asuntoja ja taloja, vaan nykyaikaista yhdyskuntaa nykyajan ihmiselle ja hänen perheelleen.'

Tapiola the process of placemaking went as far as developing a whole new name for the area. The land on which Tapiola was built was previously known as Hagalund, sharing the name of a local manor house. The Asuntosäätiö decided this Swedish name was not suitable for the new garden city, both because the old manor house kept its name and for the fear of associating the area with the North Stockholm slum of the same name, as Heikki von Hertzen (1985, p. 52) recalls. The new name for the area was chosen through a public competition. Out of over 4000 entries, a total of 978 names, the Asuntosäätiö chose Tapiola. The name Tapio was taken from the Finnish national epic *Kalevala*. Tapio was the god of forest and the territory he ruled over was also known as Tapio's land, Tapiola. Von Hertzen (1985, p. 52) reminisces how apt the name was as 'the new town was after all built on virgin land, for the most part covered by sturdy Finnish forest, a real kingdom of Tapio.'⁹¹ The new houses and suburban setting were given their own mythologically-inflected identity, whilst simultaneously erasing a part of history in the process. Despite the Asuntosäätiö's hopes the Swedish speaking population continued to use the name Hagalund. This resulted in the suburb establishing two names, Tapiola in Finnish and Hagalund in Swedish, which carry different historical and social connotations.

2.2 Modern design for a modern era

The social changes in Finland in the 1960s were also accompanied by changes in architectural practice. Town planning and architectural design were harnessed to cater for the demands of the newly urban masses and their cars. Inspired by Otto-livari Meurman's (1947) book *Asemakaavaoppi*⁹² that had originally theorised independent suburban settlements outside city centres, town plans were devised by developers into larger and more unified and cost-efficient entities (Nikula 1993, p. 146). The emphasis in designing housing areas thus moved towards constructing communities. The architectural designs of the time were dominated by standardisation through the use of modular units. Concrete became the building material of choice. Roger Connah (2005, p. 182) argues that during this time in Finnish architecture 'systematic thinking was married with the neutrality expected from social equality'. Housing was designed in accordance with the welfare state's egalitarian ideals. Colin Wilson (1992, p. 12) described the suburban building projects of Finland as 'a happy moment in history, the self-awareness of a growing nation somehow became encoded and embodied in

⁹¹ 'Rakennettiin uusi kaupunki neitseelliseen maastoon, jonka suurimmalta osalta peitti jykevää suomalainen metsä, oikea metsän kuninkaan Tapion valtakunta.'

⁹² English title *Areal Planning*

architecture.’ Building the suburbs became an act of defining the welfare nation. The carefully designed aesthetic was to become a visual representation of the new policies, a new time. In a quest to hastily provide essential housing for the newly urban population, Finnish architecture drifted towards increasingly large mass-produced housing blocks where the need to reduce construction costs overshadowed design (Nikula 1993, p. 146). The scale of development and design were super sized. This process, which *Yksityisalue* touched upon from the architect’s point of view, becomes a reoccurring theme in Finnish films that portray the suburb.

The job of designing the Tapiola town plan, housing and public buildings was given to architects selected through an open architectural competition. The group of architects chosen shared a functionalist aesthetic in their design and an interest in the possibilities of concrete as a building material. Along with Aarne Ervi, this group included Aulis Blomstedt, Viljo Revell and Aarno Ruusuvuori. When architectural historian Scott Poole (1992) writes about the architects trusted with designing Tapiola, a sense of austerity and functionalism comes across from his language. Poole (1992, p. 12) writes how the work of architect Aulis Blomstedt is ‘aimed at purifying architecture through intellectual consideration’ and ‘asceticism, simplicity, and silence were essential to his idea of architectural form’. Of Aarno Ruusuvuori, who designed the Tapiola church and parish centre in 1965, Poole (1992, p. 31) writes:

‘His architecture at that time and to this day remains uncompromising and devoid of sentimentality. There is no narrative, no longing for another idyllic time, and no representational content. The hard edge of strict geometric forms creates a distinct boundary between his architecture and the natural aspect of things - a distance between civilization and the forest.’

It was modern design for modern policy. The boundary between nature and architecture was maintained in Tapiola, as most of the forest remained in its natural state, only interrupted by the brilliant white geometric block housing rising in stark contrast amongst the trees. The hub of services and commerce, Tapiola Centre boasted a water feature, tower and shopping plaza. These features, designed by Aarne Ervi, gave the Tapiola a centre, and a recognisable individual style. It gave the area its character.

The carefully designed and crafted identity of Tapiola was not only for the Finns inhabiting it. Postcards were made of the area highlighting the beauty of its

architecture. One such card from the 1960s shows a compilation of five images that portray the buildings of Tapiola bathing in sunshine, surrounded by impeccably kept lawns and tall trees. The focus is drawn to the well-planned beauty of the buildings; there are no people in the images. Tapiola became a staple of state visits showcasing Finnish design and architecture, as Itkonen writes (1985, p. 340). Foreign officials were driven around in a fleet of black cars and introduced to Finnish government funded housing, regular people living in Tapiola and of course the communal sauna. The garden city became a calling card for a new Finnish way of life. The vision for the area had travelled through policy makers, to the blueprints of the architect and hands of builders into a real place, with its own name, identity and finally inhabitants. By choosing Tapiola as the setting of a film, though fictitious, Pakkasvirta is taking on the history of the area and the ideological burden attached to it. But rather than be weighed down by the infamy and recognisability of the area, *Vihreä Leski* uses it to its advantage.

3. THE CINEMATIC TAPIOLA

3.1 Introducing Tapiola

‘Set in the Helsinki suburb of Tapiola - much vaunted as a social and architectural success (described recently in the Times as “arguably one of the loveliest and most idealistic new towns built”) but in fact highly destructive of personal and social life - the film is an intense study of a woman’s attempts to escape the suffering and frustration of confinement.’

(John Hillier, 1972, p. 3)

Hillier’s (1972) description captures just how greatly Pakkasvirta’s cinematic Tapiola differs from this architectural ideal. Pakkasvirta however does not reject or ignore Tapiola’s prestige, but uses it to draw the line between the official image of the area and the personal narratives within it. *Vihreä leski* begins with the camera panning through lush natural woods to reveal the edge of a shiny Chevrolet parked in front of Aarne Ervi’s water feature complete with fountains. The pan moves higher to observe the buzzing suburban landscape of Tapiola accompanied by a soundtrack of melodic violins and piano. A series of slow pans drift across houses, motorways and children playing on a sunny summer day. Crowds of people pass through the screen, along them a blond woman with two children. The scenic portraits of the Tapiola landscape and inhabitants end with a young woman speaking into a microphone held by an out of

shot interviewer. 'Thank you, I do enjoy living here. It is so nice walking around here, a good place to live. With a husband and a child, what more is there to want?'⁹³ The style in which *Vihreä leski* introduces Tapiola echoes the documentary style of public information films, such as *Builders at work (Rakentajia työssään)* (1953) or *New Housing Areas (Uusia asuntoalueita)* (1957) that originally introduced the Finnish public to the same suburban areas. It also captures the beauty of the landscape in a similar way to *Yksityisalue* with its shots of the landmark water feature. The official vision of Tapiola shines through the shots of architecture and is repeated in the statement of the interviewee. The interviewer remains anonymous and out of frame, only present via the visible microphone. The film takes on the voice of a documentary. The camera then singles out the previous blond woman with her two children from the crowd and follows her into the fictive narrative of the film. The camera drifts away from the carefully framed postcard-like shots of Tapiola as it gradually moves closer to the woman, Helinä. The documentary style of the interview is left behind and the camera becomes an invisible observer. The woman interviewed does not reappear. She is not a part of the fictitious world of the film, but is left behind on the facade of the suburb occupying the postcard-like image of Tapiola, rather than the multifaceted and problematic Tapiola Helinä resides in.

Pakkasvirta introduces Tapiola as a stylised show home for the welfare state, but then steers the viewer towards the darker side of life in the area. Helinä bridges these two worlds of Tapiola, the one printed on postcards and shown to foreign officials, and her own personal experience of life in the suburb. She leads the viewer away from the familiar landmarks of Tapiola Centre, through a shadowy forest to her flat in a multi-storey concrete house. 'Director Jaakko Pakkasvirta chose Espoo's light and prestigious Tapiola as the setting. However in this film it appears as canyons between rootless people'⁹⁴ commented Pekka Eronen (2007) on this distinction between the official image of Tapiola and *Vihreä Leski's* cinematic reimagining. On the accompanying soundtrack a man sings, 'people live in their houses, like beetles'.⁹⁵ The documentary style and familiar polished imagery of Tapiola give way to one individual's story set in their personal experience of that space.

⁹³ 'Kiitos, kyllä minä viihdyn oikein hyvin täällä. Täällä on niin hauska kävellä ja on hyvä asuinpaikka. Mies ja lapsi, niin mitä muuta kaipaa?'

⁹⁴ 'Ohjaaja Jaakko Pakkasvirta valitsi tapahtumapaikaksi Espoon valkean ja ihailun Tapiolan. Tässä elokuvassa se kuitenkin näyttäytyy juurettomia ihmisiä ympäröivinä kanjoneina.'

⁹⁵ 'Ihmiset asuvat kodeissaan kuin koppakuoriaiset'

3.2 Bleeding realities

‘It was a marvellous idea to start the film with an interview and have a young woman say : “Of course I am happy, I have everything I want, a man... a child...” And then it was wonderful to see how this idyll is torn apart piece by piece and along with it our own completely blinded notions of absolute values.’⁹⁶
Shirley Clarke (1968)

Vihreä leski plays with levels of reality and versions of truth. The tension between the documentary and fiction established in the beginning of the film continues throughout allowing for characters to penetrate the divide. The film covers several other instances that challenge the time/space continuum of the narrative. When we are watching TV with Helinä and her children, flickering images of cowboys fill our screen as well, complete with the rounded edges of the television set. We move from observing her to watching the television show on a shared static screen. This shift in perspective is made clear by decreased image quality and the screen within a screen effect. At times the narrative voice of a market researcher overlaps with fiction. When Helinä dreams of her own murder the style of storytelling is the same as her reality. What is true, what is fantasy and what is documentary meld into one another. Layers of fiction are built upon one another. The authoritative voice of the market researcher studying suburban housewives leaves his sheltered and privileged control room to narrate in Helinä’s living room. The divides between reality, fiction, fantasy and documentary are brought together and allowed to bleed into each other. To further add to the blend of reality and fiction, cinema and surveillance, Pakkasvirta borrows themes, such as the man spying on women in the woods and the housewives’ alcohol abuse, from real life news headlines from the suburbs of the time (von Bagh 1968, p.29).

This blending of documentary, surveillance and fantasy creates a Tapiola where reality becomes elusive. The official Tapiola as a crowning glory of Finnish housing and architecture is lost in Pakkasvirta’s *Vihreä leski*. The much lauded forests and healthy green spaces become dark threatening domains of peeping toms and illicit affairs. Pakkasvirta shows an alienating, threatening Tapiola of bare landscapes. Rather than play with her children at the communal playground, the mother walks her children to play at the side of a muddy barren logging area. The setting of *Vihreä leski* is easily

⁹⁶ ‘Oli suurenmoinen idea alkaa filmi haastattelulla ja antaa nuoren naisen todeta : “Tietysti olen onnellinen, minulla on kaikki mitä haluan, mies... lapsi...” “ Ja sitten oli suurenmoista nähdä miten tämä idylli kohta kohdalta tuhottiin, ja sen mukana meidän omat täysin sokaistuneet käsityksemme ehdottomista arvoista.’

recognisable as the real Tapiola, but the way it is recreated on screen tells a very different story to the official take on the area. The wide paths become alienating, lush forests threatening and the new suburban lifestyle lonely. The film unveils the everyday life of the environment drawing a divide between the planned and the experience of lived space. The cinematic exposes the unpredictable human interaction with the spaces of Tapiola. As Hurme (1968, p. 4) notes of Pakkasvirta's dual portrayal: 'Tapiola is presented very strongly in both good and bad.'⁹⁷ *Vihreä Leski* creates a suburb in which the official image of Tapiola promoted in architectural posters exists simultaneously to Helinä's experience of it. The planned and lived spaces occupy the same buildings and streets, but project vastly different versions of the suburb.

Michel de Certeau (2011) writes in his essay *Walking in the City* in the book *The Practice of Everyday Life* about the misappropriation of language through speech and likens it to redefining planned spaces through the act of walking. Describing looking down at a city grid de Certeau (2011, p. 93) argues 'the panorama-city is a "theoretical" simulacrum, in short a picture, whose condition of possibility is an oblivion and a misunderstanding of practices.' He goes on to describe how the act of walking recreates and redefines the parameters of the urban space, drawing a personal and intimate map of paths and observations. This shift in perspective exemplifies the division of the planned and lived spaces. This is where the cinematic can offer insight into the experience of the lived space. Whilst policy documents develop the plans for a new welfare state and architectural blueprints draw out the stage for this change, cinema gives us a tool to explore these spaces through the human interaction experienced within them. It brings the human in to the equation, both through characters on screen and director behind it. As de Certeau's urban wanderer the camera reappropriates its surroundings as moving through the landscape; the camera also weaves amongst the buildings developing its own interpretation of the space. The difference between the planned environment and the cinematic landscape Pakkasvirta creates in *Vihreä leski* teases out parallel readings of Finnish suburbs. The vantage point ranges between those of the architect or town planner, to that of the inhabitant and director. The carefully curated planned spaces become misappropriated on screen. This is also what sets *Vihreä Leski* apart from *Yksityisalue*; the film gives the perspective to the person inhabiting the suburban space and makes visible their experience of it.

⁹⁷ 'Tapiola esittäytyy varsin tehokkaasti niin myönteisessä kuin kielteisessäkin mielessä.'

4. LIVING UNDER WATCHFUL EYES

4.1 Trolls in the garden city

As the film reimagines Tapiola from the perspective of Helinä the lush forests of the garden city are transformed into oppressive places with lurking predators. The parks and forests in *Vihreä leski* are not quite the areas for sports and play that head of Asuntosäätiö Heikki von Hertzen (1985) envisioned them as. Pakkasvirta's forest is the dark underbelly of Tapiola, a space of threat and losing control. Beyond the ordered rows of pristine white houses is a shadowy place outside the realms of social control. It is where adulterers go, and among them Helinä. It is also where a young man lurks between the trees and follows Helinä's every move. The world outside of the apartment door is one full of threats and a constantly present gaze of the peeping tom. Though the threat and fear of the forest and of the dark may seem exaggerated and irrational Kortteinen (1982, p. 68), a sociologist studying Finnish suburbs, reports that in suburbs 'women really were afraid to walk outside after dark'.⁹⁸ One interviewee tells that 'a friend of mine comes home from work every night past ten in the dark. She said she's scared to walk outside... (pause)... So am I... In the beginning I always used the safety lock on the door when Martti wasn't home. I was too afraid to even take the laundry to the drying room alone' (Kortteinen 1982, p. 69).⁹⁹ The experience of the suburb as a space of threat and violence was clearly not only solely conjured up by Pakkasvirta's imagination. When the film was released Peter von Bagh (1968, p. 29) argued that the peeping tom was 'a part of the suburban everyday'¹⁰⁰ recalling two recent murderers who preyed on their victims in Finnish suburban forests. It also makes Pakkasvirta's cinematic Tapiola uncomfortably close to the real life suburb as the fictitious world overlaps with real events. The sense of threat and surveillance is one that carries out through the film and offers points of contact with the history of the real Tapiola. Jaakko Hurme (1968, p. 4) drew parallels between the peeping tom and the husband, referring to the husband watching bathing women with binoculars. Contrastingly Tarmo Malmberg (1968) described the constant presence of the peeping tom in *Vihreä leski's* forest as a kind of fairytale troll, 'an evil ruler of the forest, a reminder of primeval force'.¹⁰¹ In associating the peeping tom with a troll the film plays with branded image of

⁹⁸ 'naisväki todella pelkäsi kävellä ulkona pimeän jälkeen'

⁹⁹ 'Yks mun kaveri tulee joka ilta kymmenen jälkeen iltatöistä pimeellä kotiin. Se sano et sitä ainakin pelottaa kävellä tuola ulkona... (tauko)... Ni muakin... Alussa mul oli ovi aina takalukossa ku Martti oli poissa. Mä en uskaltanu edes viedä yksin pyykkejä kuivumaan pesuhuoneeseen...'

¹⁰⁰ '60-luvun lähiöarkea'

¹⁰¹ 'metsän paha haltija, muistutus alkulähteistä'

Tapiola, renamed as the realm of the mythical ruler of the forest in Finnish folk tales. Again the glossy image of the garden city is intersected with underlying narratives of place and space.

Camilla Asplund Ingemark (2004, p. 87) writes how in traditional Finnish folktales 'the forest was a part of the human world, and man had to use its resources in daily life, but it was viewed as belonging to the otherworld whose inhabitants also made use of these resources.' It was territory where the natural and mythical worlds existed side by side, where the inhabitants of both worlds met. Even though the dark figure of the peeping tom is a constant presence in the forest of *Vihreä leski*, he does not leave this realm, never venturing out to the shopping centre or swimming pool to spy on Helinä. Like the trolls in traditional folktales his domain is limited to the forest, which functions as a transitional space between the supranatural and the human, or in the case of *Vihreä leski*, the deviant and the ordinary. The Lehmusto high-rise is not connected via paths or walkways to the rest of the Tapiola landscape, but Helinä has to cross through the peeping tom's territory to get to her home. The husband drives home and parks his car next to the house, but Helinä and the children need to cross this liminal space to get to their home.

In shots where Helinä is walking home, she always walks through a forest, a thicket of shrubs. She guides her family to their modern building through a scrappy clutter of trees even without a path. Behind is a patchwork of dark windows of the high-rise that fill the screen. The camera does not draw attention to the textures or details of what could be a beautiful natural forest. The dark branches and tree trunks crisscrossing the frame look like an obstacle course the family must struggle through to get to safety. No longer strolling on the wide straight asphalt walkways of central Tapiola, she has to move through the branches and weave between trees. She is a guest in this disorderly space. As Helinä's extramarital affair develops the presence of the peeping tom intensifies. He turns from harmless loiterer to stalker praying on her in the darkness of the night. Tapio, the ruler of the forest, is transformed into a troll. By creating the forest as a dark realm of the peeping tom or fairytale troll, Pakkasvirta transforms the suburb by borrowing from fairytales while referring to the rebranded vision of the garden city.

The richness provided by fairytales is taken even further when the peeping tom is revealed to be a sexual predator. Camilla Asplund Ingemark (2004) writes about folktales from Uusimaa, where Tapiola is located, recounting stories of conflicts arising from trolls abducting women and the often harmful sexual relations between the human

and supernatural. This tension and threat was especially prevalent for young unmarried women, particularly those behaving in violation of societal norms. 'Abduction is a recurrent objective, occasionally preceded by the violation of a prohibition which surrenders the woman into the troll's power' Ingemark (2004, p. 89) writes. A young woman breaking social norms gets taken by a troll. It is in fact after Helinä tells the interviewer about her sexual encounter in nature with her husband that the peeping tom appears. He comes into her life only after she has divulged private information, allowed outside access to her secrets. Ingemark (2004) explains how men were granted a more active role in dealing with the otherworld being able to intentionally traverse the boundary between the human and supernatural world. Ingemark (2004, p. 135) also notes that 'women and children were perceived as more vulnerable and open to attack'. Helinä defies this tradition by breaking the boundary to the peeping tom, her troll, entering his space in the darkness of the night. She makes herself vulnerable to attack and subsequently repels the threat. As the facade of Helinä's life as a good housewife comes crumbling down, finally she walks into the woods and invites the darkness in. She imagines him murdering her, whilst he imagines her undressing. These fantasies are intercut and set in the same bed, blending together a disturbing meeting of violence and desire. Ingemark (2004, p. 122) recounts stories of troll and human relations were disapproved of as 'sexual mixing of the two realms'. These dangerous liaisons carried a threat of violence and opened the human world up to the darkness of the trolls. The peeping tom functions as a reminder of this otherness that continues to exist along Helinä's modern everyday life. 'A reminder of primeval force' as Malmberg (1968) called it. The fears, desires and otherness of Helinä lurk in the forests of her otherwise controlled life. Recreating myths on screen the film draws on an enduring theme in Finnish folklore and repositions it in a way which both plays with the historical continuity of the forest and makes it relevant for a contemporary audience.

Smith (2009) argues that myths have a crucial role in creating and maintaining national bonds within an ethnic group. They tie people to a shared history and tradition. Pakkasvirta's mythic reimagining of Tapio the forest god, or troll, into a peeping tom perpetuates a myth and makes reference to lost heritage. It places the modern architectural landscape within the continuum of Finnish myth and ties it to the importance of heritage and nature. Smith (2009, p. 25) claims that myths and symbols endow communities with a distinctive symbolic repertoire that helps differentiate 'us' from 'them' and gives a sense of continuity with past generations. At a time in Finnish history when people were leaving behind the homes of their ancestors, the ties to their

extended family and moving to the suburbs, Pakkasvirta's modern troll brings these myths alive in the forests of the garden city. The process of drawing on myths and the shared past to reimagine a future was precisely what the process of renaming the area as Tapiola did. It draws from a shared cultural and historical lexicon and recreates familiar themes within a modern context of a nation in flux.

Interestingly not all forests are sinister in *Vihreä leski*. A flashback to the forest of Helinä's rural hometown shows the sun shining, her naked on the grass with her husband, at ease and uninhibited in her environment. In this forest, she is the one holding the binoculars and observing her surroundings. It is only the suburban forests of Tapiola that are threatening and uncomfortable. Smith (2009, p. 87) writes about the expression of unique national landscapes in poetry and uses the *Kalevala* poem *Tapiola* as an example of 'the mystery and terror of Finland's forest landscape.' The poem, which recounts the dusky forest where the forest God Tapio resides, paints a picture of a magical and ancient landscape. Intriguingly Pakkasvirta chooses to perpetuate these myths of the Finnish landscape only in the suburban forest, whilst while the rural forest of Helinä's hometown is free from such trappings. The relationship with nature only becomes problematic when one leaves it behind for urban life.

4.2 Surveillance of the mundane

The theme of surveillance follows throughout the film. Helinä is being watched by a man in the woods, listened in on by a market researcher, and checked up on by her husband. In the forest the camera angles take the peeping tom's point of view peering up at lit windows from the darkness of the woods. The viewer joins the market researcher in his radio control room to listen in on women. Helinä's life in the suburb is constantly followed, watched and regulated. Paul Virilio (1997, p. 382) has written, citing examples beginning from the 1960s, about how control within cities and the dominance of screen imagery with which the 'opacity of building materials is reduced to zero' is leading to a 'revision of point of view and radical mutilation of our perception of the world'. Nezar AlSayaad (2006, p. 147) writes how in this mediated image of the city 'the screen and lens become new modes through which the city is experienced and policed.' AlSayaad (2006, 147) also argues that in the cinematic cities 'the transparency of the virtual city has been created primarily through a grid of surveillance systems that aim to exclude the dangers of urban life from the lives and spaces of the wealthy.' The grid of surveillance is ever present in the structure of Pakkasvirta's Tapiola, but who is the threat in *Vihreä leski*? These systems of looking are not to ward

off evil or to protect the wealthy citizens, but to keep an eye out on the regular. The mundane becomes the object of surveillance. The static camera pans along from a distance following Helinä walking on the street carrying her groceries. The market researcher asks if the children went to bed without a fight. The information gathered in the market research interviews focuses on the inconsequential. The surveys do not serve any clear purpose aside from observing and monitoring the lives of the suburban housewives. Even when the peeping tom is not shown, the camera hides amongst trees and pans along watching Helinä cycle past from a static point of view. The viewer becomes a part of the structure of surveillance. The structure is not protecting her, but rather keeping a watchful eye out for any possible misbehaviour.

One sequence which combines the control of the radio interview with themes of domestic control is Helinä's interview over the radio to the market researcher. She sits on her bed and when she begins to reveal confidential details of her marriage, the camera pans to the picture of her husband on the dresser. His picture is not a reminder of shared happy moments, but an official portrait. His expression is stern and without a trace of smile. He watches her confess her intimate desires clutching to the radio as to a lifeline of contact outside the suburb. Her crouched figure becomes blurred and obstructed behind her husband and bric-a-brac on the dressing table. Helinä's face melds with that of a children's dog figurine. She becomes a part of the composition of domesticity, figures laid out to create a homely feel to the room. Staying in a blurred mirror reality, her husband stares at her, the camera and us the viewer, from his frame. The side of him that exists in Helinä's mirror world is the flip-side to his official portrait, a black hole, negative space occupying her world. There is an uneasiness to listening to her passionate confessions of desire and loss of control whilst being watched by her husband's unflinching eye.

The effect of the viewer as a part of this structure of surveillance is highlighted when we gain access to spaces that Helinä is left outside of. The viewer is privy to the delicate inner workings of the market researcher's radio control room, pulsating dials, flashing light bulbs and whirling aerials. Pakkasvirta creates a fictitious big brother watching over the suburbs. We see close-ups of technical minutia and a wall covered with a map detailing the movements of the housewives. As the viewer is allowed into this clandestine space, or to share the peeping tom's view from behind a tree, we become the voyeur. The interviewer's voiceover explains how the radio was the most

suitable instrument for conducting the questioning, as 'there was something unbiased about the radio'.¹⁰² This desire for unbiased research is in contrast to the dimly lit shed-like locale of the research centre. He is always alone, with no co-workers in sight, hunched over various pieces of technical kit. The workspace looks less like a modern marketing company and more like an underground intelligence agency. Pins on the map signify the various housewives being monitored. We are made aware of, and a part of, the structure of surveillance that looms over Helinä. AlSayaad (2006, p. 148) writes how in modern cinema 'in an age in which direct views have been replaced by screen views, the figure of the *flâneur* is reborn and magnified as the voyeur.' This urban wanderer is replaced by the watcher. 'The voyeur behind the screen or camera lens, like the *flâneur*, adopts the gaze as a means of knowing. However, the voyeur differs from the *flâneur* in his invisibility. He no longer occupies the spaces he observes, but remains physically remote, a 'Peeping Tom' behind the cloak of his technological devices.' AlSayaad (2006, p. 148) argues. This way the researcher shares the role of the voyeur in the forest, both exerting power over their subject.

The importance of Helinä knowing she is watched is that she alters her behaviour accordingly. She is not spied on, but actively watched. Her everyday becomes a performance for those watching and listening in on her life. When the camera watches her perform menial everyday tasks we are watching her to see if she is behaving as she should, not as something special has occurred. The market researcher, her husband, the peeping tom, Pakkasvirta's camera and the viewer by extension examine her performing her duties as a wife, mother and citizen. They look at her not to see her break the rules, but so that she doesn't. We are given privileged access to spaces exerting control, to hidden gazes that follow her. When Helinä first meets the peeping tom, she grabs her child and flees the situation. The camera stays with the man. We see her running away and cut back to a mid-shot of his face. We experience her thorough his eyes. We hear the radio signal that monitors her everyday. When the web of surveillance tightens around Helinä and she is distressed the background sound of her radio signal becomes overwhelming, filling the space with its relentless beeping. We hear her distress pulsating through the radio.

The web of social control and surveillance that is multilayered in Helinä's life echoes the social planning of the suburb itself and the carefully monitored process of ensuring

¹⁰² 'radiossa oli jotain puolueetonta'

a cross-section of society. The personal surveillance Helinä is experiencing can be seen as symptomatic of the paranoia brought on by the increasing state control.

4.3 Control and the state

Eero Tuomikoski (1968) claimed that the sensation of being watched and monitored in *Vihreä leski* echoes wider sentiments of Finnish society at the time 'We live a fear-filled life. The structures of society are above us.'¹⁰³ Tuomikoski (1968) refers to the structures of the welfare state, the growing force of consumerism and urbanisation that were influencing the everyday lives of Finns. The structures of surveillance in *Vihreä leski* range from the erotic male gaze of the peeping tom to the prying questions of the research specialist. They keep a watchful eye over Helinä and her attempt at holding up a facade of happy family life. The market researcher's voice narrates a sociological study of the housewife's family dynamics and role in society. The structure of surveillance the viewer is complicit in becomes a structure of society looking in on its inhabitants.

Helinä's position under constant surveillance works like Jeremy Bentham's panopticon, first proposed in the late eighteenth century as a model for a prison, where as AlSayaad (2006, p. 148) puts it: 'surveillance would be constantly present, exposing the object of discipline to constant view.' The design of the building would allow for constant surveillance that would then alter the behaviour of those imprisoned. Foucault (2002, p. 58) expanded upon this in his essay *Truth and Juridical Form* describing it as 'a form of architecture that makes possible a mind-over-mind type power' and 'the utopia of society and a type of power that is basically the society we are familiar with at present, a utopia that was actually realized.' To Foucault (2002, p. 59) the beauty of the panopticon was that 'a knowledge that now was no longer about determining whether or not something had occurred; rather, it was about whether an individual was behaving as he should, in accordance with a rule or not, and whether he was progressing or not.' AlSayaad (2006, p. 147) writes of a panopticon where 'surveillance would be constantly present, exposing the object of discipline to constant view.' This position of power, knowledge and technology are intertwined in *Vihreä leski*. As AlSayaad (2006, p. 148) writes of the observer 'although the city is exposed to him, he gains power by retreating into the panopticon's opaque centre.' The market researcher sits in the control room of his panopticon monitoring the inhabitants of Tapiola. The

¹⁰³ 'Elämme pelonsekaista elämää. Yhteiskunnan rakenteet ovat yläpuolellamme.'

themes of monitoring and social control expressed in *Vihreä Leski* correspond to structures of that were in part present in real life Tapiola.

Heikki von Hertzen (1985) shows comprehensive records, which detail Tapiola's inhabitants of the late 1960s naming their flat number, occupation, monthly income, how many rooms they have and square meters of the flat. Von Hertzen (1985, p. 290) recounts the careful process of allocating the new homes of Tapiola according to professional group, as 'about 15% of the homes being built were to be given to people, who possessed the crucial skills and were able to provide technical and other care and services that the new, emerging society needed'.¹⁰⁴ Besides ensuring a professional population to provide Tapiola with necessary skills, the listings functioned as a checklist for social diversity that Tapiola strove for. 20 lawyers, 26 engineers, 3 doctors, 9 nurses, 9 construction men, 2 teachers, 2 metal workers, 47 office workers, 3 cobblers and so on, as von Hertzen (1985, p. 290) lists. Tapiola was designed as a *läpileikkausyhdykskunta* or a cross section of society, where all groups of society were equally represented in the inhabitants. This meant that 78% of the plot was given to government housing. Von Hertzen (1985, p. 289) recalls the 1966 municipal elections a triumphant sign of diversity as non-socialist parties won 57,4% and socialist parties 42.6% of the votes in Tapiola. The result was seen to suggest the success of Tapiola's social planning.

Tapiola was very much as government orchestrated social experiment in egalitarianism, an experiment measured and monitored with great detail. A social experiment in which Helinä fills the statistics for the role of housewife, two bedrooms, amount of square meters, married, husband engineer, household monthly income in marks. The theme of state interventionism is one that comes up in regard to the building of the welfare state. As Henrik Stenius (1997, p. 171) has put it, in the welfare state 'all the doors are open- to the living room, the kitchen, the larder, the nursery, not to mention the bedroom- and they are not just open: society marches in and intervenes, sometimes brusquely.' The layout of each home in Tapiola was to be approved by an expert in home economics to ensure its efficiency (von Hertzen 1985, p. 60) recalls. The welfare state was reshaping Finnish life and architecture of the home was one stage for this process. The new state policies in Finland functioned as tools for gender equality reshaping family life and gender dynamics. As high

¹⁰⁴ 'noin 15% valmistuvista asunnoista päätettiin jakaa sellaisille henkilöille, joita tarvittiin välttämättä uudessa, syntymässä olevassa yhdyskunnassa sen teknisen tai muun huollon sekä palvelujen järjestämiseksi.'

employment was required to pay for the costs of the welfare state, women were encouraged to enter the workforce, as Hilson (2008) writes. Traditional roles within the family were challenged as women started taking a more active role outside of the domestic sphere. Mary Hilson (2008, p. 90) characterises the welfare state as one where 'welfare benefits were provided mostly by the public sector, leaving little room for the private sector, for philanthropic or voluntary provision, or for the family.' The welfare state was taking an increasingly active role in determining how people should live; designing the optimal layouts for the home, taking over child-care duties and care for the elderly. What better place to play out the anxiety and trepidation that came with the increased state interventionism as the model home for the welfare state?

5. THE GENDERED SUBURB

5.1 Lonely together

In addition to performing the role of a good suburban citizen for the various surveyors Helinä also plays the role of a good wife. *Vihreä Leski* draws attention to suburb as a space in which gender roles are played out, often reluctantly. Helinä is a housewife, with no interests of her own beyond minding the children and doing domestic chores. Her exercise class is less of an enjoyment and more of a tool to ward off the fear of 'getting fat'. The shots in the Tapiola swimming pool are brightly lit, sun streaming through the large windows. The women perform their choreographed exercises in perfect unison, the camera capturing their bodies in movement. They are a group, but do not interact with one another. Once finished with their class they jump into the pool and the camera moves underwater. The camera stays still without cutting, simply watching the parade of female bodies swim past. Their heads bobbing above the surface makes them look like decapitated bodies drifting past the camera, the camera angle creating a guilty voyeuristic pleasure of assessing women's figures in their swimsuits. The instructor lists the 'slack' muscles they will be working next and Helinä sighs to her friend how she is getting fat. The classes are not for social interaction, but a piece in the puzzle of maintaining the perfect image of being a housewife. When her husband goes bowling with his friends they move around the alley freely, talking and joking as they play. For them the sport is for relaxation and socialisation.

The suburban home is treated as a gilded cage of loneliness in which Helinä is trapped. Fawell (2001, p.) writes about urban loneliness in Hitchcock's *Rear Window*: 'in overview shots that show all the neighbours in their apartments, windows divide

them from one another, and their simultaneous proximity and isolation accentuates the feeling of loneliness.' *Vihreä leski* creates a similar effect with single static shots of people on their balconies, always alone. Smoking or cleaning within earshot of each other, but without acknowledging each other's presence. Now physically closer than ever to other people, yet overcome by crippling isolation and loneliness. Helinä stares out of her kitchen window whilst secretly snacking on cold cuts and ignoring the male voice of the radio calling her to respond. She is wedged between dark panels, barely seeing out of the window. The black boards around the window place her within a frame, confined. In the background only wall and ceiling create an effect of a high window, Helinä struggling to reach to peek outside of her domestic sphere. We do not see what her view looks like, again the viewer is outside, watching in. Her pained expression and hands clutching onto the windowsill make it seem as she were drowning struggling for air. The reflection of the trees overlaps with her face drawing a kind of halo of darkness around her, smearing the white walls of her kitchen. Even in the private sphere of her own home the sense of entrapment and loneliness linger.

5.2 The female *flâneur*

Despite Helinä being the protagonist of the film we do not experience the suburb from her perspective. As she walks through the suburbs, we follow the peeping tom's point of view or a static camera observing her from a distance. Her experience of her surroundings is stunted. Elizabeth Wilson (1995) writes about the female *flâneur*. As noted by AlSayyad (2006p. 148) 'the perspective of the *flâneur* is normally thought to be exclusively male.' Wilson (1995, p. 68) discusses the role of the female *flâneur* and argues that 'despite the public presence of women in the city as journalists, prostitutes and shoppers and the new openness of urban spaces, women still do not share the same experience of the city'. Wilson (1995) argues that their role in the city is restrained to the domestic sphere and their activities remain commodified by their roles both as consumers and consumed. This rings true of Helinä's interactions with her surroundings. Her experience of Tapiola is limited to the shops and visits to the hair salon. She enters the public sphere through consumerism, in the role of a mother and housewife. She buys things, allowing her to enter the consumer space or work to improve her appearance, but her options are very limited. In the children's clothing shop the camera shows successive shots of products for sale. The voiceover follows the women discussing coats for the youngest son while the camera observes the stacks of clothes. The children looking at the piles of identical products, identical dolls hanging from the ceiling, overwhelmed by the amount of goods available.

Furthermore Helinä's experience of the suburb is drastically limited by the fact it is a pedestrian experience; she does not drive. In the first minutes of the film Tapiola is shown as an isolated community, an island connected by highways. Helinä does not drive, so is stuck in a gilded cage waiting for her husband to come home with the car. Whenever outside the suburb Helinä is ushered around by an irate husband. Borden (2012, p. 46) writes about the multifaceted forms and meanings of driving in films and notes that 'it is very much in normal people's quotidian lives that the city car operates, offering us not only a means of transport but also an important psychological and ideational sense of emancipation, pride, independence, autonomy and self-expression.' In contrast to this Helinä's lack of transport severely restricts all these aspects of her life. Her independent scope of the world is only within walking distance of her home. All other interactions with the outside world are mediated through her husband and reliant on his agreement to participate. Suburbs were built on the assumption that inhabitants would have access to cars (Salokorpi 1970, p. 46), but despite having a car in her household Helinä's everyday reality is still very limited. Here again Pakkasvirta shows how the planned vision of the suburb is not met by the experience of everyday life and use of space. Helinä is unable to use the space in the way the town planners had envisioned and her personal autonomy is severely restricted due to this. She relies on her husband to go see her mother, confiding in the interviewer that it has been over two years since their last visit. Finally returning to her rural home during a holiday she visits her father's grave, a place of memory and significance, whilst her husband pesters them to leave. He is eager to drop her back off to Tapiola and leave to pursue his own interests, including his mistress. Helinä has left behind her rural life and extended family for her life in the suburbs with her husband. She is now unable to go back to these without his consent. Visiting central Helsinki to pick up a radio the husband leaves the kids and wife to wait in the car allowing them to view the capital only through car windows. After their trip Helinä and the children are left standing in the car park watching their father drive away. Standing in a row next to a parked car they seem like objects left to wait until their owner returns and finds use for them again.

5.3 The gendered home

Pakkasvirta plays with these sentiments of loneliness, abandonment and gender division in his framing of the domestic sphere. The houseplants, soft lighting, paintings on the wall and children playing quietly combine elements of family life to form an idyllic setting of domestic life. The home is decorated with personal touches, with plenty of

textures to add softness to the modern furniture. In this harmonious scene the father sitting with his head buried in his hands looks misplaced. In fact he is misplaced, a visitor in his own home unused to his own children. In another shot the camera looks through the doorway into the bedroom. Helinä sits on the edge of the bed and watches her sleeping husband. The marital bed is literally divided, creating a strip of white between the headboards, a visual gulf between the couple. Despite the modern, clean and homely interiors the way their bodies move in this space and around each other makes it awkward. They are lonely and apart even when sharing the same bed.

The frustrations and apparent gender disparity was also noted in the press debate that followed from the films release. Anneli Koistinen (1974) claimed that the new suburbs provided women living in them with limited opportunities. Koistinen (1974) argues that 'housewives living in these surroundings feel like they have entered a mental offside' and 'women felt frustrated by this loneliness and lack of activity- they felt they were prisoners of the green spaces- Green Widows.'¹⁰⁵ Eero Tuomikoski (1968) had similar views when writing on Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä leski*, 'The man has a car, the woman has a kitchen and children. The gender division is apparent.'¹⁰⁶ The gender division was also noted by Tuomo-Juhani Vuorenmaa (1968) who argued that 'the tragedy of the woman in Green Widow is not only to be blamed on the soulless suburb, but also gender inequality: a man who has a lover is a great hero, whilst a woman who has an affair has no morals.'¹⁰⁷ Tuomikoski (1968) takes this further by claiming that the milieu of Tapiola itself is the result of a patriarchal thinking that directs people's actions guiding the women into the domestic sphere, children outside and men into the business life. Tuomikoski (1968) saw the design of suburbs like Tapiola as a direct result of this type of ideological bias. For him, the apparent inequality between Helinä and her husband is stemming from the suburban surroundings. Roivainen (1999, p. 116) considers that the strong public reaction to *Vihreä leski* is due the way the film challenges suburban gender roles. Roivainen (1999, p. 166) claims the film 'reflected the gendered nature of the suburb of its time' when 'the middle class wife institution was very much in place in suburbs that carried the garden city ideological heritage.'¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ 'Näissä ympyröissä elävät kotirouvat tunsivat joutuneensa jonkinlaiseen henkiseen paitsioon. Naiset tunsivat turhautuvansa tästä yksinäisyydestä ja tapahtumaköyhyydestä- he tunsivat itsensä viheriöiden orjiksi- vihreiksi leskiksi.'

¹⁰⁶ 'Miehellä on auto, naisella keittiö ja lapset. Kuvan huikea roolijakoisuus on ilmeinen.'

¹⁰⁷ 'Vihreässä leskessä kuvatun naisen tragediaan ei kuitenkaan ole yksin syynä asumalähiön hengettömyys, vaan myös sukupuolten tasa-arvottomuus: mies joka pitää rakastajattaria on suuri sankari, nainen joka tekee syrjähyppyn on sen sijaan moraaliton.'

¹⁰⁸ 'peilaa aikansa lähiön sukupuolitettua luonnetta.' 'Keskiluokan rouvainstituutio oli yhä voimissaan puutarhakaupungin aateperintöä kantavissa asumalähiöissä.'

Women had not fully joined the work force yet and their role was to tend to the children and home in a safe environment 'away from the dangers - and opportunities- of the city.'¹⁰⁹ (Roivainen 1999, p. 116). Despite the press focusing on the suburban milieu of the film, for Roivainen (1999, p. 116) herein lies the real controversy of *Vihreä leski*, 'In the Green Widow film the woman detached herself from her role - and this is the scandal'.¹¹⁰ Pakkasvirta makes visible the limitations and restrictions of gender roles within the suburban space, and how despite best planning efforts the suburban home is not always a happy one.

6. FRONTIERS OF THE SPACE AGE

6.1 The space race

Vihreä leski is very much a portrait of its time as it draws a parallel between the technological advances of the suburban building process with the optimism of the space age. The film is littered throughout with references to space and the Moon. Helinä investigates the topography of a globe with her child, except it is not the surface of the Earth her fingers are running along, but the Moon. The globe is a grey moonscape showing extraterrestrial hills and valleys. Helinä's youngest son, Sampo, named after the magical artifact of Kalevala that brings wealth and prosperity to its owner, plays with the moon globe. He runs his fingers along the surface while trying to speak into a broken toy phone. The child tries to reattach the broken handset to the unconnected cord. The disconnected children's toy phone echoes the mother's radio transmitter technology. The child is calling the moon, while the mother is calling the world outside the suburb.

The closing shot of the film pans the camera away from Helinä's dysfunctional home and towards the sky whilst playing a song of moon travel. In 1968 when *Vihreä leski* was released, one year before the first manned moon landing, the space race between the United States and the Soviet Union was reaching its highest point. There was a quest for new frontiers, optimism about exploring the capabilities of technological advancement to find undiscovered worlds. The idea of blazing new frontiers in the name of development and modernity rings true to the experimental nature of Tapiola itself. The penthouse restaurant in the central high-rise in Tapiola with overarching

¹⁰⁹ 'ympäristössä etäällä kaupungin vaaroista - ja mahdollisuuksista.'

¹¹⁰ 'Vihreä leski-elokuvassa nainen irtautui tästä kohtalostaan - se oli skandaali.'

views of the suburban landscape was called the *Ravintola Linnunrata*, or Restaurant Milky Way. In theme song of the film a man sings 'We leave the earth and sky. We go away, upward. We step into a space ship, hand in hand, in each others arms.'¹¹¹ The optimism of finding a better world in space becomes entangled with the almost futuristic modernity of the high-rises.

The same year in which *Vihreä leski* was released also saw the influence of the space race reach Finnish architecture in Matti Suuronen's Futuro-house. The elliptical house was built of fibreglass and complete with moulded access door that dropped down to reveal the front stairs; it resembled the UFO spaceships of sci-fi films. It was built as a summer or ski cottage and mass produced in Finland between 1968-78. According to Miika Tanila and Marko Home (2002) these houses represented the mood for the late 1960s and its economic boom and represented a utopian vision for the future. 'New York Times published an article about the Futuro - 'Saucer-Shaped House Arrives on Earth'- on July 20, 1969, the same day as *Apollo 11* landed on the moon' Home and Tanila (2002, p. 28) recall. Ranti Tjan (2002, p. 50) describes the 'air of innocence, of unsullied optimism' of the Futuro. Harri Hautajärvi (2002, p. 58) places the Futuro design in the larger trend of space age design as he describes how:

'From the 1950s to the 1970s, space mania was omnipresent in Western culture. This was the age of nuclear power, space travel and plastic: nothing was impossible. While the machine romantics of the 1920s and the 1930s drew inspiration from ships, aeroplanes, and automobile, architects now embraced space technology and ultramodern sci-fi visions. They began to design buildings shaped like flying saucers, carrier rockets, moon modules, satellites and space stations.'

Tapiola itself was a new product of this optimistic vision of the future and technology. It utilised cutting edge technology and design to create a modern environment. Tapiola was the first Finnish suburb to have *kaukolämpö* or district heating, as von Herten (1985, p. 68) writes. Its designs were drawn by top architects, it had the largest unified town plan ever made in Finland. As Standertskjöld (2011, p. 22) writes about the 1960s, 'the general enthusiasm for space, disseminated effectively through American TV-series, films and comics, was also visible in Finnish architecture. If in the 1930s the

¹¹¹ 'Jätämme maan ja taivaan. Lähdemme pois, ylöspäin. Astumme avaruuslaivaan, käsi kädessä sylissäin.'

ideal a well designed small apartment was based on the cabin of a ocean cruiser, in the 1960s the ideal was a completely controlled spaceship.¹¹² In many ways the suburb was a part of the modern frontier itself. For Pakkasvirta this position is a lonely one. As Pertti Lumirae (1968) wrote of the ending of *Vihreä leski*, 'All that Vihreä leski is left with is a cosmic emptiness, in the midst of which a night-time Tapiola rises silenced by its own desolateness.'¹¹³

6.2 The new frontier

In one way the barren surface of the moon, reaching to faraway places which hold a promise of bright modern futures is parallel to Helinä's own journey from the rural community to the suburb. She has left behind her rural roots to move to the height of architectural modernism and live the urban dream. As the ladies in the salon comment 'Madam can be happy about her rural roots',¹¹⁴ a statement that Tuomikoski (1968) claims 'contains unwitting irony for more than one person'.¹¹⁵ As rapid urbanisation drew people from the countryside to metropolitan Helsinki Helinä's situation was far from unique. S.H (1968, p. 50-51) describes Helinä as 'a somewhat withdrawn character - a first generation city dweller. She has spent her childhood in the countryside, in a community built on entirely different values than her husband.'¹¹⁶ The psychological effect of moving to the suburb and adjusting to a new lifestyle leaves her 'like a plant, violently uprooted and replanted into infertile soil, a greenhouse. Roots in the countryside and tradition, the greenhouse at the edge of the city, in the suburb.' (E.T 1968).¹¹⁷

As the narrative progresses Helinä disassociates herself and her children even further from their society. They move from the shops and walkways of the Tapiola centre to the woods and playgrounds surrounding their home and as the alienation grows finally to the peripheries of the area. They move to the barren plots waiting to be filled with identical white box houses. In distancing themselves from their community they sit at

¹¹² 'Yleinen avaruusinnostus, joka levisi tehokaasti amerikkalaisten tv-sarjojen, elokuvien ja sarjakuvien välityksellä, näkyi myös suomalaisessa arkkitehtuurissa. Jos 1930-luvulla hyvin suunnitellun pienasunnon ihanteena pidettiin valtamerilaivan hyttiä, 1960-luvulla ihanteena oli täydellisesti kontrolloitu avaruusalus.'

¹¹³ 'Vihreässä leskessä on jäljellä vain kosminen tyhjyys, jonka keskellä öinen Tapiola kohoaa omaan autiuteensa mykistyneenä.'

¹¹⁴ 'Rouva voi olla iloinen maalaisesta syntyperästään'

¹¹⁵ 'sisältää tahatonta ironiaa usemman kuin yhden ihmisen kohdalla.'

¹¹⁶ 'Rouva Lehmusto - luonteeltaan jossakin määrin sulkeutunut henkilö - on ensimmäisen polven kaupunkilaisia. Hän on viettänyt lapsuutensa maalla, kokonaan eri arvoille rakentuvassa yhteiskunnassa kuin miehensä.'

¹¹⁷ 'kuin juuriltaan kiskaistu kasvi, joka on uudelleen istutettu hedelmättömään maaperään, tai sanokaamme ansariin. Juuret ovat maalla ja perinteissä, ansari taas suuren kaupungin laidassa, lähiössä.'

the edge of the expanding welfare state, where centuries old forest has been cut down, but not yet filled with modern housing. Perched on logs, they are shown in mid-shots whilst Helinä tells a story of a mother who kills her son and feeds him to the boy's father. In the background the white houses create a wall, almost a barrier of civilisation outside of which Helinä has taken her family. Here there is no forest, no peeping tom, the landscape is in great contrast to the orderliness of the high-rises and the mature trees that rise amongst them. It is barren land waiting for the edge of civilisation and high-rises overtake it inch by inch. Then the camera turns around to a wide shot showing what is behind the family. A flat skyline without Tapiola's signature lush forest is only broken by two masts. Helinä and her children blend into the mud and thicket. They are at the edge of the periphery of Tapiola and the welfare state. The loneliness and withdrawal that comes through these shots is very different from the visions of Tapiola, and in fact the welfare state society. Pakkasvirta depicts a system that despite the material symbols of wealth is lacking in community and family relations.

Matti Pajula (1968, p. 46) writes that 'it is no coincidence that the setting of Green Widow is the dormitory suburb, that one of its scenes is in a grave yard, children are told fairytales sitting in a raped suburban landscape, that there is a peeping tom lurking behind the trees the architects have saved. All this goes together with what is happening to Finnish people: they are moving from the countryside through suburbs and into the city.'¹¹⁸ The suburban landscape is as hostile and inhospitable for Helinä as the moon surface on the globe in her home. The journey towards modern urban life has not been easy for her, as it was not easy for a great number of people. Whilst interviewing people living in suburbs Kortteinen (1982, p. 120) noticed that the suburban dwellers who had moved in from the countryside were nostalgic for their childhood homes despite the poorer living conditions and hard work rural life entailed. 'The melancholy is directed towards rural culture, so called peasant values, which were internalised when growing up in the countryside' (Kortteinen 1982, p. 120).¹¹⁹ The adjustment to the suburban setting was not only a change in physical surroundings, but social ones as well. The gulf between gender roles that Pakkasvirta captures in *Vihreä leski* was also a contributing factor to the unhappiness of those who migrated to the

¹¹⁸ 'Ei ole nimittäin sattumaa, että Vihreän lesken tapahtumat sijoittuvat nukkumakaupunkiin, että eräs sen kohtauksista tapahtuu hautausmaalla, että lapsille kerrotaan satuja raiskatussa lähiömaisemassa kököttäen, että tirkistelijä piileksii arkkitehtien säästämien puiden takana. Tämä kaikki sopii hyvin yhteen sen kanssa, mitä suomalaiselle ihmiselle on tapahtumassa: hän on siirtymässä maalta lähiöiden kautta kaupunkiin.'

¹¹⁹ 'Haikeus kohdistuu maalaiskulttuuriin, ns. talonpoikaisiin perusarvoihin, jotka maalla kasvaessa sisäistettiin.'

suburbs from the countryside. Suburban dwellers with rural roots recounted how in rural households the division of labour was not as pronounced and the wife's contribution to household work was considered invaluable (Kortteinen 1982, p. 122). Kortteinen (1982, p. 122) summarises the gender roles on a farm that 'despite the man owning and ruling, work was dependent on the wife and her contribution to labour mitigating the patriarchal power dynamic'.¹²⁰ Despite the egalitarian ideals of the welfare state according to Kortteinen (1982, p. 123, 124) the suburban milieu contributed to a more patriarchal environment where those moving from rural areas had to go through a 'painful resocialising process'¹²¹ which revealed how ill-fitting traditional values were for the modern surroundings.

7. CONCLUSION

Pakkasvirta's controversial reinterpretation of life in Tapiola provoked a public debate that questioned the architectural design of suburbs, the emerging suburban lifestyle and even the social policies of the Finnish welfare state. After *Vihreä leski* was released it functioned as a catalyst in the press questioning the future and development of the Finnish suburbs. Pakkasvirta (1968) himself insisted that 'prior to filming there was a research phase, when through interviews we acquainted ourselves with the milieu, people's living conditions and the choices they make. There were no claims in the film that are unrealistic.'¹²² Virtanen (1968) noted that despite Pakkasvirta's reassurance that the film's story is an isolated one 'it is obvious that the suburb of the film and *Green Widow* are general representations, despite the private nature of the film.'¹²³ The state of the suburbs and the accuracy of Pakkasvirta's cinematic equivalent was widely debated in the press by all major newspapers, film journals, and magazines such as *Teinilehti*, *Ylioppilaslehti* and *Ajankohta* (Fränti, 1968). Talaskivi (1968) argued that 'there are surely plenty of such young wives bored out of their mind elsewhere to be found than the suburbs, but a certain dull emptiness, tiresomeness and disconnect must press hardest in the lifestyle that forms in the periphery.'¹²⁴ What most of the commentators did agree on however was the film's importance in

¹²⁰ 'Joskin mies omisti ja hallitsi, niin työnteollinen riippuvuus vaimosta ja vaimon työpanoksesta liudensi patriarkaalista valta-asemaa.'

¹²¹ 'kivuliaana uudelleensosiaalistumisprosessina'

¹²² 'filmaamista edelsi tutkimusvaihe, jolloin haastattelujen avulla tutustuttiin miljööseen, ihmisten elinehtoihin ja heidän tekemiinsä ratkaisuihin. Filmiin ei päässyt yhtään väitettä, joka ei olisi mahdollinen.'

¹²³ 'Ilmeistä on, että elokuvan esikaupunki ja *Vihreä leski* ovat yleisyyttä edustavia, yksityisyydestään huolimatta.'

¹²⁴ 'Tällaisia nuoria tympäännyksiin väsyneitä aviovaimoja on runsaasti toki muuallakin kuin asumalähiöissä, mutta tietty ankea tyhjiys, väsymys ja irtonaisuus painaa varmaan pahiten siinä elämänmuodossa, joka periferiassa muodostuu.'

questioning the suburbs and their design as a whole. As Velipekka Makkonen (1968) wrote in *Contactor*:

Green Widow takes place in one of those Finnish garden cities that have sprung up in the past few decades, where architecture itself dictates the majority of life conditions for those imprisoned in them....*Green Widow* depicts the psychological violence, whose origins are impossible to define, but that is present in both human and surroundings.¹²⁵

Makkonen (1968) goes on to note that it would be a mistake to read the film as a direct critique of suburban town planning, but rather as a portrait of an individual tied by society. Some critics argued that the film was not a realistic representation of suburban life, whilst many felt the portrayal was honest and touching. Whilst critics were by and large united in their view that suburbs were dull and lifeless places to live, Inkeri Lius (1968) writing for the *Sosiaalidemokraatti*¹²⁶ magazine, felt this criticism was misplaced. Lius (1968) was one of the few writers who questioned if the suburbs were in fact as bad as Pakkasvirta portrayed them to be. 'Why could this woman, according to the film, not feel unity with the gymnastics group? Why does the director make fun of this mode of relaxation.'¹²⁷ The sentiment in Lius's (1968) article is that it is Pakkasvirta's urban dweller is using the space incorrectly, being herself to blame for the isolation she is facing. Perhaps there is also a link in that the strongest opposition to the film's suburbs came for the Social Democrats, the party in power and heading the development of the suburbs.

The strong reaction that *Vihreä leski* provoked is not surprising. Tapiola was not simply constructed of concrete and the problem of representing it truthfully becomes a matter of capturing its identity, society and meaning. The development of the area, which was a massive government-backed project, also inevitably ties its identity to the building of the Finnish welfare nation. When Pakkasvirta transforms a pleasant area into a hostile environment he is unavoidably critiquing much more than the architectural design. Transforming the garden city into a maze of dark forests and homes into a patchwork

¹²⁵ 'Vihreä leski tapahtuu yhdessä noista suomalaisista viimeisten parinkymmenen vuoden aikana syntyneistä viherkaupunginosista, joissa jo arkkitehtuuri sinänsä sanelee suurimman osan niiden vangiiksi joutuneiden elämisen ehdoista. Vihreä leski kuvaa henkistä väkivaltaa, jonka lähde on mahdoton yksilöidä, mutta joka kuvastuu paralleelisena sekä ihmisessä että miljöössä.'

¹²⁶ In English the *Social Democrat* magazine.

¹²⁷ 'Miksi tämä rouva ei elokuvan mukaan voi tuntea yhteenkuuluvuutta kuntovoimisteluryhmäänsä? Miksi ohjaaja pilkkaa tätä rentoutumismuotoa?'

of balconies with people gazing back into the woods in solitude transforms Tapiola's land from utopia to dystopia. Helinä's experience of the space is very different to the way it was planned to be enjoyed. The camera reveals the gulf between the Tapiola displayed in postcards and depicted in architectural magazines, and the voyeuristic and threatening isolated and alienated Tapiola Helinä weaves her way through. Further complicated by the social baggage of leaving the rural home behind, Pakkasvirta's film offers a portrait of a generation of migrants struggling to settle in to the suburban idyll. The fears of a society facing change in all aspects of life, most importantly in redefining domestic life and the home, become visible on screen. As in the film, the cinematic world that Pakkasvirta creates on screen allows for the experience of the space, the fears and uneasiness of a new way of life, to bleed into the official imagery of Tapiola.

Pakkasvirta's film challenged the official vision of Tapiola as a pleasant neighbourhood by showing how the experience of living there differs from the ideal lifestyle envisioned for it. By exposing the structure of surveillance, rigid gender roles and lack of opportunity for women, the film creates an alternative highly personal vision of life in the suburb. Pakkasvirta makes visible the experience of lived environment and adds his vision to the competing and conflicting versions of the reality of Tapiola. As always in the case of film, *Vihreä leski* offers a framed and edited version of reality, one that it even plays up to with its structural shifts. Similarly to the architectural blueprints, the vision of space is mediated through different channels and viewpoints. Pakkasvirta's strength is in bringing to life characters of the area, the community the welfare nation was working so hard to build. As Matti Luoma (1968) wrote as a response to the film 'This is how people live. Their problems are worth examining. These are the difficult consequences of urbanisation'.¹²⁸ While this chapter illustrates the emergence of the suburb as cinematic setting in Finnish film and a housewife's experience of life in the suburbs, the next case study presents more over rejection of the suburban lifestyle.

¹²⁸ 'Näin elävät ihmiset. Heidän ongelmansa ovat tutkimisen arvoisia. Tässä on eräs kaupungistumisen vaikeita kasvannaisia.'

Nostalgic Maps: Wandering in a disappearing cityscape in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*

'So what if the people change, but they don't even spare the houses.

*This is the only place where I can see my way.'*¹²⁹

Blind man. *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* (*The Man Who Could Not Say No*)

dir. Risto Jarva 1975

We now move ahead to 1975, when the landscape of suburban high-rise housing had changed from the exception to the rule. Throughout the 1960s the population of the Helsinki metropolitan area was growing annually by over 20,000 new inhabitants (Laakso 2012, p. 6). The Finnish wave of migration to southern cities in search of work hit its peak between 1969-1975, according to Laakso and Loikkanen (2004). By the mid 1970s the city was under enormous pressure to build new housing to accommodate its ever increasing population. All the while entirely new areas were being developed at increasing speed on the outskirts of Helsinki, older areas within the city were falling into disrepair. Areas built in the 1910s such as Puu-Pasila¹³⁰ and Puu-Vallila¹³¹ were under threat of being torn down and replaced by modern concrete high-rises. Coincidentally the village-like milieu comprising wooden low-rise houses in Puu-Vallila had in fact also been built to provide healthy and safe housing for the urbanising masses only some 50 years earlier, as Riitta Malve-Tamminen (2013) notes. Malve-Tamminen (2013) writes that the model houses planned for the area originally were abandoned in favour of small rented housing when building began in 1908. Puu-Vallila, a part of the Vallila¹³²

¹²⁹ 'Mitäs siitä vaikka ihmiset vaihtuukin, mutta kun eivät talojakaan säästä. Ainoat paikat, missä osaan kulkea.'

¹³⁰ Wood-Pasila, the prefix referring to the wooden clad housing stock

¹³¹ Wood-Vallila

¹³² name stemming from the word embankment in both Finnish and Swedish Vallgård variations

district is located some three kilometers north of the Helsinki city centre is the setting of Risto Jarva's 1975 film *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*, and the focus of this chapter. Neighbouring Puu-Vallila to the south was an industrial area which housed the National Rail engine shop, the Finnish Co-operative factory and coffee roastery. The colourfully painted houses were organised around central courtyards ensuring the area had plenty of trees and greenery. This working class area had been under threat of demolition as early as the 1940s, this time to be replaced by stone houses, but the general lack of housing in post-war Finland was the reason why Puu-Vallila was left standing in the 1940s (Yli-Ojanperä 2011). In the 1970s Puu-Vallila was again under threat of demolition, this time deemed antiquated and uninhabitable by the city of Helsinki (Yli-Ojanperä 2011). As an example Yli-Ojanperä (2011) notes that in the early 70s the majority of toilets in Puu-Vallila were communal outhouses. The houses were in need of district heating, new toilets and kitchens. As the land rental period was coming to its end the city of Helsinki was keen to avoid costly renovations, remove the previous tenants and rebuild the area with modern more cost-efficient housing, as Malve-Tamminen (2013) recounts. Demonstrations and petitions from Puu-Vallila residents persuaded the Helsinki city council to reconsider their redevelopment plans, as Kari Silfverberg (2012) writes. Due to the very public campaigning for the preservation of the area, the city of Helsinki agreed to test out the costs of renovation on one property (Yli-Ojanperä 2011). The building co-operative HAKA demonstrated on Roineentie 1 that the renovation of the old wooden housing stock was in fact a cheaper option to rebuilding the area. Since the renovations of the area were completed in the early 1980s Puu-Vallila has developed into a picturesque and sought-after area. In 1991 Puu-Vallila was even awarded the international Europa Nostra diploma as recognition of preserving a cultural milieu.

This chapter examines how Risto Jarva utilises the distinct history of the Puu-Vallila area in his filmmaking and presents yet another cinematic case against high-rise suburban housing. In contrast to the previous chapters of the thesis, here the focus shifts from newly built areas to preserving memories of the old; what is lost when concrete high-rises take over. The chapter begins with a comparison of the real Puu-Vallila and Jarva's cinematic reimagining of the area. This is followed by analysis on the juxtaposition of old and new housing stock, Jarva's cinematic nostalgia and the ways in which the filmic text weaves in memories of space through navigation. The chapter also introduces the developments in the Finnish film industry funding structure beginning with the Finnish Film Foundation and questions how film financing influenced the types of films that were getting made in the 1970s.

1. FINNISH FILM FOUNDATION AND FILMINOR

1.1 Finnish Film Foundation

In 1969 the system of various film prizes and state support for the film industry were brought together and formalised as the Finnish Film Foundation. The foundation would receive 4% of the gross income of film theatres, freed up from abolishing the entertainment tax, and would grant its funds as loans for Finnish film productions, as subsidies for the promotion of export of Finnish films, as subsidies to film theatres for the import and screening of artistically important films, and as support for research and education and publishing (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 25). The decision-making body of the Finnish Film Foundation was the Executive Committee made up of six members, 'of which the chairman and two members are nominated by the Ministry of Culture and Education, while the other three places are filled by the film industry' (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 25). The future direction of Finnish cinema was debated as funding decisions had to be made. Mass entertainment, especially Hollywood mass culture, was considered problematic due to its commercial motives and standardised form (Pantti 1999a, p. 122). Rather than entertainment to be consumed, film's role was seen as encouraging citizens to engage with social issues in a critical manner (Pantti 1999a, p. 122). Art cinema prevailed over trade and film was seen as cultural capital to be governed by state cultural policy (Pantti, 1999a, p.122). This approach emphasised film's role as art and as a part of national culture instead of measuring success by the box office. The Finnish Film Foundation quickly became an indispensable part of the Finnish film industry. As Cowie (1990, p. 107) argues it was a 'lifeline that most film-makers have just had to seize. They rely on it for everything from start-up grants on screenplays, to subtitling prints in English.' Though the Finnish Film Foundation became instrumental in keeping the Finnish film industry alive through the 1970s, it also garnered criticism.

Aside from suffering from political pressures and 'an innate tendency toward bureaucracy' (Cowie 1990, p. 107) the Foundation also struggled to balance the interests of the various groups within the film industry. Toiviainen (1975, p. 26) notes that the 'Foundation's activities have been intensely criticised during the whole period of its existence' citing opposition from small-scale production companies and cultural organisations. Toiviainen (1975b, p. 26) argues that the industry representatives on the Film Foundation Committee, Suomi-Filmi and Fennada, are not invested in the promotion of Finnish film due to both companies running large import businesses. The

old problem of reaching audiences and remaining profitable continued as only seven out of the twenty-eight Finnish films made between 1970 and 1972 broke even (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 26). Paradoxically this was despite domestic films drawing a larger average crowd than foreign films (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 26). Despite having a central funding body the old problems persisted.

In 1970 the Government Committee on Film Policy was established to examine possible models for structuring the Finnish film industry (Toiviainen 1975b p. 27). The committee, headed by director Risto Jarva, pinpointed problems within the current model of film financing. According to Jarva's committee 'the main objective of state film policy should be ensuring equal opportunity for citizens to receive and influence film culture'¹³³ (Pantti 1999a, p. 122). The committee drew a distinction between the commercial film industry and the socially critical New Wave, arguing that the New Wave 'was aimed towards artistic and social objectives, while comedies and farce were aimed towards traditional commercial goals.'¹³⁴ (Elokuvapoliittisen komitean I osamietintö, 1973 p. 93). Jarva's committee urged support for cultural activity in all its forms including film clubs (Pantti 1999a, p. 122), but no changes were made on the basis of the report (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 27). The dividing line in Finnish film industry 'between, on the one hand, small-scale producers, filmmakers and film culture organisations and, on the other, the old production companies (which have withdrawn from production), importers and film theatre owners' persisted despite the work of the Finnish Film Foundation (Toiviainen 1975b, p. 28). Smaller production companies continued their financially precarious work heavily reliant on attracting state funding for projects. Among these financially struggling companies was the head of the Government Committee on Film Policy Risto Jarva's own production company Filminor.

1.2 Filminor and Jarva

In 1962 the TKY¹³⁵ had its 90th anniversary and decided to mark the occasion by producing a feature length film (Toiviainen 1983, p. 64). This resulted in founding the Filminor production company by Risto Jarva, Juhani Kolehmainen and Jaakko Pakkasvirta (Uusitalo 2014). Half of the 30 shares in the company went to the student

¹³³ 'Valtion elokuvapolitiikan keskeisiin päämääriin kuuluu taata eri kansalaisryhmille tasavertaiset mahdollisuudet osallistua elokuvakulttuurin vastaanottamiseen ja siihen vaikuttamiseen.'

¹³⁴ 'perustuvat pääasiassa taiteellisille ja yhteiskunnallisille tavoitteille, ja komeidat ja farssit enemmän perinteisille liiketaloudelliselle ajattelulle.'

¹³⁵ abbreviation of Teknillisen korkeakoulun ylioppilaskunta, in English The Students Union of the Helsinki University of Technology

union and the rest were equally divided between Jarva, Kolehmainen and Pakkasvirta (Uusitalo 2014). Later in 1968 Jarva acquired shares from the students union and Kolehmainen, accruing half of the company. Jarva had an important and visible role in running the company from the start, both as the main artistic force and later as managing director (Uusitalo 2014). The first film produced by Filminor was the Jarva-Pakkasvirta co-production *Yö vai päivä*, which turned out to be a steep learning curve for the young inexperienced producers and directors (Toiviainen 1983, p. 64). Despite being awarded a state film prize the film was a financial flop and nearly bankrupted the company (Toiviainen 1983, p. 78). The company however managed to stay afloat and continued producing both feature length films and industry commissioned short films. Filminor acted as a type of finishing school into filmmaking for many of its employees including Jarva and Pakkasvirta (Toiviainen 1983). The company also went on to play an important role in the Finnish New Wave by producing Jarva's seminal films and several of Pakkasvirta's films. However by the end of 1973 Filminor was again facing financial difficulty, in part due to the energy crisis and its affect on the price of film stock (Toiviainen 1983, p. 275). Industry short films were also dwindling and Jarva's previous release *Yhden miehen sota* was not drawing in audiences as had been hoped (Toiviainen 1983, p. 275). It was time for a drastic change. Some argued that Jarva's move to comedy was a calculated commercial trick, but the factors leading the decision towards comedy were more tied to ensuring the future of Filminor and the salaries of its employees. In 1974 Jarva and managing director Kukkasjärvi were taking out personal loans to pay salaries (Uusitalo 2014). *Mies, joka ei sanonut ei* was made to save Filminor. The copies of the film for theatrical release were made on credit and the filmmakers anxious waited for results which would determine the future of the company (Toiviainen 1983, p. 268). Luckily *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* drew in 280,000 viewers, an absolute hit compared to the 7,000 odd viewers of Jarva's previous film *Yhden miehen sota*. The film also marked Jarva's move to comedy and a significant change in his directorial style.

Jarva's career as film director grew from his interest in film and international cinematic trends. Jarva admired filmmakers such as Eisenstein, Buñuel, Kurosawa, Renoir, Bergman, Chabrol and Godard (Toiviainen, 1983, p. 51). He wrote about film and actively participated in the University of Technology's *Montaasi* film club (Toiviainen 1983, p. 51). Jarva's artistic influences and interest in film as social commentator followed through his films in the urban New Wave portrayal *Onnenpeli* (1965), class drama *Työmiehen päiväkirja* (1967) and the futuristic *Ruusujen aika* (1969) before turning to increasingly darker social dramas *Bensaa suonissa* (1970), *Kun taivas*

putoaa (1972) and *Yhden miehen sota* (1973). Alongside feature length films Jarva directed various short films for industry and promotional use. Although Jarva was a highly regarded director, the financial pressure after the poor box office performance of *Yhden miehen sota* forced him to reassess his directorial style. As a result Jarva turned to comedy. In *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* Jarva sought inspiration from Jacques Tati's comedies and fashioned the protagonist Aimo after Harold Lloyd's persona, all the way down to the round spectacles (Toiviainen 1983, p. 261). Despite the stylistic changes in Jarva's filmmaking, the social ethos remains the same as in his earlier films and the interest in urban landscape continues throughout. Jarva as a social commentator is examined further under heading 3.2.

2. PUU-VALLILA, REAL AND REEL

2.1 Puu-Vallila documented

As in chapter two, the setting of the film is a recognisable place with its own rich history. Puu-Vallila's past has been captured in short documentaries, news clips and photographs. One of these was Lauri Törhönen's documentary *Vanha puukaupunki, varo!*¹³⁶ from 1973. Törhönen's 45 minute black and white documentary was made as a final student project for the Camera Arts department of Helsinki University of Art and Design with the support of YLE, the Finnish Broadcast Company. The documentary was later shown on television, even as recently as 2012. Törhönen shows Puu-Vallila's residence living in cramped conditions and lacking in even the most basic amenities. One family with small children do not even have a stove. As Törhönen addresses the public debate over the future of the Puu-Vallila his interviewees voice opinions both for and against rebuilding the area. The documentary includes viewpoints from both architects and residents. The overarching argument of the documentary remains that something must be done about the poor living conditions of Puu-Vallila. The visuals are accompanied by Vesa Mäkelä singing Viljo Kajava's (1972) poetry from his collection *Vallilan Rapsodia (Vallila's Rhapsody)*, mournful verses of tearing down a wooden house. The soundtrack of the documentary makes clear where the filmmaker's sympathies lie in the debate about rebuilding.

Similarly to the way Törhönen's documentary highlights the rundown state of Puu-Vallila, Eeva Rista's black and white photographs from 1973 show rotting walls and

¹³⁶ No English title, but translates to *Old Wood Town, Beware!*

leaky roofs. This time the focus is on the buildings themselves, people rarely venturing into the shots. Streets are quiet, buildings dirtied by grey slush snow. A shot of a lone mitten lying on the frozen asphalt adds to the sense of abandonment of the area. In the few interior shots people are huddled together in small kitchens. The inhabitants are shown in their small homes staring directly into the camera, well aware of being documented. Even though the photographs might have people in them they are not portraits; the focus of the series is kept strictly on the surroundings. There are shots of everyday spaces and items; a small bathroom, a crammed closet, an old wood-burning kitchen stove. In similar documentary style 1971 Simo Rista photographed the redevelopment meetings in Puu-Vallila. He captured a community organising and signing of petitions, this time inside a dark town hall, divided by sharp shadows. These black and white documents of life in Puu-Vallila capture houses in desperate need of repair and people that live their everyday lives in these modest surroundings.

It did not take long after the renovations to Puu-Vallila for these shabby portraits to be replaced by an altogether more pleasant image. Already in 1982 Marjatta Cronvall directed a short segment for YLE entitled *Ädit lapsineen Puu-Vallilassa*¹³⁷ that recounted the success story of the area. Cronvall's shots show pastel coloured houses and mothers enjoying the sun outside with their children whilst describing the efforts to save the 'working class idyll'. Shot in the summer, people lounge outside talking to their neighbours surrounded by the lush greens of the courtyard gardens. The camera surveys the street view from a moving point accompanied by the click clacking of hooves. The viewer is taken on a stroll through the streets of Helsinki on a horse. This approach of showing Puu-Vallila as basking in sunshine from atop a horse-drawn carriage is one that echoes Risto Jarva's fiction film *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* (*The man who could not say no*) from 1975. It is testament to how enticing the romanticised version of Puu-Vallila Jarva popularised in 1975 is, that when the same area was shot seven years later after major building works the vision of place remained the same.

2.2 Jarva's Puu-Vallila

Jarva's film addresses the same themes as Törhönen, the Ristas and Cronvall, but through a fictive narrative. Jarva's film tells the story of a homecoming, as pastor Aimo Niemi returns to his childhood neighbourhood of Kivimäki in Helsinki. It also chronicles

¹³⁷ No English title, but translates to *Mothers and their children in Puu-Vallila*

the closely-knit community's fight to save the area from urban regeneration. Though Kivimäki is fictive, it is recognisable as Puu-Vallila where *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* was filmed and which in 1975 was still under threat of being torn down. It is interesting how Jarva's fictional milieu differs from the documentary material of the time. As opposed to black and white, Jarva's film is vibrantly colourful, full of golden sunshine and soft pastels. Simo Rista's photographs of a Puu-Vallila village meeting were set indoors among dramatic stark shadows, quite a different affair to the personable village meeting Jarva set outside on makeshift chairs under the tree canopy. Where Leena Rista's photographs and Törhönen's documentary highlighted the poor living conditions and lack of basic amenities, Jarva's interiors are cosy and quaint. Though Rista, Törhönen and Jarva all depict a recognisable Puu-Vallila, Jarva's mise-en-scène is distinctly different from that of his contemporaries. The leaking roofs and crumbling exteriors captured in Rista's photographs are noticeably absent from Jarva's milieu. Absent are the complaints of poor kitchen and bathroom facilities of Törhönen's interviews. Curiously it is Cronvall's 1982 depiction of Puu-Vallila that is closest to Jarva's fictive Kivimäki. Seven years after *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* Jarva's dreams for Puu-Vallila had indeed come true. In fact Cronvall footage could be intercut with the fiction film without anyone noticing, so similar are they in lighting, colour scheme and setup. Even Jarva's horse drawn carriage, a curiosity in the film, is also replicated in Cronvall's news clip. What differentiates Jarva's work from Törhönen's or the Ristas' and ties more closely to that of Cronvall's, is a question of time. Not that of when the films or photographs were captured, but what time do they show. Törhönen and the Ristas were documenting the now, the current state of Puu-Vallila. Jarva and Cronvall capture the past, Puu-Vallila as historical milieu preserved as a physical reminder of days gone by. Jarva's nostalgia for the idyllic past of Puu-Vallila was only seven years earlier, before the renovations had rendered the area the pleasant village that Cronvall lauds. The similarities did not go unnoticed, as Silius (1975, p. 6) writes: 'the neighbourhood is called Kivimäki in the film, but the people of Kivimäki raising against the threat of demolition is in direct parallel to the efforts to save Puu-Vallila.'¹³⁸ As Sakari Toiviainen (1983) writes, despite the obvious similarities Puu-Vallila and Kivimäki are not interchangeable, but Kivimäki rather a fairytale version of the real Puu-Vallila. This magical take on reality was noted by film critics as well. Gröndahl (1975) wrote: 'it would be easy to dismiss Man who could not say no as naive trifle, but its naiveté, warmth and friendliness are so deliberate the film is disarming.'

¹³⁸ 'Kaupunginosaa kutsutaan elokuvassa tosin Kivimäeksi, mutta kivimäkeläisten puolustautuminen purku-uhkaavastaa on suorassa yhteydessä Puu-Vallilan säilyttämisyrityksiin.'

Risto Jarva has created a fairytale for adults, a playground for dreams where all endings are happy ones'.¹³⁹ In this case the cinematic fairytale is one of warmth and naivité, rather than the trolls which loom in forests of *Vihreä leski*. Though Jarva presents a fairytale version of real place and space in his film, this does not diminish *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*'s political message or agency. In fact film's whimsical qualities grant artistic freedom and allow Jarva to present simplified solutions to complex problems.

3. THE CHANGING ARENA OF FINNISH LIFE

3.1 At the intersection of old and new

A part of the fairytale-like charm of Jarva's *Kivimäki* is the simplified juxtaposition of old and new, good and bad. All new developments shown in the film are distant grey concrete jungles, forever unfinished and accompanied by a disproportionately loud cacophony of construction sounds. Walking between high-rises on wide dirt roads Aimo, the pastor who has just returned to Helsinki, gets lost. Looking up at the newly built landscape the camera cuts to reveal Aimo's point-of-view, rapid still shots of identical imposing glass and concrete walls. The high-rise area is more akin to visiting a construction site, cranes and tractors are parked by the roads and there is no greenery to be seen. More than a place it is a moment in time, a landscape caught on the cusp of change of the development of the city. This intersection between old and new is played out in the dialogue as Aimo talks about preserving *Kivimäki* to his old friend Kake, appealing 'to the good old days'.¹⁴⁰ 'Good new days'¹⁴¹ Kake replies crouching over blueprints of what will replace *Kivimäki*. Kake and his wife are planning to make the move from selling meat and groceries to selling gasoline. There is a symbolic parallel in their decision to move from nourishing people to nourishing machines. Their store in *Kivimäki* is a hub where locals gather to meet and sneak a taste of cold cuts from Kake in exchange for a kiss. Cars and traffic are non-existent in *Kivimäki*, it is a quiet pedestrian zone. This is in vastly different from the soundscape of central Helsinki which is dominated by heavy traffic and the new high-rise areas which are full of machines, but not people. Cars and machinery seem to go hand in hand with

¹³⁹ 'Det vore lätt att avfärda Mannen som inte kunde säga nej some en naiv bagatell men dess naivitet och värmande vänlighet är så medvetna att filmen blir avväpnande. Risto Jarva har skapat et saga för vuxna, en drömmarnas lekplats där allt slutar lyckligt.'

¹⁴⁰ 'vanhoja hyvä aikoja'

¹⁴¹ 'uusia hyviä aikoja'

the future of urban development. Kake and his wife's decision to shift their focus from people to machinery preempts Kivimäki succumbing to this future.

During the mid 1970s Finland was going through not only rapid urbanisation, but commodities such as televisions and kitchen appliances were quickly making their way to Finnish homes (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 12). Travel, both within the country and abroad, was becoming increasingly popular, and private motoring was becoming commonplace paving way for large supermarkets set outside the city centres, as Standertskjöld (2011, p. 34) also notes. The trends were already pointing towards Kake's vision of the future and Kivimäki was undoubtedly falling behind the times, quickly becoming a relic. One explanation for this stark juxtaposition and emphasis on the negative qualities of modernisation comes from the film's producer Kullervo Kukkasjärvi. Toiviainen (1983, p. 260) recalls Kukkasjärvi explaining

'the choice of theme was influenced by the topical "energy crisis", which brought forth the need to emphasise a simple, non-consumerist lifestyle, which was in danger of being lost in the midst of technological advancements and urbanisation.'¹⁴²

The consumerist lifestyle mocked in Donner's *Mustaa valkoisella* and to some degree Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä leski* is revisited by Jarva who offers a solution to the problem advocating a simpler life and return to tradition.

Whereas the high-rises stand isolated in the landscape, Kivimäki's pastel houses are shown closer, as a part of the fabric of the city. Even though high-rises were built equally in the suburbs on the city's periphery, they were also becoming a fixture closer to the city centre such as Puu-Vallila's neighbouring Pasila. *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*, not only portrays Kivimäki as a disappearing idyll, but pits it against the newly built high-rises. The film captures a moment in time when the arena of Finnish urban life was changing. It shows a society in flux, on the cusp of a new era. It makes the case for preserving the urban cityscape, 'the disappearing culture of wooden houses in our city, the small and homely shops that are disappearing from the city as well as the countryside only to be replaced by large markets, and in general losing the human-centric lifestyle through prioritising

¹⁴² 'aiheenvaijannassa painoi myös ajankohtainen "energiakriisi", joka toi esiin tarpeen korostaa yksinkertaista, kulutushysteriasta piittaamatonta elämäntapaa, jollainen on vaarassa kadota teknologian kehityksen ja kaupunkilaistumisen myötä.'

efficiency in stagger for housing development' (Stålhammar, 1975b).¹⁴³ Much like Aimo and Kake's discussion about Kivimäki, the film itself is simultaneously looking back to the good old days with nostalgic warmth, and ahead to future prospects with uneasy anticipation. Through juxtaposing the old and the new Jarva addresses questions of travel, rapid movement and the decentralised mode of life that were at the core of the debate surrounding urban regeneration.

3.2 Jarva as social commentator

Considering the close resemblance to real places and real events, it is surprising that Jarva (1974, in Toiviainen 1983, p. 259) made sure to mention to funders that 'this is not a realist depiction of everyday life nor does it directly bring up social issues.'¹⁴⁴ This might have had more to do with reassuring the funding body that the next film would not be a repetition of Jarva's previous social drama, which had not performed well at the box office. In the spring of 1974 Finnish film director Risto Jarva had just released his social critique drama *Yhden miehen sota* (*One Man's War*) to empty movie theatres. As the film failed to reach its audience Jarva confessed to a film funding committee in April 1974 (Jarva quoted in Toiviainen 1983, p. 258)

'To be honest, both Filminor's part in Finnish film production and my own career as a director, will be in poor form unless we are able to reconnect with the audience soon. Because of this our future plans lie with with comedy. We are planning a warm-hearted comedy, to counterbalance the increasingly cold world.'¹⁴⁵

It was this need to reconnect with the greater public that drew Jarva from darker dramas to comedy, and set forth the production his next film *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* that was released in 1975. In this film, as Toiviainen (1975a, p. 65) notes, as in all of Jarva's films, the starting point is mapping a particular community, social

¹⁴³ 'Kaupunkiemme katoava puutalokulttuuri, pienten ja kotoisten myymälöiden häviäminen niin kaupungissa kuin maallakin suurten markettien tieltä sekä yleensä ihmisläheisen elämänmuodon väistyminen vain tehokkuutta päämääränään pitävän asuttamisen rynnäkössä.'

¹⁴⁴ 'Ennen kaikkea haluan huomauttaa, että kysymyksessä ei ole arkirealistinen ja yhteiskunnallisia kysymyksiä suoraan esille tuova elokuva.'

¹⁴⁵ 'Näin suoraan sanoen sekä Filminorin osuus suomalaisessa elokuvatuotannossa että minun ohjaajaurani alkavat olla huonoissa kantimissa, jollei kontaktia yleisöön pian löydy. Siksi tulevaisuudensuunnitelmamme liikkuvat komedian parissa. Rohkenemme kuitenkin vielä suunnitella komediaa, jonka henki olisi lämmin, vastapainona yhä kovenevalle maailmalle.'

problem or event. Toiviainen (1975a, p.33) also emphasises Jarva's role as a director who deals with topical social and political questions. Certainly the question of urban regeneration was a topical issue in Finland in 1975, but it was also a theme that Jarva had explored in his earlier work. *Asuminen ja luonto (Living and Nature)* (1966), *Kaupungissa on tulevaisuus (Town is our Future)* (1967) and *Maaseudun tulevaisuus?*¹⁴⁶ (1970) were short films commissioned by the Postisäästöpankki bank that investigated the changes urbanisation was having on Finnish landscape and society. In Jarva's biography Toiviainen (1983, p.120) argues that 'questions of living conditions and "quality of life" are present in virtually all of Jarva's films, if not on the surface then certainly underneath it.'¹⁴⁷ Toiviainen (1983) goes on to recall that Jarva's earlier work on the *Teekkari*-magazine and discussions with various architects had familiarised him with the debate around urban design and city planning. Jarva's reservations against high-rise housing were already made clear in his earlier short *Kaupungissa on tulevaisuus (Town is our Future)*, which shows a very critical stance towards the trend of suburban high-rises. This interest in the lived environment and quality of life are also evident in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. As Jarva himself (1974 in Toiviainen 1983, p.259) described the film: 'It portrays the last remnants of a type of urban lifestyle, where people were people to one another, congenial, caring, helpful, and where people stayed friends whatever happens around them.'¹⁴⁸ This nostalgia for a lost time and way of life becomes embodied in Kivimäki. In a bid to reconnect with his audience Jarva directed a film in which a community is struggling to maintain its unity whilst the world is changing around them. *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* taps into the anxieties of urbanisation and exposes a society shifting from traditional to modern. As in his previous films Jarva addresses social issues and the lived environment, but this time his social commentary is veiled in comedy. It is no surprise that a film about communities, place and belonging would ultimately restore Jarva's career. Kivimäki provides a fictional home and community for the viewers, architecture they could relate to. Jarva's (1974 in Toiviainen 1983, p.258) strategy to provide warmth 'in an increasingly cold world' worked and *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* became one of the highest grossing domestic films of 1975 (Toiviainen 1983, p. 268).

¹⁴⁶ No English title, translates to *The Future of the Countryside*

¹⁴⁷ 'Kysymykset elinympäristöstä ja "elämän laadusta" väreilevät käytännöllisesti katsoen Jarvan kaikkien näytelmäelokuvien pinnalla, tai vähintäänkin pinnan alla.'

¹⁴⁸ 'Se kuvaa viimeisiä jäänteitä sellaisesta kaupunkimaisesta elämäntavasta, jossa ihmiset ovat toisilleen ihmisiä, tuttavallisia, osanottavia, avuliaita, ja jossa ihmiset pysyvät ystävinä tapahtuipa mitä tahansa.'

3.3 Changing lifestyle

As discussed throughout this thesis the debate on urbanisation and its effects on Finnish lifestyle was one that dominated public discourse all throughout the period of heavy migration 1960-80s. By the 1970s popular attitude of the press towards the suburban housing and lifestyle was an overwhelmingly negative one (Roiviainen 1999, p. 57). On Christmas eve 1972 Finland's leading newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat* published Mauno Saari's (1972) poem about the life in the suburban high-rises.

'This evening
the hazard lights of the suburb
have been lit again.
A new breed crammed into
eight-storey houses,
that collide into each other
in the dark.
In a few years Helsinki has
taught the country boy:
never mind the human,
as long as the city is well.
Charmed by ceramic tiles, cement
and apparent services
the suburban breed is quiet
and productive.
Never mind else.
Let us light a candle
for the leaders
whose idea building this Finnish
metropolis was.
A candle for those, from whose hands
is emerging this
abhorrent metropolis
of cold loneliness.'¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁹ 'Tänä iltana/on lähiöiden hätävalot/taas sytytetty./Uusi rotu on ahtautunut/kahdeksankerroksiin taloihin,/jotka törmäilevät toisiinsa/pimeydessä./Parissa vuodessa Helsinki on/opettanut maalaispojalle:/viis ihmisestä,/kunhan kaupunki voi hyvin./Kaakelilla, sementillä/ja näennäisillä palveluilla/hurmattu lähiörotu on hiljaa/ja tuottaa hyvin./Viis muusta./Sytyttäkäämme siis kynttilä/niille johtajille,/joiden idea tämän

The poem captures the primary assumption was that the newly built suburbs of Finland housed a population of troubled and alienated people. This approach was also reflected in filmmaking, as we have seen in the reviled slums of *Yksityisalue* and the alienation of Pakkasvirta's housewife in *Vihreä leski*. This at times simplistic attitude towards the suburb is also perpetuated in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* and forms a core theme of the film. Partly as a response to this astoundingly bleak popular image of the suburb a sociological study was launched.

In 1982 Matti Kortteinen published *Lähiö: tutkimus elämäntapojen muutoksesta*¹⁵⁰ in which he tackled this popular belief by interviewing inhabitants about their process of adjusting to suburban life. Kortteinen (1982) conducted his interviews between 1978 and 1981 in an unnamed suburb in greater metropolitan Helsinki and sought to understand the psychological journeys of people leaving behind their rural roots for a life in the suburb. By chronicling the memories and stories of suburban inhabitants Kortteinen (1982) outlines how the development of suburbs had affected the Finnish way of life. According to Kortteinen (1982, p. 9) the public discourse postulated that:

‘these so called concrete suburbs offer their inhabitants poor living conditions, and this coupled with the strain caused by urbanisation, leads to the accumulation of personal and social problems in these new areas.’¹⁵¹

Kortteinen (1982, p. 13) argues that this discourse has developed into a specific ‘suburban ideology’ or *lähiöideologia* that deems the suburbs inhospitable places that erode community ties and harbour social problems. This commonly held belief is however in stark contrast with the results of a survey executed by the City of Vantaa in 1980. This survey found that people living in Vantaa's suburbs were on average happy with their surroundings and their life as a whole (Kortteinen 1982, p. 16). This puzzling division between perspectives on suburban life presented in the media and popular culture and those of the inhabitants was the starting point of Kortteinen's research. Through in depth interviews with suburban dwellers Kortteinen (1982) attempts to overcome what J.P. Roos (1978) termed in 1978 a ‘wall of happiness’ or

suomalaisen/metropolin rakentaminen on./Kynttilä niille, joiden käsien/jäljiltä alkaa hahmottua tämä/kammottava, kylmän yksinäisyyden/suurkaupunki.’

¹⁵⁰ No English title, translates to *Suburb: a Study on the Change in Lifestyle*

¹⁵¹ ‘nämä ns. betonilähiöt tarjoavat asukkailleen heikot asuinolosuhteet ja että tämä yhdessä maassamuuton tuottamien rasitusten kanssa aiheuttaa sen, että uusille lähiöalueille kasautuu inhimillisiä ja sosiaalisia ongelmia.’

onnellisuusmuuri. With this wall of happiness Roos (1978) refers to embellished answers that survey participants provide in order to block the reality of their situation from both themselves and their surveyors. In order to break down this wall of happiness, and bridge the gap between survey results and common suburban rhetoric, Kortteinen (1982) bases his research on in-depth interviews with residents of a particular unnamed metropolitan Helsinki suburb. Kortteinen's (1982) research moves away from the quantitative data of surveys to qualitative information that records the individual narratives of structural change and urbanisation Finland was going through. Kortteinen's (1982) interviews discuss family ties, neighbourhood relations, social class and then place these as a part of the larger lifestyle shift that followed from urbanisation and new welfare state policies. And although the question of happiness remains at the core of the interviews Kortteinen (1982, p. 24) emphasises that his intention is 'not to determine if people are 'really happy' or even how happy they are',¹⁵² but rather investigate the potential problems that the suburban milieu places on Finnish lifestyle. The interviews paint a portrait of a population between the rural past and urban future, finding its feet in both a new environment and new way of life.

What Kortteinen (1982) found was that the inhabitants of the suburbs were a very homogenous group, very young as the vast majority of inhabitants were families with young children, as portrayed in *Vihreä leski*. Kortteinen (1982, p. 39) also noted that the example suburb was more uniformly working class than any other area in metropolitan Helsinki, including the 'traditional working class areas' *työläisyhdyskunnat*. Despite the often scathing critique of the suburban environment Kortteinen (1982, p. 37) found that

'more thorough analysis and deeper interviews created an impression that the larger problems are not directly linked with the physical environment or the quality of building, but rather with the social life, which is rooted in this planning and building.'¹⁵³

Kortteinen's (1982) interviewees spoke about missing the close and effortless neighbour relations of their rural childhood, the drudgery of the daily commute to work in central Helsinki and navigating social situations in close quarters. Their

¹⁵² 'ei ole selvittää sitä, ovatko ihmiset 'todella onnellisia' taikka edes sitä, kuinka onnellisia ihmiset ovat'
¹⁵³ 'pidemmän perehtymisen ja syvempien haastattelukontaktien jälkeen syntyykin vaikutelma siitä, että suurimmat ongelmat eivät välittömästi liity fyysiseen ympäristöön tai rakentamisen laatuun vaan siihen sosiaaliseen elämään, jonka perusteet suunnittelu ja rakentaminen luovat.'

concerns centred on questions of community and of family, rather than of poor urban planning. Kortteinen (1982) does however tie these concerns, such as the urban nuclear family replacing the rural network of relatives, with the way space is organised in the suburbs. The new suburban breed is struggling to connect to both their surroundings and to each other. Kortteinen (1982) documents the interviewee's longing for a more simple past, a time when one knew their neighbours and felt a sense of belonging to a community and to a place. These themes are ones that play a significant role in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. Like Kortteinen's interviewees Jarva looks back to an idealised past where community ties were treasured and people felt an emotional affinity to where they lived.

4. ARRIVING AT KIVIMÄKI

4.1 Morning in Helsinki

Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei starts by introducing Helsinki waking up to the rising sun on a summer's day. The first shot pans over the silent shoreline and calm sea, another shows the empty central Helsinki shopping street Aleksanterinkatu where traffic lights blink at empty streets. As the next shot pans over the pastel coloured houses of Kivimäki a harmonica starts to play. The viewer has arrived home. The dim hazy dawn light that filtered between buildings in central Helsinki has broken into a full warm sunshine by the time the camera reaches Kivimäki. The mood of the area is steeped in nostalgia: overview shots following people on their way to work are intercut with closeups of flowers, and kittens playing in the sunshine.

There are several short shots of people waking up, opening their windows and starting their day. Introducing the viewer to Kivimäki and its residents does not play a great role in driving forward the narrative, but functions more in setting the mood. A man stretching in front of his window taking in the fresh air, others chatting on their way to work while carrying packed lunches show the most ordinary gestures. By intercutting mundane morning rituals with closeups of greenery and animals, everyday life in Kivimäki seems particularly charming. Starting from a panning overview shot of the area the viewer is brought gradually closer to those living there. It is telling of the importance of milieu in the film that Kivimäki is introduced even before Aimo, the protagonist, appears on screen for the first time.

It is made clear from the start that the film's sympathies lie with Kivimäki and with conserving the old wooden housing stock. The range of cinematic methods employed to create a sense of place and belonging make *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei's* approach to architecture and space exciting. By showing the mundane tasks of minor characters Jarva shows the crucial role the inhabitants play in making a place, thus elevating Kivimäki beyond its architectural structures to include the spatial cultures and networks of those residing there. The relaxed morning rituals of Kivimäki residents are juxtaposed with a shot of Helsinki centre, this time bustling with people. The shock effect of the contrast is enhanced by speeding up the film and adding loud traffic-sounds. Central Helsinki is shown literally double speed to Kivimäki and the streets are full of people, traffic and noise. Cutting back to the empty streets of Kivimäki where a lone horse-drawn carriage walks across the screen accompanied by a soundtrack of wistful harmonica, the difference in environments is made obvious. In Kivimäki there are no cars even parked on the sides of the street. The voiceover of the narrator passionately defends Kivimäki, its residence and lifestyle -- and curiously, the narrating voice turns out to belong to a horse.

4.2 Riding through Kivimäki

When introducing Kivimäki in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* the viewer travels through the cinematic space by horse-drawn carriage. In a twist on the more common transport found in city films, where the camera boards buses or cars as a mode of transport that illustrates the fast-paced modern city, Jarva invites us to move through this city with a horse. With this twist on a familiar trope in film history Jarva rejects the notion of the camera as an accomplice to the modern metropolis and positions Kivimäki outside of the tradition of urban portrayals. The 'phantom rides' of early cinema, as Christian Hayes (2012) describes, fused together train travel and film. These short films presented the viewer with a journey captured by a camera that was fixed to the front of a train, and in which 'the film would appear to be moving by aid of an invisible force, hence the name 'phantom ride', Hayes (2012) writes. According to Tom Gunning (2010, p. 37) the phantom rides of early landscape films broke away from the painterly tradition of a carefully framed static picture and 'moved into the landscape via technology.' Gunning (2010, p. 55) argues that these hugely popular films 'deliver an experience of movement more extensive and dynamic than the pivoting pans.' The moving camera penetrates the landscape in a way that had been previously unseen. Gunning (2010) also draws attention to the fact that the camera position meant that the spectator was not experiencing the train traveller's point of view, but rather that of the

train itself. Nigel Morris (2003, p. 112) writes that phantom rides ‘heightened visual sensation through a rectangle from a seated perspective’ and replicating the train’s forward motion ‘film was just another facet of modernity’. In later films such as Vertov’s *Man with a Movie Camera* (1929) or Ruttmann’s *Berlin: Symphony of a Metropolis* (1927) the cinematic city was defined by a bustling transport system, one the viewer was allowed to board. There motorised transport, as the city, was a distinctly modern phenomenon. Giuliana Bruno (2002, p. 20) claims that ‘when the camera is placed at the very front of a moving vehicle... the camera becomes the vehicle: that is, it becomes, in a literal sense, a spectatorial means of transportation.’ Bruno (2002) goes on to argue that the this type of transport films inscribed motion into the language of cinema. Some 50 years later Jarva chooses to take quite an opposite approach; his camera sways in step with the horse’s movements. In *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* the cinematic medium does not function as an accomplice to modernity and the bustling metropolis. In contrast to Bruno’s (2002) embodied experience of moving through a city space, the body Jarva tunes us to is not a that of a machine, but that of a living, breathing being. Jarva rejection of cinema’s role as ‘an emblem of modernity’, as Charney and Schwartz (1995) call it, also redefines his camera’s relationship to the city. The iron horse of early cinema is replaced by a real horse.

4.3 The telepathic horse

‘The tepid light of early morning/shimmers on the roof antennas./Somewhere from Häme Road/ you can hear familiar echo/of the steps of the workhorse/coming home.’¹⁵⁴

Viljo Kajava’s (1972, p. 52) poem *Hiljaiseloa*¹⁵⁵ from his collection *Vallilan Rapsodia*¹⁵⁶. Present in Kajava’s poem reminiscing about the past and Jarva’s cinematic nostalgia, the workhorse of Puu-Vallila was clearly not only a figment of Jarva’s imagination. It even has a historical tie to real life, as according to Silfverberg (2012) the Romani community kept horses by the nearby Kumpula allotments until the late 1980s. Even Eeva Rista’s photographs from 1973 show a horse cart in the courtyard of a Puu-Vallila house. In fact the horse charmed audiences and was introduced as ‘the film’s third star, working horse Aroviima, a genuine Helsinkier from the sewer section of the city’s

¹⁵⁴ ‘Aamuyön haalea valo/ hohtaa kattoantenneissa./ Jostakin Hämeentieltä/ kuuluvat kotiin palaavan/ ajurinhevosen askelet/ kodikkaana kaikuna.’

¹⁵⁵ no English title, translates to *Quiet life*

¹⁵⁶ no English title, translates to *Vallila’s Rhapsody*

sanitation department' (Harkki and Blomqvist 1975, p. 41)¹⁵⁷. Martti Pennanen's role as 'the voice of the horse' was also recognised in the press (Sainio, 1978, p.9).¹⁵⁸

However what is distinctive in Jarva's portrayal of the workhorse, is that his horse is also the narrative voice of the film. It tells the viewer of Kivimäki's people and comments on their lives throughout the film. While in earlier films about suburbs this narrative voice was given to interviewers (*Mustaa valkoisella*), market researchers (*Vihreä leski*) or statisticians (*Työmiehen päiväkirja*), in the old-fashioned neighbourhood of Kivimäki this privilege is given to a horse. The horse speaks only to the viewer and not the characters immersed in the narrative. The horse is woven into the film to seem like a natural part of Kivimäki. In the beginning of the film we first listen to a voiceover of a soft male voice, which is only later revealed to be a horse. Surprisingly there is no sense of shock in this revelation: the camera shows the horse looking perfectly ordinary as it walks through Kivimäki. The horse itself is not a magical being, but rather he exists in a world where a speaking horse is commonplace. Fredric Jameson (1986, p. 311) wrote in his essay 'On Magic Realism in Film' that magical realism was 'not a realism to be transfigured by the "supplement" of a magical perspective but a reality which is already in and of itself magical or fantastic.' In the essay Jameson (1986, p. 303) draws out features he finds common in a series of magic realist films; 'these are all *historical* films; the very different *color* of each constitutes a unique supplement and the source of a peculiar pleasure, or fascination, or *jouissance*, in its own right; in each, finally, the dynamic of *narrative* has somehow been reduced, concentrated, and simplified, by the attention to violence.' Although looking at a very limited selection of films what Jameson (1986) captures is magic realism's capacity to present a recognisable reality that is slightly disjointed, also using Freud's uncanny to describe this effect. Jameson (1986, p.310) differentiates the magical realist films from the nostalgia film which 'consistent with postmodernist tendencies generally, seeks to generate images and simulacra of the past... producing something like a pseudopast for consumption'. Rather than producing a cinematic history which envelops the viewer into a different cinematic world, according to Jameson (1986) magical realist films poke holes in this history. Kivimäki, with its talking or telepathic horse, is an inherently magical world, a fairytale version of reality as Toiviainen (1983) described. It is the modern, noisy, fast-paced 'real' Helsinki that

¹⁵⁷ 'Elokuvan kolmas tähti, työhevonen Aroviima sensijaan on alkuperäisiä stadilaisia, kaupungin puhtaanapitolaitoksen viemäripuolelta.' By using the slang word for Helsinki, *stadi*, the article emphasises the horse belonging to a group of true Helsinkiers.

¹⁵⁸ 'filmin hevosen ääni'

threatens to poke holes into this magical realm, and therefore the real tension of the film is the threat of reality puncturing into Kivimäki's idyll. Jarva emphasises the point of two worlds colliding by rejecting the association of cinema with modernity and technology that the phantom ride is the emblem of in favour of a talking horse, and in the process giving Kivimäki a sprinkling of magical realism. From the start of the film, tradition, history, nostalgia and a hint of magic of Kivimäki are set against the modern, mechanised and efficient future of Helsinki.

5. HOUSES OF KIVIMÄKI

5.1 Nostalgia

'Nostalgia (from nostos - return home, and algia - longing) is a longing for a home that no longer exists or has never existed. Nostalgia is a sentiment of loss and displacement, but it is also a romance with one's own fantasy.'

writes Svetlana Boym (2001, p. xiii). These sentiments of displacement and longing for a home that no longer exists echo the experiences of Kortteinen's (1982) suburban interviewees. The newly suburban breed was suffering of an outbreak of nostalgia, reminiscing about their rural past in their suburban high-rises. As the public debate criticised the suburban environment, Kortteinen's (1982) interviews revealed the sense of longing directed at a time rather than a place. As Boym (2001, p. xv) writes, 'at first glance, nostalgia is a longing for a place, but actually it is a yearning for a different time - the time of our childhood, the slower rhythms of our dreams.' This observation is certainly true for Kortteinen's (1982) interviewees who reminisce as much about past times, a disappearing lifestyle and sense of community, as they do about place or landscape. The way nostalgia is simultaneously for both time and place is acknowledged and utilised in the way *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* constructs Kivimäki. Jarva's cinematic nostalgia is attuned to Boym's (2001) claim that nostalgia is a type of rebellion against the modern idea of time and progress. This certainly comes across in Jarva's juxtaposition of a society at the crossroads of old and new. Kivimäki becomes a romantic fantasy of Puu-Vallila suspended in time; forever living in the good old days. Even Jarva himself (1974, in Toiviainen 1983, p. 259) admitted of his directorial style in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* that 'my approach is

romanticised'.¹⁵⁹ By this admission Kivimäki is an idealised and unrealistic portrayal of Puu-Vallila. The sense of loss and longing the film creates around the old-fashioned cityscape was captured by Heikki Eteläpää (1975, p. 16): '*The Man who could not say no* evokes a sorrowful happiness... Jarva has written - with the help of Jussi Kylätaski- a comedic eulogy for an obvious corpse.'¹⁶⁰ To Eteläpää (1975) the juxtaposition of old and new is integral to creating this sense of loss and nostalgia. Despite being a fairytale version of reality *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* taps into the social climate of the mid 1970s urbanising Finland. As Boym (2001, p. xiv) notes, 'nostalgia inevitably reappears as a defence mechanism in a time of accelerated rhythms of life and historical upheavals.' Jarva's film captures the nostalgic longing for a home that was in the minds of so many of Korttinen's (1982) interviewees.

This looking to the past is also used in the construction of *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. 'The film is set in current times although its entire form is inherited from the folk comedies from many centuries ago, the character types of the scriptwriting belong to the same group of clichés as characters from Tarkas's comedies and television series.'¹⁶¹ (Tuuli 1975). The nostalgia for a time gone by in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* is also incorporated into its cinematic genre and style. It recycles a range of cinematic tropes from the previous decades of Finnish filmmaking, adding to the film's warmth and familiarity (Karemo, 1976). Jarva himself admitted this stating that the 'film has tried to draw as much as possible from old comedies' (Rinne, 1975, p.4).¹⁶² Several film critics (Eteläpää 1975, Tuuli 1975, Salomaa 1975) described the style of the film as farce in the style of films produced in the bygone studio era. The cinematic style and genre of the studio system, which were shunned by earlier New Wave directors are given a new lease of life. Jarva's decision to make a farce is nostalgic in itself, a memorial to a style that is lost in history, similarly to the lifestyle of Kivimäki under threat. As a film about protecting a traditional way of life and community, the genre of the film itself is reviving a lost film culture. Jarva picks up on tropes from the old comedy genre and weaves them into a 'collection of the most beloved themes of our beloved national cinema'¹⁶³ (Karemo

¹⁵⁹ 'käsittelytapani on romantisoiva'

¹⁶⁰ 'Haikeita tunnelmia hyvänolon oheella herättää *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*... Jarva on laatinut -kirjurinaan Jussi Kylätasku - komediallisen hautakirjoituksen ilmiselvälle vainajalle'

¹⁶¹ 'Elokuva on sijoitettu nykypäivään, vaikka sen koko muoto periytyy kansankomedioista monen vuosikymmenen takaa, ja käsikirjoituksen hahmottamat ihmistyytit kuuluvat samaan klišeeluokkaan, kuin Tarkaksen komedioiden ja tv-sarjojen ihmiset.'

¹⁶² 'tässä elokuvassa on yritetty ammentaa mahdollisimman paljon vanhasta komediasta'

¹⁶³ 'kokooma rakkaan kotimaisen elokuvamme vielä rakkaammista aiheista.'

1976). An example of such a revived film trope is the narrative voice of a horse; perhaps surprisingly this had been a familiar feature in studio era films (Karemo 1976, Tuuli 1975). The familiarity of the genre appealed to audiences and critics who claimed despite being a fairytale like comedy 'it takes the material seriously, it is approached almost solemnly.' (Karemo 1976).¹⁶⁴ *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* was a stylistic departure for Jarva, one in which he looks back at a traditions and heritage in both subject and style of the film. By using a horse ride through the city and reviving the comedy genre of the bygone studio era Jarva employs film history to frame his cinematic argument.

5.2 Colour of home

Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei captures the different warm pastel shades of the houses in Puu-Vallila. These soft hues were used in Helsinki already during its Empire style from the 1820s onwards, as Hannula and Salonen (2007, p. 11) note. In contrast to these warm hues, architecture built in the 1960s in Finland was dominated by a clean crisp white in the functionalist style with bolder colours such as browns and oranges in the 1970s (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 34, 82). The colours of Kivimäki distinctly differ from burnt oranges, dark browns and blacks that Standertskjöld (2011, 84) describes as being the dominant palette of the time. Kivimäki is decidedly untrendy and immersed in colour. The bedsheets drying on the clotheslines in the courtyard are a selection of strong reds and blues. There is very little pure white or black in Kivimäki, making Urho's black priest's uniform stand out against the medley of colour surrounding him, as Toiviainen (1983) remarks. The film is shot in natural sunlight and exudes warmth. This makes the moments when Jarva uses artificial lighting or a more limited colour palette even more distinctive and significant. Lewis Jacobs (1970, p. 189) writes that 'color takes on the quality of shifting harmonies, discords, and rhythms in support of propelling and exchanging dramatic action, and therefore becomes an expressive part of film structure itself.' Similarly Jarva's use of colour in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* sets the mood and differentiates places, people and motives, supporting the narrative developments. Colour and light are used in an especially power way to signify the change from house to home.

Fig. 37 Risto Jarva, *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*, 1975, film frame 00:08:48

¹⁶⁴ 'Se ei irvaile aineistoaan, siihen suhtaudutaan miltei pieteetillä.'

One of these moments is when Aimo moves to his new home in Kivimäki. He brings only two suitcases of belongings with him. There is no furniture in the flat, nor does he bring in any. Aimo sleeps on the floor in a sleeping bag, uses a suitcase as a table and old newspaper as tablecloth. The colour palette is cool, dirty blue walls and white doors. The lighting is not warm despite there being window across the room. The artificially cold light casts Aimo's shadow on the wall making his body blend in with the wall. It is not a homely space, not even a functional one, as even cooking is difficult with such limited means. Aimo's personal space is one of a person passing through, merely camping in the space not making any effort to settle in. Without furniture his body interacts with the space awkwardly. Either sitting perched on top of a wobbly pile of books or laying on the floor with no mattress, Aimo's figure is not at ease with his dwelling.

It is only after the other Kivimäki residents paint Aimo's walls and rally together to collect him furniture that the space is transformed into a home. Walls are a newly painted, in a palette of yellow and blue. The floors are covered with rugs, pictures and mirrors hung on the walls. This time the warm light streams in from the window at the other end of the room. The previously cold and impractical space has been transformed into a cosy home. This process of making a house a home happens regardless of Aimo himself. It is the community that makes a home, in this case quite literally. The furniture is old-fashioned but clean and functional. The rug is a traditional *räsymatto* woven together from rags. The kitchen is rudimentary and the bed is a foldaway. Aimo's room is colourful and modest, arguably like Kivimäki itself.

Kake and Anna's home in the high-rise offers a stark contrast to the interior of Aimo's home. Their home has all the modern commodities, designer furniture and a television in the corner. The colours here are a muted palette of trendy browns, blacks and whites. The lounge they invite Aimo to sit in is Yrjö Kukkapuro's iconic Karuselli or Carousel chair, which started production in 1964. The chair's groundbreaking design took inspiration from a lecture in physiology, which guided its ergonomic design, as Kukkapuro (2008) recalls. The Karuselli chair quickly became a sought-after classic. Despite the design innovations of the chair Aimo finds it difficult to get out. The shot offers a comedic moment as the camera looks down as Aimo struggles to lift and rock his way out of the designer chair. This is especially ironic as just one year prior to the making of *Mies*, *joka ei osannut sanoa ei* the chair Karuselli had been given an award for its design. The New York Times had chosen the Karuselli as the world's most

comfortable armchair in 1974, as Mark Robinson (2012) recalls. To further drive home the contrast of Kake's modern design home and Aimo's modest residence, the shot is followed by Aimo at home preparing his bed for the night. He simply spreads a sleeping bag on the floor and lies down. The two interiors reflect the difference in opinion between Aimo and Kake in what constitutes a desirable living environment or a home.

5.3 Sound of community

In addition to colour, music and soundscape play an important role in defining milieu in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. Sound is used to signify a place, create atmosphere and tie together the characters. Markku Kopisto's score was inspired by his childhood in Turku's wooden housing area, according to Toiviainen (1983). The soothing theme of Kivimäki plays whenever the camera pans over the area. Kopisto's theme for Kivimäki consists of only a single unaccompanied acoustic accordion playing a harmonious tune that lingers unhurriedly on each note. Cutting back to Kivimäki from central Helsinki or the archipelago, the familiar tunes welcome the viewer home. There is a moment in the film where this theme song shifts from non-diegetic to diegetic sound. The music is revealed to originate from the top of the Kivimäki hill, the player a lone homeless alcoholic. He is a familiar figure in the film, a constant presence keeping an eye on his village from atop his bedrock throne. The theme song, the soul of Kivimäki, is entrusted to its most marginalised member. The tune of his harmonica is not only heard by the viewer, but a melody that follows the characters as they go about their daily lives.

There is a scene in which the same homeless man meets up with the caretaker and painter to give an impromptu concert in the summer night. As the orchestra play a upbeat song, people open their windows and reach out to listen. Simple amateur music brings out the community to share an experience together. There is no continuous shot that shows the orchestra with their audience, but rather separate still shots of first the orchestra and then a selection of windows where their adoring public have gathered to listen. A collection of individuals not necessarily seeing or hearing each other, but brought together through listening. They do not share a visual space, but an aural one. Without leaving their homes or communicating with one another, the inhabitants share an experience that affirms their belonging to a group. Sakari Toiviainen (1983, p. 267) described this 'short scene an almost magical moment ... it is a beautiful expression of communal spirit and a disappearing lifestyle all the while communicating something

wondrous.¹⁶⁵ Toiviainen (1983) also notes that this scene is devoid of any narrative function, which only lends more power to its elegance. The one and a half minute clip is a cinematic embodiment of Kivimäki's unhurried pace of life.

Similarly to the orchestra scene sound is used transcend other boundaries of the film. Interiors and exteriors are bound together by the use of sound. An argument had in the "privacy" of one's home echoes across the neighbourhood and gathers an audience onto the street. The line between private and public is crossed by sound. Rather than a flowing pan of the camera that would visually follow the journey of sound, sound is used to maintain unity throughout cuts which occupy different spaces. A mid-shot shows a group of residents gossiping and the dialogue continues as the film cuts to Milla at her window. What looks like a shot emphasising isolation, Milla sits perched above the others and at the edges of the frame, whilst the villagers take centre stage. Though divided on screen, Milla in sunshine and the neighbours behind a fence, the sound transforms the effect of the shot to one of shared communal space. Before a wider shot then reveals their spatial relation, we already know they share the same space. The importance of sound draws attention to the unseen presence of others. Even when sitting alone in her home Milla, and thus the viewer, can sense the community around her and hear the harmonica player's melody. It suggests there is more to Kivimäki than its visual aspect; life continues outside the frame. This is in distinct contrast to an earlier scene at the high-rise where Kake shouts to Aimo from his open window, unintelligible from his elevated position and overtaken by the rumble of the construction machines. This example of a severed connection between interior and exterior is in clear contrast to Kivimäki's free and easy flow of sound.

5.4 The milieu as a character

The buildings of Kivimäki itself carry an anthropomorphic quality about them in the film. They interact with protagonists, almost carrying an autonomous personality. The painter's house performs as the second character in a slapstick routine alongside him, knocking him out and tripping him up. The house extends its doors and gates to take part in the physical comedy. At other times the house is a co-conspirator and partner in crime, hiding a bottle of booze in a hatch. The houses are unhindered by ownership, or by rental agreements, merely coexisting with the inhabitants. These buildings are not

¹⁶⁵ 'Lähes taianomainen on lyhyt kohtaus ... siinä on kaunis ilmaus yhteishengestä ja katoavasta elämäntavasta samalla kun se välittää jotain sanoin kuvaamatonta.'

owned by the inhabitants, as living things could never be truly owned. Kivimäki is public space at its best, a beloved character of the film.

The windows are left open allowing interior and exterior to mix. They are peered through, letting in the sights and smells of the surrounding world. The houses of Kivimäki meld private spaces with the public arena. The environment and presence of others is felt and heard, as the buildings bring people together rather than isolate them from each other.

Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei is a love letter to Kivimäki, and simultaneously to Puu-Vallila. It is a deeply personal place, one entrenched with meaning, memories and personal histories. Kivimäki has such character it becomes a being in itself. A man states in the film, 'it does not matter if the people change, but as long as the houses stay the same.' The strength and identity of Kivimäki is localised to its houses and architecture. Boym (2001, p. 76) writes that 'urban identity appeals to common memory and a common past but is rooted in a man-made place, not in the soil.' It does not matter if the new high-rises were built on the same plot, if the houses are gone so is Kivimäki. This importance placed on tradition and community offers an antidote to the isolated suburban life in lived high-rises by Aimo and Anna, or *Vihreä leski*'s Helinä.

6. NAVIGATION AND MOVEMENT

6.1 Moving through memories

'The (im)mobile spectator moves across an imaginary path, traversing multiple sites and times. Her fictional navigation connects distant moments and far-apart places. Film inherits the possibility of such spectatorial voyage from the architectural field, for the person who wanders through a building or a site also absorbs and connects visual spaces.'

For Giuliana Bruno (2002, p. 56) movement and memory are intrinsic to experiencing both architectural and cinematic space. Bruno (2002) discusses this kind of emotional mapping in her book *Atlas of Emotion*. The landscape, real and cinematic, is embedded with meaning, memories and personal journeys. Bruno (2002) likens the experience of moving through a cinematic space to that of the changing of perspective when walking through a Baroque Garden. Architecture and garden design open up to

the viewer through the shifting perspective that allows the spectator to penetrate them, a quality they according to Bruno (2002) share with cinema. Bruno (2002, p. 56) gives the example of Sergei Eisenstein claiming 'the filmic path is the modern equivalent of an architectural itinerary'. She describes (2002, p. 27) how in the symbiotic relationship between the real city and cinematic counterpart 'a sense of place is actively produced by a constellation of imaginings, which includes films, but those shot on location as well as those that fabricate their mise-en-scène.' Bruno (2002, p. 28) argues that process of creating a city onscreen 'creates a sense of geography' activating the city as much on screen as on the street. This reciprocal relationship of architecture and cinema is somewhat problematic in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. From the start the viewer is made aware, with the help of landmarks and voiceover, that the film takes place in Helsinki. Yet Kivimäki remains separate from the bustle of Helsinki life, woven into the fabric of the capital but removed from it. In the film's case a city portrayal becomes more a portrait of a time.

Aimo wanders around the courtyards and parks where he played as a child; climbing and jumping through Kivimäki he relives childhood memories by reconstructing his boyhood games. He takes an unconventional route cutting through gardens with a familiarity that suggests he used to do this before he moved away from Kivimäki. Aimo climbs sheds and checks if he can still fit through the broken fence he did when he was a child. This walking tour of his childhood memories inspires him to run and join in on games with the neighbourhood children. Despite having been away for 13 years he only needs to return to the old neighbourhood to be reminded of his experiences there. Like Quintilian's theory, as cited in Bruno (2002, p. 220) of film functioning architecturally, one populating each room of a house with a memory that can be revisited through moving this mental landscape, Aimo walks through a landscape embedded with memories of his childhood. He moves through Kivimäki ducking and weaving, climbing and tracing a choreography of movement from his boyhood days. His recollections draw a personal map of the area, Jarva filming the act of mapping a city or rather finding 'moments that lurch out unexpectedly, revealing traces of the invisible city, which, as Alexander Kluge once said, is 'the urban structure... lodged between our nerves, feelings, knowledges.' (Lyssiotis and McQuire 2000 p. 6). When Aimo points a camera at the area he documents both present and past Kivimäki, simultaneously capturing a moment of his personal history. Aimo's physical journey through his childhood memories recalls Svetlana Boym's (2001, p. 80) statement that 'memory resides in moving, traversing, cutting through place, taking detours.' Aimo's handheld camera captures the intimate shifts and sprints of his body moving through

the space. The physical choreography of his memories are captured on film as he films his own personal map of Kivimäki.

Walter Benjamin (1985) wrote about the flâneur, an urban wanderer, and cinema's capacity to capture a city's topography. In the notes Benjamin (1985, p.179) writes about the possibilities of film functioning as a map, of providing an alternative method of navigation. Benjamin considers cinema's potential to disenchant the city, aid navigation and make the city legible. On the other hand Benjamin (1985, p. 298) writes of the playful relationship between the city and film. Graeme Gilloch (2007, p. 118) describes how in Benjamin's view, 'film participates in and sustains these intricate games of metropolitan hide-and seek, forms of playfulness between architecture, space, body and image.' In *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*, Aimo takes on the role of a cinematic flâneur playfully exploring his city. He chooses the same paths he took as a child, squeezing through fences, zigzagging between trees and climbing over obstacles. He takes the unofficial pathways of Kivimäki, shortcuts known only to insiders who live there. There is a sense of ease and playfulness in the way Aimo interacts with the space, touching it, speeding up to a run when he is excited. He plays games with it and invites the viewer along. This act recomposes and reconfigures the city as a web of paths, a highly physical environment to navigate through.

Bruno (2002, p. 56) writes about this experience of a body's movement in film:

This relation between film and the architectural ensemble involves an embodiment, for it is based on the inscription of an observer in the field. Such an observer is not a static contemplator, a fixed gaze, a disembodied eye/I. She is a physical entity, a moving spectator, a body making journeys in space.

As Aimo dashes through the buildings and editing speeds up, the viewer not only observes the body moving through space, but becomes embodied within the motion. The architecture of Kivimäki is experienced through the movement of those inhabiting it, views unfold simultaneously to the walker and the viewer. Architecture takes on a third dimension, as the camera circles around corners revealing the form of the building. Aimo's reveals Kivimäki's back gardens and shortcuts to the viewer. Like de Certeau, Henri Lefebvre (1991) drew attention to architecture's relation to the body in revealing the lived experience. In *The Production of Space* Lefebvre (1991, p.137) wrote 'architecture produces living bodies, each with its own distinctive traits. The animating principle of such a body, its presence, ... reproduces itself within those who

use the space in question, within their lived experience'. This kind of intimate navigation involving the cinematic space, the characters and the camera, literally adds depth to the way architecture is experienced in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. The lived experience of Kivimäki comes alive in the film through movement, memories and personal histories. This personal embodied personal map of Kivimäki is soon replaced by a wholly different type of perspective on the area.

The sequence of Aimo filming Kivimäki is immediately followed by another type of lens. The dumpy level of the surveyor is measuring the same streets. The architectural tool, which is set on a static tripod to ensure a level reading, has a very different function and viewpoint to the area. These two lenses illustrate Michel de Certeau's (2011) division of planned and lived space, as mentioned in chapter 2. The surveyor's lens shows the measurements of the city, whereas Aimo's handheld viewpoint meandering through the buildings captures the experience of walking in the city. The city the surveyors and building company sees is drastically different from the viewpoint held by those who use the space.

6.2 Drawing a map

The connection of urban space, memory and movement was a theme that had already received scholarly interest in the 1960s. Strategies of navigation and anchoring oneself to the surrounding world is explored in Kevin Lynch's (1960) book *The Image of the City*. Lynch (1960) studied how people take in information from the city by interviewing people in Boston, Jersey City and Los Angeles. Lynch (1960) asked people to describe their cities and draw maps of them. From the different mental maps produced, Lynch (1960) identified five common elements that people used to form mental maps; paths, edges, districts, nodes and landmarks. These were the shared basic elements that were used to communicate location and the immediate surroundings. Each map was different, relying on personal memories, daily walks, favourite spots or views, but they were communicated by using the same set of elements. The mental maps people carry were subjective and based on individual experience. The more familiar the interviewee was with the area, the more detailed map they could draw. Whilst Lynch (1960) writes about the American city, his observations on the individual experience of the citizen are applicable to any urban environment. Like Lefebvre Lynch (1960, p. 2) draws attention to people and movement of the city:

‘moving elements in the city, and in particular the people and their activities, are as important as the stationary physical parts. We are not simply observers of this spectacle, but are ourselves a part of it, on the stage with other participants. Most often our perception of the city is not sustained, but rather partial, fragmentary, mixed with other concerns. Nearly every sense is in operation, and the image is the composite of them all.’

Jarva weaves together these partial and fragmentary perceptions of space to provide the viewer with a map of Kivimäki. By following the pedestrians the spectator becomes familiar with the street grid, being able to draw out the paths of the area. It is clear when the viewer is within the district of Kivimäki, although we never see its edges. The camera continues to come back to the landmark of the central hill, both looking down from the hill and from street level looking up. Most importantly these elements are connected together by showing their relation to one another. Rather than separate points they are edited together to form a cohesive map of the area, joining the dots on a mental map. As Lynch (1960, p. 1) notes ‘At every instant, there is more than the eye can see, more than the ear can hear, a setting or a view waiting to be explored. Nothing is experienced by itself, but always in relation to its surroundings, the sequences of events leading up to it, the memory of past experiences.’ The viewer recognises the hill, a familiar landmark, from Aimo’s window. The camera pan later brings us to a different vantage point from that same hill, showing the space from several perspectives. On a third instance we hear music coming from the same hill. Once the camera is on the street, the spectator might remember what is behind them. Most importantly, the viewer knows where everyone lives. In a similar way to Lynch’s (1960) interviewees enriching their mental maps with memories of people and events, the viewer of *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* develops a not only a sense of place, but of neighbourhood. As Lynch (1960, p. 1) writes ‘every citizen has had long associations with some part of his city, and his image is soaked in memories and meanings.’ Similarly Jarva is able to create an environment that is soaked in memories.

Whilst Kivimäki is an environment that becomes familiar and easy to navigate in the course of the film, Kake’s high-rise area is quite a different matter. Aimo wanders on the wide dirt road looking up at the identical glass towers unable to find a landmark or a distinctive feature that would place him on a map. The identical buildings, containing identical homes give little guidance on how to navigate the space. Aimo is unable to locate his friend’s home and is able to get to his destination only after Kake locates himself by waving from a window. This issue of missing landmarks or identifying

qualities was an actual issue in the newly developed high-rise areas: as Standertskjöld (2011, p. 70) recalls houses being colour coded to ease the locals finding their way home. Kivimäki's familiarity, memories and ease of movement are again pitted against the very lack of these qualities in the high-rise suburbs.

This effect is further underlined with the example of a blind man navigating through Kivimäki. When hearing that the familiar environment is under threat of demolition the man remarks 'these are the only places I can see my way'.¹⁶⁶ Later a man measuring Kivimäki's terrain asks for direction to a cafe and the blind resident gives exact directions that rely heavily on visual clues. 'Do you see that green building, some 100 meters to the right and there is a sign.'¹⁶⁷ Continuing on his way the man bumps into a dumpy level that is left in the middle of his usual path. The character emphasises the embodied experience of seeing a space, of knowing one's way home. Lynch (1960) writes about wayfinding meaning all the ways in which people or animals orient themselves in physical space or use to aid in navigation. 'A consistent use and organization of definite sensory cues from the external environment' is how Lynch (1960, p. 3) describes this act of intimate navigation. Citing examples of Maori navigating on the sea using the shifting perspective of island constellations, or Eskimo finding their way in icy landscapes, Lynch (1960, p. 138) discusses how through sensitive reading of the environment makes navigation possible in challenging conditions. This type of wayfinding is one that intimately ties the human to their environment, a link that goes beyond the information that sight can provide. It is also what is at stake for the blind man if Kivimäki is torn down.

'The film adopts our proprioception,' Barker (2009, p. 81) argues, 'the sense we have of our bodies in space; it may confirm it or thwart it by its own movements, but always it is indebted to it'. The blind man makes this type of embodied experience of cinematic space visible. As he has not seen Kivimäki, but knows it intimately, the viewer can navigate a fictional place with ease. The physical way he moves and senses surroundings in the cinematic plain recalls Bruno's (2002, p. 6) comment, 'as a function of the skin, then, the haptic - the sense of touch - constitutes the reciprocal *contact* between us and the environment, both housing and extending communicative interface. But the haptic is also related to kinesthesia, the ability of our bodies to sense their own

¹⁶⁶ 'ainoat paikat missä näen kulkea'

¹⁶⁷ 'Näettekö tuon viheän talon, siitä oikealle noin sata metriä ja siinä kyllä lukee.'

movement in space.’ The blind man, Aimo and the spectator are anchored to Kivimäki through their bodies, their experience and the personal maps that are drawn on film.

7. CONCLUSION

It is clear Kivimäki is a relational space embedded with history and memories. Its people form a closely knit community that comes together in the yard and taking active part in each others lives. Its inhabitants range in age from children to pensioners all in the same environment, sharing their everyday lives. Figures of authority are among the people, supporting the life of the citizens. The police officers are approachable and informal. One police officer has a dog trailing behind her off the lead as she patrols the streets of Kivimäki. The spectator is allowed to see into the personal life of the police officer, to the extent of inspecting her underwear drawer. In similar fashion the priest has a work meeting on a park bench, among the people. Both police and priests are not seen as representatives of a larger organisation, but seem to be working out of genuine concern for the wellbeing of the people of Kivimäki. The services provided in Kivimäki are limited to Kake’s grocery store and a cafe. There are no luxury items, cars or designer goods. These are only shown in Kake’s high-rise home. Kivimäki is a working class microcosm that shows a community made up of fallible but loveable individuals.

‘Its people are caricatures, but the feeling that filters through the film is far from superiority or scorn for these people; it radiates understanding towards all the shapes and variations of humanity. These people might be far from perfect: they are drunks, lazy, cheats, liars, gossips, conmen and each have their own quirks, but precisely these give them a human edge’¹⁶⁸

is how Sakari Toiviainen (1983, p. 267) described the inhabitants of Kivimäki. The characters are a variation of qualities, each very human in their weaknesses. But their personal failings, like alcoholism, are grounds for comedy not drama. The struggles of a wife to keep her husband sober is a comedic game of cat-and-mouse. Away from the pastel coloured idyll of Kivimäki, the homeless drunks might be less sympathetic. In the

¹⁶⁸ ‘Sen ihmiset ovat pilapiirrustustasoa, mutta elokuvasta suodattuva tunne on kaukana ylemmydentunnosta tai halveksunnasta näitä ihmisiä kohtaan; siitä henkii ymmärtämystä inhimillisyyden kaikkia muotoja ja muunnelmia kohtaan. Nämä ihmiset saattavat olla kaukana täydellisestä: he juopottelevat, laiskottelevat, pettävät, valehtelevat, juoruavat, huijaavat ja tekevät kukin omia omituisuuksiaan, mutta juuri siksi heidät tunnistaa jotalkin särmältään eläviksi.’

modern suburb of *Vihreä leski* Helinäs occasional drinking acts as a reminder of the social problems and marginalisation of the area. Here they are characters among others living life in Kivimäki. Not marginalised, not condemned, just playing their part in everyday life. Jarva depicts the social problems in a comedic and optimistic light, in the same way as he leaves out the dilapidated reality of Puu-Vallila. Practical considerations are left out of the film and modern developments can safely take the role of an antagonist threatening the traditional way of life that Kivimäki represents.

Despite conjuring a fairytale world that is somewhat removed from reality, the way Jarva creates the structure of his cinematic city is worth noting. The overt criticism of the high-rise suburban lifestyle is coupled with a more subtle aversion to modernism. Jarva rejects the camera as the city's mechanic eye, moving to the beat of the metropolis. Instead he approaches the city to the swaying gait and clip-clop of a horse. As opposed to functionalism, which emphasised efficiency and measurement, Jarva displays the dumpy level as a visiting curiosity that is juxtaposed with a handheld camera moving freely within the space. *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* becomes a counterargument to the direction of urban development in Finland. As Sakari Toiviainen (1983, p. 263) writes:

‘the film reminds us of the irreplaceable value of a the human-centric way of life and the disappearing environment, and points to the possibility of a future worthy of a human being, despite the standardising and perverting bulldozer that is city planning.’¹⁶⁹

Jarva captures the fears and anxieties of a generation in the midst of urbanisation, whilst alluding to a safe nostalgia of a past way of life. In his attempt to connect with the audience Jarva invites them to share a safe cinematic home as refuge in a rapidly changing world. This rejection of the high-rise milieu and lifestyle is continued in the next chapter in a very different cinematic style as we move on to the social realism of Jaakko Pakkasvirta's *Jouluksi kotiin*.

¹⁶⁹ ‘elokuva muistuttaa ihmiskeskeisen elämänmuodon ja katoamassa olevan ympäristön korvaamattomista arvoista ja viittaa ihmisarvoisen elämän mahdollisuuteen myös tulevaisuudessa, kaupunkisuunnittelun yhdenmukaistavasta ja vinouttavasta jyrästä huolimatta.’

Brick by Brick: Building a haptic home in *Jouluksi kotiin*

*'It had always been decided it has to be a detached house.
Having seen and worked on the high-rises - no, I couldn't live like that.'*¹⁷⁰

Urho Suominen, *Jouluksi kotiin* (*Home for Christmas*)

dir. Jaakko Pakkasvirta 1975

Another film from the same year as *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* also rejects the suburbs and features a quest for a more personal home. Whilst Jarva's film was a commercial success, Jaakko Pakkasvirta's film *Jouluksi kotiin* from the same year was released to a small audience, but gained critical acclaim. According to Uusitalo (1999) the film gathered only 5,000 viewers, but despite the low box office figures it won the Jussi-award for best direction. Pakkasvirta's social realism did not sell many tickets, but its pared down aesthetic and social message gained praise and positive reviews (Uusitalo 1999). *Jouluksi kotiin* tells the story of a Finnish family desperately trying to build their own home. The family comprises father Urho Suomalainen who works at a building site, mother Sirkka who works at a factory, and their two children. As financial pressures begin to mount the physical labour of building the house begins to take a toll on Urho. His mission of having a new home for his family ready by Christmas takes over his life and consumes him. The first shot of *Jouluksi kotiin* is of the family silently watching the branches of a pine tree burn. This becomes an eerie premonition of how the dream of being home by Christmas develops in the film. It is as if the family were watching their Christmas tree turn into cinder.

¹⁷⁰ 'Kun se nyt on aina ollut päätetty, että omakotitalo sen pitää olla. Siinä kun on katellut ja ollut tekemässä tornitaloa - ei sitä meikäläinen osaisi olla.'

Jouluksi kotiin approaches architecture, space and the process of building in several ways. On one hand it depicts the physical act of building itself. Attention is drawn to the building process through close-ups that show Urho laying bricks or tarring the roof. The settings for this encompass both the domestic building project and the construction site where Urho works. Secondly the film deals with the intimate psychology of creating a home and claiming a space in the world. Here the close-ups of hands, dirt, dust and rising bodyheat evoke the haptic and are connected with Urho's childhood memories. It develops imagined spaces that do not exist yet, but are yearned for. Thirdly it places Urho's building project into a wider historical and political framework of the changing architecture of the city, the abandoned countryside and Urho's role as a member of the SKP (Finnish Communist Party).

Through this examination *Jouluksi kotiin* is able to move quite literally between the spaces of the private and public, the domestic and cityscape, whilst highlighting how urbanisation has irrevocably changed the everyday life of Finns. It chronicles Urho's rejection of high-rise homes and the welfare nation as a whole, whilst displaying a nostalgia for a lost time. While these themes have also been prominent in earlier chapters of the thesis, *Jouluksi kotiin* approaches the topic of suburban housing from a strong political standpoint. Questions of social equity and the plight of the workers are as much present within the film as they were in the aftermath of its reception in 1975. 'It is not only leftist, but it is extreme leftist'¹⁷¹ wrote Leo Stålhammar (1975a) about the film. *Jouluksi kotiin* offers a class conscious perspective to the building other Finnish suburbs. As such the film also serves as an introduction to the rise of leftist filmmaking in Finland in the 1970s.

1. POLITICAL FILMMAKING AND WORKER'S FILMS

1.1 Leftist cinema

In the 1970s cultural debate in Finland had drifted away from the radicalism and liberalism of the 1960s. The political focus moved towards questioning capitalism and the class system which was seen to determine an individual's place in society (Pantti 1999a, p. 131). The Finnish Film Foundation's hopes for a socially conscious film culture was realised when filmmakers rediscovered the roots of the class war and began portraying the lives of the working class (Pantti 1999a, p. 131). Pantti (1995, p.

¹⁷¹ 'Se ei ole vain vasemmistohenkinen, vaan lisäksi ääri vasemmistolainen.'

195) argues that this wave of political filmmaking was heralded by Jaakko Pakkasvirta's 1970 film *Kesäkapina* (*Summer Rebellion*), which attempted to expose the ideological power structure of society and answer Godard's challenge of making film politically. The overtly political film broke away from the traditional narrative style with its combination of interviews, adverts and monologues. Films such as Mikko Niskanen's *Kahdeksan surmanluotia* (*Eight Deadly Shots*) (1973), Erkki Kivikoski's *Laukaus tehtaalla* (*A Shot in the Factory*) (1973), Risto Jarva's *Yhden miehen sota* (*One Man's War*) (1973) and Eija-Elina Bergholm's *Marja pieni!* (*Poor Maria!*) (1972) followed on the path of political cinema. These socially critical films showed 'the working classes as victims of an alienating and oppressive system'¹⁷² and overtly condemned the political and economic system that created these conditions (Pantti 1999a, p. 132). All of the films mentioned share a focus on a downtrodden individual trying to better their situation, but failing miserably. They deal with social issues such as the poverty, emptying countryside, worker's rights and the plight of the small business owner. As in *Jouluksi Kotiin*, the protagonist is a hardworking individual trying to improve their life against the overwhelming odds. Jarva's *Yhden miehen sota* also follows a man working on the suburban construction site in search of a brighter future for his family. Unlike *Jouluksi kotiin*, the film refrains from commenting on urbanisation or suburban housing, but the pressures and plight of the working man are shared themes. Though the films were trying to engage with the audience in a new way, the audience was not responding to this socially critical style of filmmaking (Pantti 1999a, p. 133). As the films became darker, more serious and political the audience numbers continued to drop (Pantti 1999a, p. 133).

1.2 Pakkasvirta as political filmmaker

Jouluksi Kotiin was produced by Filmi-työ Oy, which Pakkasvirta had founded in 1970 with Jukka Mannerkorpi, Otto Donner and Katri Siikarla (Uusitalo 1999, p. 230). The film received 220,000 Finn marks of state support for the production of the film and a further 70,000 Finn marks after the film's release (Uusitalo 1999, p. 230). Pakkasvirta had been planning the film for three years and was looking to finance it through his three-year artist's grant received from the state (Anon 1975, p. 13). Pakkasvirta first applied for state funding for the film in 1973 and the application was successful, however Minister Marjatta Väänänen from the Centre Party froze the funds and pushed back the filmmaking for a year (Anon 1975, p. 13). When applying for funding

¹⁷² 'työläiset kuvataan vieraannuttavan ja sortavan järjestelmän uhreina'

Pakkasvirta had argued that the film would reach a broader audience through its engagement with the worker's movement (Jokinen 1975). The film's engagement with the working classes went beyond the fictive narrative of the film, as Pakkasvirta wrote the script of the film with a carpenter Väinö Pennanen, who was drawing on experiences in his own life (Anon 1975). Pakkasvirta had also reached out to labour unions to drum up support for his film (Jokinen 1975, p. 13). The Rakennustyöläisten liitto¹⁷³ had agreed to recommend the film to all of its members and advertise the film at the workplace (Jokinen 1975, p. 13). The film was not only about portraying the working class, but also reaching the working class as an audience. These promotional strategies were seen as necessary due to the film's political leanings and the fact that it was struggling with film distributors (Jokinen 1975, p. 13). 'The film industry is well known for its good memory and long anger, and Pakkasvirta's role in recent film political debate has been so prominent that the vengeance of these circles might have well been sparked'¹⁷⁴ speculated Jokinen in the Communist *Tiedonantaja* magazine (1975). *Jouluksi kotiin* faced difficulties in its distribution and had its Helsinki premier pushed to the same week as the ice hockey World Cup, again raising criticism for the distributor's strategy. 'Nothing would be as delightful for Suomi-Filmi than if Pakkasvirta's film would not succeed at all'¹⁷⁵ claimed Jokinen (1975, p. 13). This political nature of the film was highlighted even further when the press reception of the film followed party political lines, right opposed and left supported (Jokinen, 1976). Pakkasvirta's film showed the difficulty of making a political leftist film in Finland and getting it distributed. Though winning the Jussi-prize for best director, *Jouluksi Kotiin* was only seen by some 5000 viewers. Similarly to Risto Jarva's move away from social realist drama after his film *Yhden miehen sota*, after *Jouluksi Kotiin* Pakkasvirta turned to historical period dramas such as *Runoilija ja muusa (Poet and Muse, 1978)* and *Pedon merkki (Sign of the Beast, 1981)*. Toiviainen (2008) argues that it was Pakkasvirta's bleak portrayal of the working man in *Jouluksi kotiin* that pushed the socially critical leftist filmmaking to breaking point and marked an end for the genre.

¹⁷³ Construction Workers' Union

¹⁷⁴ 'Jouluksi kotiin tulee luultavasti tarvitsemaan tätä rakentajien tukea. Elokuvan liikeala on nimittäin tunnetusti hyvämuistinen ja pitkävihainen, ja Pakkasvirran rooli viimeaikaisessa elokuvapoliittisessa keskustelussa on ollut sen verran merkittävä, että näiden piirien kostonhalu on saattanut hyvinkin herätä.'

¹⁷⁵ 'Mikään ei olisi esim. Suomi-Filmille iloisempi asia kuin se, että Pakkasvirran filmi ei alkuunkaan menestyisi.'

2. THE ACT OF BUILDING

2.1 Building in the 1970s

As discussed in the previous chapter, the 1970s in which *Jouluksi kotiin* was made and released saw drastic changes occur in Finnish society and its way of life. Elina Standertskjöld (2011, p. 63) lists the 1973 oil crisis, the following depression and growing unemployment as social issues that shook Finland in the mid 1970s. This era also saw the consequences from a law that was passed in 1969 devised to actively limit agriculture. Standertskjöld (2011, p. 64) describes how this attempt to limit agricultural oversupply effectively resulted in 'a structural change that emptied out entire villages in Northern and Eastern Finland.'¹⁷⁶ The resulting wave of migration to growth centres in Southern Finland gave housing projects a sense of urgency. Standertskjöld (2011, p. 66) argues that these political and social changes along with the atmosphere of the 1970s that emphasised a communal way of life affected architectural trends and aided the development of urban planning.

In a similar style to Koski's monologue in *Yksityisalue*, *Jouluksi kotiin* addresses this process of urbanisation directly. Urho describes the ever-changing cityscape and abandoning of the countryside in search of work in a monologue as he drives past high-rise housing. This monologue is accompanied by single shot that pans out from pedestrians and an idyllic row of small wooden houses to reveal a row of housing blocks parallel to the older buildings. Next the camera reveals cars and towering high-rises in the distance. It becomes a visual history of change, which eventually leaves the people in the picture dwarfed and surrounded by metal and concrete. The continuous unedited pan adds to the effect of change and the passing of time. It serves as a visual representation of both change in architectural styles and a representation of the ever expanding parameters of urban development.

This pan echoes what Saarikangas (2004, p. 46) writes of the 1960s building boom: 'the aesthetic ideal became mixing long lamella houses with tower blocks'.¹⁷⁷ Saarikangas (2004) also notes that during this time cars and traffic began to dominate the design process more and more as the regulations of import cars were lifted. The slow pan compactly represents all of Saarikangas' (2004) points about the changing

¹⁷⁶ 'Rakennemuutos tyhjensi Pohjois- ja Itä-Suomessa kokonaisia kyliä'

¹⁷⁷ 'Esteettiseksi ihanteeksi tuli pitkien lamellitalojen ja korkeiden tornitalojen yhdistäminen.'

cityscape, the long houses teamed with tower blocks and parking lots. Urho's feelings of the changing cityscape were very much reality at the time.

As discussed in chapters one, as the speed and scale of the suburban housing developments began to grow the quality of work began to suffer. Standertskjöld (2011, p. 66) argues that by the 1970s the size, design and layouts for the Finnish suburbs were determined by the profit margins of factories, that produced the concrete elements used in building. This trend, picked up early on in 1962 by Kurkvaara in the film *Yksityisalue* had gradually gotten worse as years passed. Standertskjöld (2011, 67) goes as far to claim that the reason for building large suburbs at once was down to maximising profit for the building companies and even the placement of houses in even rows was due to optimising the axis of building cranes. It is therefore no wonder Standertskjöld (2011, p. 66) calls this a time when 'quantity took over quality'.¹⁷⁸ This way of building quite strikingly leaves out a key element of the suburbs, its inhabitants. These new monotonous areas even required architects to colour-code the buildings as residents found it impossible to navigate, as Standertskjöld (2011, p. 70) notes. Pakkasvirta makes it abundantly clear that Urho considers the suburban housing of poor quality and places the blame with the developers.

Another narrative strand that has its roots firmly in history is the abandoning of the countryside. As Mäenpää (2004) confirms Finland had gone through rapid urbanisation from the 1960s to the 1970s and the migration was directed towards cities, especially in the south of Finland. This seems to be Urho's personal story as well having migrated to the metropolitan Helsinki area from Kitee in Karjala. Similarly to Helinä in *Yksityisalue*, Urho is a newcomer to the suburban milieu. Urho discusses this change on his way back home and the camera shifts from the cityscape to the decaying buildings of the countryside. He recounts how hopeless it is to find work there and how a plot of land is no longer enough to provide a living. Urho's comments are accompanied by shots of derelict shacks that once were used to house the harvest. Static shots work as snapshots chronicling the abandonment of the countryside. Empty farmhouses become symbols for a lost way of life. The crumbling socialist clubhouse used to be the hub of local activity, now highlights the loss of a lively society and even the socialist ideology that Stoddard (1974, p. 139) argues was the dominant political view in the area.

¹⁷⁸ 'kun määrä korvasi laadun'

Urbanisation has driven Urho and his family into the city leaving behind a crumbling countryside and elderly relatives. The emotional investment into buildings was not present in the urban growth centres of the south. Saarikangas (2004, p. 59) gives insight into the high-rise boom of the period 1965-1975:

‘Idealising efficiency and believing in the new went as far as thinking a building’s lifecycle to be 30 years, after which it would be replaced by new and more modern version. This disregarded the fact that these were people’s homes with memories and experiences, not only easily replaceable commodities.’¹⁷⁹

This sheds light on Urho’s motivation to build a personal and long lasting home. Despite the financial troubles that threaten the build everything about Urho’s project reinforces his ownership of the house. His build is intensely personal, timber brought from his childhood forest, walls built by his own hands. Sitting at the table with his young daughter Urho explains how he has planned every detail of the house. This is in stark contrast to the impersonal tower blocks where residents only have a say regarding the furniture of their flat. Also drastically different is the future planned for Urho’s house. In his monologue he wonders what he is leaving behind for his children. Urho is not building a house to be replaced in 30 years time, but a home for his family and something to leave to the next generation.

These social and architectural developments form the basis upon which *Jouluksi kotiin* builds its narrative that problematises both the high-rises and the individual building projects. Unlike Koski in *Yksityisalue* who begrudgingly complies with developer demands or Helinä of *Vihreä leski* who sees no way out of her life in the suburbs, Urho rejects the ready planned and ready-made homes in favour of his own build. Thus the chapter also adds a new point of access to the theme of the cinematic suburb, that of the process of building. In 1974 the housing boom of Finland reached a record amount of new homes, 73 000, according to Standertsköjld (2011, p. 78) and thousands of Finns were faced with similar decision to Urho’s.

¹⁷⁹ ‘Tehokkuusajattelussa ja uskossa uuteen menttiin niin pitkälle, että rakennusten eliniän ajateltiin olevan vain 30 vuotta, minkä jälkeen ne korvattaisiin uusilla ja ajanmukaisilla. Samalla unohdettiin, että ne ovat myös ihmisten koteja omine muistoineen ja kokemuksineen, eivät vain helposti vaihtettavia kulutushyödykkeitä.’

2.2 Building versus construction

The theme of building naturally remains at the core of the film throughout. But it is not only the process of building Urho's own house that features in the film. *Jouluksi kotiin* juxtaposes two construction sites and their different methodologies. One is Urho's work where he is a part of building high-rise housing blocks, the other is the site where he is building his own house. These sites may be similar in theme but they have a very different feel to them. The construction site is surrounded by other high-rises, whereas Urho's private site is solitary and surrounded by forest. The high-rise site is made of metal and concrete, while Urho's house is built on more old-fashioned materials of wood and bricks. The high-rise site is about construction, whilst Urho's home is about building, quite often with bare hands. If Urho's work would be described as development and construction, his home would be about crafting and building. These words describe divide the projects between public to personal, governed and regulated to intimate and autonomous.

The construction site featured in *Jouluksi kotiin* firmly places Urho in an industrial setting. Popular building materials of the time, concrete and structural metal bars dominate the high-rise building site. At work Urho walks around carrying materials without much noticeable change to the site during the film. He works with metal rods that protrude out from the concrete base with sharp ends. These rods create a jarring and threatening effect on the screen rising like spikes. The way the concrete blocks rise from the ground looks aggressive and alien. The disordered lines take over the entire screen and their scale suggests this chaos continues in all directions outside the frame. Urho stands on top of the clutter and despite his efforts is unable to make a visible difference to his overwhelming surroundings.

This is in great contrast to the building process Urho experiences on his own site. There he works with light-coloured sturdy wood. The difference with the generic metal rods and the wood planks is deepened by the fact that Urho retrieved the material for the planks from his home and cut them at a sawmill himself. The wood that is used to build Urho's home is from trees he grew up around and that were saved for him by his family. The shot of Urho building the foundations for his own home is filled with thick beams, filling the frame and creating an illusion of them carrying on in every direction. They look solid and dependable. Whereas the foundations for the high-rise looked feeble poking their way only halfway across the screen the wooden beams appear as sturdy pillars upon which to build. On his own site Urho is allowed into his structure

instead of merely standing on top of it. On this site Urho's work is constantly making a visible difference to his surroundings. Here he has access to and the ability to transform the space.

2.3 Building the existential space

Of course Urho's quest for his own home plays a more complex role than simply being the antithesis of his working realm. As Pallasmaa (2009, p. 117) writes 'Buildings are not abstract, meaningless constructions or aesthetic compositions, they are extensions and shelters of our bodies, memories, identities and minds.' The intimate way Urho builds his home develops it into an extension of his identity, of his memories.

Pallasmaa (2009, p. 128) describes how:

'In order to distinguish the lived space from physical and geometrical space, it can be called lived, or existential space. Existential space is structured on the basis of meanings and values reflected upon it by an individual or group, either consciously or unconsciously; existential space is a unique experience interpreted through the memory and experience of the individual.'

Urho is creating an existential space upon his meanings and values: when refusing the high-rises he is refusing those values and meanings. He is building an arena for his memories of a time gone past. Preserving a link to the tradition of home, family, building, masculinity, and society. The nostalgia of retrieving wood from the forests where he grew up to build his home or lovingly laying each individual brick become acts of rebellion against the overwhelming rows of indistinguishable block houses. Pallasmaa (2009, p. 12) ties this nostalgia to the loss of the haptic and physical as he argues that 'in earlier modes of life, the intimate contact with work, production, materials, climate and the ever-varying phenomena of nature provided ample sensory interaction with the world of physical causalities.' Pallasmaa (2009, p. 12) continues to argue how the past ways of life 'provided more experiences for the development of a sense of empathy and compassion than today's individualised and molecular life world.' The lack of touch becomes the lack of feeling. Again *Jouluksi kotiin* raises similar themes of memory and longing as *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*, but offering a different solution to the predicament of suburban life.

The losing of touch, feeling and identity in a modernising world calls again investigation into Kortteinen's (1982) research. Kortteinen (1982) found out that people living in the

suburbs indeed were unhappy, but they did not site the design of their environment as the cause. Rather it was a loss of traditional ways of living that were affecting their attitudes. Ossi Lång (2011) summarises how the findings showed that through paid labour and women joining the workforce the structure of society became more family oriented and less reliant on the support of the community of neighbours. Despite a brief initial period of forming social networks the Kortteinen (1982) found that people became more self-reliant and isolated. According to Kortteinen (1982) the effect of the physical environment on its inhabitants is in fact limited. This conclusion has been later disputed as Lång (2011) writes, but the core question of loss of community and identity has stayed at the centre of the discussion regarding suburban life.

In *Jouluksi kotiin* Urho and his family receive support from their Communist Party community, sharing both work and celebration. This is in line with Kortteinen's (1982) finding that increasingly organisations and social clubs took the role of a supporting community in the suburbs. This involvement however is in constant conflict of Urho's goal of building his home. The project takes him away from the community and unable to take part in their events. In either case the Suominen family are at risk being left outside their surrounding community.

3. URHO'S POLITICAL INHERITANCE

3.1 Communist Party

The political community Urho and his family are a part of plays a central role in the film. The Finnish workers' movement is a topic that keeps reoccurring throughout *Jouluksi kotiin*. It is in the background in the SKP (Finnish Communist Party) 1918 logo, in the *Tiedonantaja* newspaper Urho reads, as recollections of political persecution and in the clubhouse he frequents. These strands weave together a fabric of Urho's personal identity, family history, and above all his part in the larger Finnish society of the time. To fully understand the references of social and political history *Jouluksi kotiin* uses, it is essential to be familiar with the development of the workers' movement.

The roots of the workers' movement reach back to the association activity of the mid 19th century, which included temperance associations, sports societies and public education societies (Alapuro and Stenius 1989, p. 43-44). Among the first goals for the workers' movement was to gain equal right to vote and after 1896 the movement began to demand the right to collectively negotiate their position in the work market (Alapuro

and Stenius 1989, p. 31). In 1899 this independent workers' movement formed a political party and in 1903 adopted the name Finnish Social Democratic Party (SDP) with what Upton (1973, p. 105) describes as a revolutionary, Marxist programme, that 'committed the party to an unrelenting pursuit of the class war in every department of its activity.' Alapuro and Stenius (1989, p. 30) claim this emphasis of the class struggle was already present as early as the strikes of 1860s where 'the protests were no longer directed at the officials, who would have been thought to be incapable of securing the traditional rights of the workers'. Now the adversary was the owning class.¹⁸⁰

What had begun as a workers' movement had developed into a political party that in the first election after the parliamentary reform in 1907 gained an overwhelming 80 out of 200 seats (Alapuro and Stenius 1989, p. 40). In 1917 the October revolution in Petrograd transformed the political situation and the Bolshevik regime urged the Finnish socialists to seize power from the then bourgeois parliament, as Upton (1973) claims. This prompted 'the SDP to present a series of radical demands to the new Parliament and proceed to enforce them with a revolutionary general strike' Upton (1973, p. 109). The conflict would continue to escalate further. Upton (1973) explains how both the radicals of the SDP and the bourgeois government developed an arms race culminating in January 1918 when both sides decided to strike and a full-scale civil war erupted. It is in this war that Urho's relatives are killed near the family's rural hometown. Haataja (1977) argues that the white army consisted mainly of educated and wealthy members, whilst approximately half of the red army was farmers and the rest industrial workers and craftsmen. Urho's relatives fought on the side of the reds for a socialist revolution. This divide caused the civil war to also be referred to as a class war. The war ended in May 1918 with the victory parade of the white army in Helsinki (Haataja 1977). Haataja (1977) also notes that the Kansanvaltuuskunta, the governing body of the red side, and thousands of red supporters fled to the Soviet Union. This part of Finnish political history is also mentioned by Urho, as he meets with one of the few remaining communists in his childhood town. Upton (1973, p. 119) describes how shortly after the war in 1918 'the victorious whites had unleashed a massive repression against their defeated enemies'. Upton (1973, p. 119) goes on to claim that 'between seventeen and twenty thousand reds were murdered, judicially executed, or allowed to die of hunger and the disease of malnutrition in prison camps during the course of 1918'. The bitter civil war is a constant presence in *Jouluksi kotiin*; in the background in

¹⁸⁰ 'Protestin kohteena eivät enää olleet viranomaiset, joita olisi pidetty kyvyttöminä turvaamaan työläisten perinteisiä oikeuksia. Nyt vastustajaksi tuli omistava luokka.'

posters, told through flashbacks or voice-over memories narrated by Urho. The larger historical currents are shown from an individual perspective.

After the civil war the Finnish socialists divided into two parties, the communist SKP and the social democratic SDP, according to Haataja (1977). It is SKP that features in *Jouluksi kotiin* as the party supported by the Suominen family. Upton (1973, p. 119) states that upon founding the 'fundamental task of SKP was to establish itself as the leader of workers inside Finland'. Upton (1973, p.122) goes on to note that this was made considerably difficult by the government's security police and a 1921 ruling that SKP was 'a criminal conspiracy and a membership of it a criminal act.' The battle for party existence continued until 1944 when the authorities finally legally registered SKP (Upton 1973). By 1975 when *Jouluksi kotiin* was filmed SKP had 44,117 registered members (Leppänen 1999). Haataja (1977, p. 409) also claims that in the 70s 'there were more professionally and politically organised workers in Finland than ever'.¹⁸¹ Hints of the turbulent political history of the workers' movement and SKP are referred to in *Jouluksi kotiin*. Urho recalls events of the civil war and his father's efforts on the red side, as he travels home drawing memories from specific spots within the landscape. Urho is carrying on the political work of his father as an active member of the Communist Party.

3.2 Workers' clubhouse

The worker's movement clubhouse plays a significant part in the narrative of *Jouluksi kotiin* as the communal hub of action, both social and political. These houses were the centres of the workers' movement that brought together the workers both as an organisation and ideologically (Alapuro and Stenius 1989, p. 42). Hentilä (1989, p. 232) writes that the clubhouses were built by volunteers with the main feature of the improvised design of the building being the main hall and stage, but also often including a library for political texts. In 1905 there were only 47 of these houses in Finland, but by 1910 the amount was 683 and by 1916 to 940 (Alapuro and Stenius 1989, p. 42). The development of the workers' movement grew and developed taking root in the club houses. These houses became symbols for the working classes social, political and cultural unity, also tying them to the workers' movement (Hentilä 1989, p. 235). Alapuro and Stenius (1989, p. 42) go on to note the variety of activities taking

¹⁸¹ 'Ammatillisesti ja poliittisesti järjestäytyneitä työläisiä on Suomessa enemmän kuin koskaan aikaisemmin.'

place in the clubhouses ranging from speeches, plays, singing, poems and public debates to dances. Urho's family takes part in these events and their involvement in the party is as much social as it is political.

The socialist movement split in the 50s these houses were debated over and eventually divided between the two parties with the 40 percent going to the SKP (Tuomisto 2008). *Jouluksi Kotiin* features two of these clubhouses. One is the forgotten and deserted clubhouse left behind in Urho's hometown in Kitee. This abandonment was brought on by the migration to the cities as Urho narrates the images of decaying houses in his old hometown. Solsten and Meditz (1988) describe how the mechanisation of agriculture and forestry meant fewer jobs were available in these traditionally dominant sectors and redundant workers set south to find new work. Before the Second World War three out of four Finns lived in rural areas, but due to the migration by the early 1980s 60 percent of Finns lived in urban areas as Solsten and Meditz (1988) note. Urho himself had been a part of this wave of migration leaving behind his elderly mother, the rural community and the SKP clubhouse of his father. The other SKP clubhouse is an active and vibrant one. It is a space that welcomes Urho and all the members of his family. It is the only space outside the industrial workplace and private space of the home where the family spends time.

The clubhouse is introduced with an exterior shot. It has a traditional design and is built from wood automatically setting it apart from the modernist style of architecture demonstrated elsewhere in the film. The building has a history and tradition that is evident in the stained colour of its walls. The low camera angle emphasises its size as it takes over two thirds of the frame. The structure extends outside the frame on two sides creating massive proportions for the building. It is set amongst trees and nature, retaining the look it would have had when it was built decades ago. From the outside the viewer is invited in, allowing time to develop a general view of the building before moving in.

The traditional and nostalgic aesthetic of the house continues in the interior. The women are positioned behind a counter serving dinner to the men who have been working on the building site all day. The wooden surfaces show signs of wear and flaking paint. Behind the women's busy preparation lurk reminders of past glory. A SKP 1918 plaque is suspended on the wall next to a row of trophies of old sports victories. The background and its historical weight are present, but the hardworking women occupy the foreground. The SKP party past is left looking over from the background as

the action is focused on the table and eye is drawn to the lighter shades of the clothing and containers. The first general view of the building has invited the viewer in and brought them amongst the people, eye-height almost as a participant themselves. The viewer is allowed even further access to the more remote parts of the house, as the camera follows children rummaging around the attic. The surrounding darkness is not threatening after having being familiarised to the other parts of the house. The viewer is allowed to wander through the building and learn to know its rooms creating a similar familiarity and ease to it as the Suominen family experiences as they spend time there.

3.3 SKP headquarters

Political participation and Urho's ideological inheritance in *Jouluksi kotiin* features as a historical burden, a social reality of the everyday party community, and on the more general level of party politics. Urho and his family's SKP group is very communal one. Their friends gather to help them in casting the foundations of the house, followed by sandwiches and a dance at the SKP clubhouse. The other members of the party have a significant role in the family's everyday life. Urho's friend helps him saw the lumber, another borrows his Lada and a group of friends invite him to play in the SKP orchestra. The only part of the party that seems cold and distant is the party politicians. Urho's pleas for help with the mortgage are ignored.

The party office interior is a white concrete bunker. Pakkasvirta's party politics are modernist white, while the communist party clubhouse is a traditional wooden structure. The portrayal of the party headquarters bears resemblance to the Heathcote's (2000, p. 23) comments on how 'the Italian Neo-Realists were among the first to use modern architecture as a kind of cypher for alienation and disenfranchisement, and their work has continued to influence directors, particularly those coming out of England (Ken Loach is the obvious example), who attempt to portray the empty existence of the welfare classes.' Heathcote (2000, p. 24) goes on to note that the 'lairs of the baddies and the bureaucrats are futuristic cities'. In *Jouluksi kotiin*'s party headquarters the lines are angular and harsh with little decorative elements to soften the space. It is distinctly lacking in any political colour or imagery. A lonely houseplant stands in a corner next to the bare furnishings. The party members asking for help are placed in a hallway waiting to be ushered out. They are set aside into this transitional space to be served, not invited to the politician's office. This space and placement mirrors the treatment they receive from the politician, distant though courteous.

'Home for Christmas is undoubtedly a report on mundane realities, which unflinchingly reveals the nature of capitalism, the exploitation and pressure workers daily struggle with'¹⁸² wrote Arkkitehti (1975) in the Communist *Tiedonantaja* magazine. They argued that ideology functions in the film on two levels, as both explicit and symbolic. On an explicit level the film makes references to the class struggle, the difficult and strained position of the worker, Urho's ideology passed down through generations. These are however being challenged by capitalism, pettiness in party politics and Urho's quest for a home for his family. As Pakkasvirta (1975) noted, the process of building one's own house tempts people away from political activism and into the realm of capitalism. Arkkitehti (1975) picks up on this strand as they note that 'it is not very difficult to notice that the brass band in the film represents organised political action, worker's unity for their class, party and ideology. This action Urho Suomalainen moves "into the future", finally from here to eternity.'¹⁸³ Urho loses his way as he is pulled away from party events by his increasingly demanding building project. In his last moments he returns to a flashback to his childhood and home, to the lake where reds were killed in the civil war. These flash backs Arkkitehti sees as Urho's political inheritance: 'from there he received his instrument, which unequivocally represents his responsibility to continue from where the 1918 worker's revolution failed.'¹⁸⁴ This responsibility becomes clear to Urho only in his final moments, and leaves him as Pakkasvirta stated 'an unfulfilled human'.

4. THE WORKER'S BODY

4.1 The Classic Man

As in *Mies, joka sanoi ei*, the body and its relationship to its surroundings is a key theme in *Jouluksi kotiin*. The point of Urho as an unfulfilled human is highlighted as his body fails its task as a builder and as a man. Urho is brought down by pneumonia worsened by the lung problems brought on by his previous work in the mines. His fate becomes one with similar characteristics to what J.P. Roos (1994) associates with the typical Finnish man: existential loneliness, melancholy and inability to communicate.

¹⁸² 'Jouluksi kotiin on epäilemättä arkirealistista tosiolojen raportointia, joka säälimättä paljastaa kapitalismin luonteen, sen riiston ja prässin, jonka alaisena työläinen joutuu päivittäin kamppailemaan.'

¹⁸³ 'Ei tuottane ylivoimaisia vaikeuksia havaita, että elokuvan torvisoittokunta symbolisoi järjestäytyntä poliittista toimintaa, työvään yhteistoimintaa luokkaetujensa puolesta, puoluetta ja sen aatetta. Tämän toiminnan Urho Suomalainen siirtää "tuonnemmaksi", lopulta täältä ikuisuuteen.'

¹⁸⁴ 'Sieltä hän sai perinnöksi soittimensa, joka yksiselitteisesti merkitsee velvollisuutta jatkaa siitä, missä vuoden 1918 työvään vallankumous oli epäonnistunut.'

Mia Spangenberg (2009) claims in her thesis on masculinities in contemporary Finnish fiction and film, that researchers like Roos have 're-legitimized a particular male identity as quintessentially Finnish and have generated a widespread discourse of the Finnish long-suffering man¹⁸⁵ who is ill-equipped to deal with the changing world around him and deserves our sympathy because of it.' DuBois (2005) writes about masculinity in Finnish cinema and the yearning to rediscover one's identity in a contemporary world. *Jouluksi kotiin* certainly places Urho in the role of a likeable hardworking protagonist who gets exceedingly clobbered by life. He is like the classic man Kari Hotakainen (1997, p. 410) describes in his book *Klassikko*:

'Classic men are ripped from the woods or the bar, each one of them are one of the seven brothers or at least know one of the brothers. Some are unknown soldiers, whose fathers or grandfathers fought an unforgettable war, and who now fight a bloodless but brutal war against the unstable interest rates, unpaid home and modern women.'¹⁸⁶

Urho's masculine role develops when he is outside the domestic sphere. This happens when he takes his place as a part of the masculine group of SKP members. Sneaking a sip of alcohol behind the door of a dance or joining the men playing music on stage in a performance watched by women in admiration.

Despite receiving help from his wife and children the building project remains very much Urho's domain. It is a space that he inhabits mostly alone and especially as the film progresses in increasing isolation. Elina Standertskjöld (2011, p. 79) writes 'the Finnish man who had moved from the countryside to the city felt he had been forced to relinquish power over the household to his wife by moving into a suburban flat. In a detached house he could reclaim it through DIY work.'¹⁸⁷ In their attic flat the wife Sirkka takes charge of the domestic space and chores. She ushers the family to the table and towers over Urho as he reads the newspaper. Even the downstairs landlady extends her authority to the privacy of the home. Urho's struggle for space may not

¹⁸⁵ 'suomalainen kärsivä mies'

¹⁸⁶ 'Klassiset miehet on repäisty pystymetsästä tai pystybaarista, heistä jokainen on joku niistä seitsemästä veljeksestä tai ainakin jonkun veljeksen tuttu. Jotkut ovat tuntemattomia sotilaita, joiden isät tai isoisät kävivät mielestä lähtemättömän sodan ja jotka käyvät nyt itse veretöntä mutta raakaa sotaansa heittelehtiviä korkoja, maksamatonta asuntoa ja moderneja naisia vastaan.'

¹⁸⁷ 'Maalta kaupunkiin muuttanut suomalainen mies koki, että oli joutunut luovuttamaan lähiöasunnossa isäntävallan vaimolleen. Omakotitalossa hän saattoi palauttaa sen tee-se-itse-työssä.'

only be about finding footing in the suburbs or society, but perhaps also a quest for his own personal space.

4.2 Failing Body

When Urho is unable to take care of himself he is ordered to bed by his wife who then leaves to work in a factory among heavy machinery. He is visited by his mother who remarks that it is her first time travelling outside her hometown in 20 years. When Urho is confined to the domestic sphere he is surrounded by soft light, a tapestry of fabrics, prints and textures, and women. When he loses control over his body he loses autonomy, his role as the provider of the family and his identity as builder. Juha Siltala (2003, p. 209) examined autobiographical essays by Finnish men and writes about the pride and shame of the Finnish man. 'A man's honor is experienced as physical potency, as being an agent - not a victim. Shame, on the other hand, is equivalent to the loss of one's psychological borders and one's exposure to the eyes of others as a passive victim.' Urho loses his ability to work and participate in his community of SKP activists and effectively his autonomy.

Steve Neale (1993, p.12) writes that in mainstream cinema it is easy enough to find examples of films 'in which the male hero is powerful and omnipotent to an extraordinary degree.' Neale (1993) goes on to note how generally this power and manhood is tested and then qualified. This is a similar narrative to *Jouluksi kotiin* where the male protagonist accepts a challenge that will in this case quite literally mark his place in the community. However Urho fails this test of power and omnipotence as a man. As his physique fails him he seeks comfort in the embrace of his wife, leaning his head on her shoulder. In a reversal to Pakkasvirta's earlier suburban portrayal *Vihreä leski*, which focused on the experience of a suburban housewife, *Jouluksi kotiin* explores the challenges that suburban places on the working man.

The framing of the film emphasises Urho's debilitated role. For most of the film the upper edge of the frame chops off the sky and even the top of the characters' heads. Instead of giving the people headspace it pushes down on them. The characters are weighed down by the frame. The sky is rarely seen and focus is drawn on the ground. As Urho and his friend measure up the site, the heads of the men working are completely framed out of shot. They become active bodies as focus is drawn to the task at hand and the physical performance required to achieve it with a similar single-mindedness the protagonist Urho exhibits. This claustrophobic framing, especially in

the attic apartment, creates a burdened feel for the characters as if they were unable to stand up straight in their home. This crowded framing is only broken at the cemetery when sky takes over the screen and the view stands still and in silence and Urho is laid to rest.

Urho's experiences take a universal scope as he turns into a representative of a larger group through his naming. Urho Suomalainen translates directly into Brave Finn. As Yvonne Bertills (2003, p.1) explains that personal names in literary contexts are 'largely governed by narrative context' and are formed largely to serve 'poetic purposes'. The Brave Finn becomes the everyman, a role enforced by the director Jaakko Pakkasvirta (1975) in subsequent interviews. This does not speak of the truthfulness of Urho's life story or the honesty of the portrayal of high-rise housing in the film. It does however speak of the belief and intention of the film to reach an audience, how ever imagined, of workers and of men pressed by financial restraints and struggling to find their place or community in the new suburbs of Helsinki.

4.3 The Haptic Build

Urho's physicality also plays a significant role in the way Pakkasvirta portrays the building process of his home. The interaction between Urho's body and the build develops the emotional narrative and investment that is instilled in the project. This intimate knowledge of one's home, the relationship between man and his land is communicated to the viewer by evoking a multi-sensory experience of the surroundings.

Vivian Sobchack (1992) outlines theory on the embodied film experience in *The Address of the Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience*. Sobchack (1992, p. 3) argues that 'more than any other medium of human communication, the moving picture makes itself sensuously and sensibly manifest as the expression of experience by experience.' She claims (1992, p. 4) 'cinema uses *modes of embodied existence* (seeing, hearing, physical and reflective movement) as the vehicle, the "stuff", the substance of its language.' Cinema's capacity to transmit experiences through its language, to go beyond seeing and hearing, to touching, smelling, feeling. Sobchack's (1992) approach to the filmic body and embodied viewership was later taken further in the work of Laura Marks (2002, 2000) and Jennifer Barker (2009). Both Marks and Barker examine the ways in which film communicates the experience of touch, smell and taste in the viewer. For Marks (2002) this haptic film theory extends to the material

qualities of the film skin, textures and patterns presented in film which renders the screen a two-dimensional surface. Marks (2000, p. 21) claims this haptic¹⁸⁸ filmic expression is used as the 'language with which to express cultural memory' especially in cases of intercultural cinema. Emphasising its difference from Hollywood narrative film conventions she prefers 'to see haptic as a visual strategy that can be used to describe alternative visual practices, including women's and feminist practices, rather than a feminine quality in particular.' (Marks 2000, p. 170). I argue that the tactile and textual qualities of *Jouluksi kotiin* utilise haptic strategies in their expression, whilst placing emphasis on the construction process. In contrast to feminine qualities often attached to touch, such as softness or subtlety (Marks 2000, p. 169), Pakkasvirta's haptic is a masculine of sweat, dust and rough surfaces.

In *Jouluksi kotiin* the physical aspects of building a house receive more emphasis than the practicalities of building a house. There are no mortgage applications, very little planning or drawing, calculating or comparing materials. Urho's build is one of action, physical strain and working with one's hands. The shot of laying bricks has a tactile quality. The contours of the hand, the fingers pressing into the soft wet cement and rough texture of the bricks can be sensed through the visual. Marks writes (2000, p.162) 'haptic perception is usually defined by psychologists as the combination of tactile, kinesthetic, and proprioceptive functions, the way we experience touch both on the surface of and inside our bodies. In haptic visuality, the eyes themselves function like organs of touch.' Without sensing touch on their skin the viewer can understand how and what the builder is feeling as he feels the texture and weight of the brick in his hand. The function of the shot is not simply informative nor reflective of the revival of red bricks enjoyed in the late 1970s taking over the earlier white and grey aesthetic (Saarikangas 2004). It is about the sensation of building a home, the dialogue between callused hands and coarse bricks. It illustrates the ownership and intimate bond Urho can claim to a house he has so painstakingly built himself, each brick in the walls of his home having passed through his hands.

Marks (2000, p. 162) describes how haptic looking 'tends to move over the surface of its object rather than to plunge into illusionistic depth, not to distinguish form so much as to discern texture.' *Jouluksi kotiin* begins with a shot in which texture takes

¹⁸⁸ deriving from the Greek word to touch and generally referring to communication through touch, smell or taste

a central role. A series of mid-shots linger on the faces of the family as they stand together watching a pine branches burn. The smoke rising from the flames distorts the focus of the shot, abstracting their faces and at times enveloping the entire screen in a grey haze. It both renders the screen a flat surface entirely made up of texture. The swirling smoke and crackling sound of the fire also evokes the physical experience of standing next to burning wood. When the smoke fills the screen the viewer is reminded of the physical sensation of burning eyes and the smell and taste of smoke. The smoke renders the screen flat whilst evoking a haptic experience.

'Cinema itself appeals to contact - to embodied knowledge, and to the sense of touch in particular- in order to recreate memories' (Marks 2000, p. 162). A scene in which Urho returns to his rural hometown to gather timber from his childhood forest shows the process of sawing planks. As the tree trunks are guided through the blades clouds of sawdust rise from the machine. The particles float in the air whilst a voiceover of Urho reminisces about childhood summers working at the lumber mill. As a viewer Urho's memories blend with personal memories the viewer might have of what freshly sawn timber smells like. There is an intimacy in the scene that echoes Marks' (2000, p. 130) writings 'senses that are closer to the body, like the sense of touch, are capable of storing powerful memories that are lost to the visual. Senses whose images cannot be recorded (...) are repositories of private memory.' Through these examples of haptic cinema the viewer is given intimate access to Urho's physical experiences and his emotional landscape. Shots where sawdust, dirt, sweat and body heat float in the air emphasise the physical strain of building a house. In other scenes the haptic is joined with reminiscing to evoke memories, sharing an intimate moment with the viewer. As Marks (2000 p. 111) notes, 'sense memories are most fragile to transport, yet most evocative when they can be recovered.' The qualities of the haptic to evoke memory, texture and the senses together not only draw up Urho's past memories, but illustrate how new memories are literally being built into his home.

4.4 Tools and the hand

Another perspective on Urho's physical build is opened by analysing the physical process of the build itself. Urho's build is decidedly low-tech, using a tape measure and sticks to determine the size of rooms or chopping wood with a small axe. Pallasmaa (2009) has written on the act of working with one's hands, of crafting and creating something. Pallasmaa (2009, p.47-48) describes the tool as 'an extension and

specialisation of the hand that alters the hand's natural powers and capabilities. When an axe or a sheath knife is being used, the skilled user does not think of the hand and the tool as different and detached entities; the tool has grown to be a part of the hand, it has transformed into an entirely new species of organs, a tool-hand.' The hammers, axes, shovels and trowels of *Jouluksi kotiin* are used with ease and familiarity.

Surprisingly Urho only uses tools at his own building site and none at his work at the construction site. There he merely carries and lifts objects. The intimate bond of using tools is reserved only for the private sphere. 'In the same way that the boundary between the hammer and the hand disappears in the act of hammering, complicated tools such as musical instruments merge with the user's body; a great musician plays himself rather than a separate instrument.' Pallasmaa (2009, p.50) writes. It is fitting that this bond is only shown when creating something as personal and intimate as one's own house. The tools used translate Urho's vision of home, identity and his values into physical reality. By drawing attention to this process and use of tools through numerous lingering closeups the film makes the build a highly emotional and personal venture. It also further differentiates the process of crafting a home from the massive construction projects which Urho is a part of at work.

This significance of the build itself gains another level of importance when Urho returns to his childhood home to reclaim the last part of his inheritance in the form of forest. He takes the forest of his youth and turns it into timber in order to literally create the framework of a home for his own children. As the timber is erected the logs protruding from the earth look like a forest. It is as if Urho uprooted the memories and traditions of his childhood and attempted to plant them into a new location. Echoing Kortteinen's (1982) interviews of suburban dwellers missing the traditions and lifestyle they lost to urbanisation, Urho himself is trying to replant his history to a new land. His decision to do so using traditional building methods is also notable. As Pallasmaa (2009, p. 51-52) recounts 'in my country numerous traditional specialised crafts- such as the building of traditional church boats, basket making, burning of pine tar, restoration of buildings and objects, and painting of imitation materials in buildings- were lost in the period of euphoric industrialisation of the 1960s and 1970s.' In *Jouluksi kotiin* these traditional crafts are shown drawing attention to their process and details, including specifically the burning of tar Pallasmaa (2009) mentions.

Another aspect of the craft of building a home that Pallasmaa (2009, p. 15) brings up is that of muscle memory as he writes: 'Learning a skill is not primarily founded on verbal teaching but rather on the transference of the skill from the muscles of the teacher

directly to the muscles of the apprentice through the act of sensory perception and bodily mimesis.’ This muscle memory inhabits Urho as he builds his home. A memory not transferred on to new generations, as the irate Urho asks his child to stop trying to help with the building. A nostalgia present in the grains of the wood from his homelands, in the memory of his muscles. These skills are unable to find use in the modern world of concrete construction sites. A way of life and craft that no longer has space or need. The role of his body is highlighted through framing out the head or cropping the face. When showing Urho work, the tools are at the centre of the frame showing only parts of his body that are actively taking part in the work. The expressions on his face are irrelevant when the body is at work.

These filmic strategies draw attention to the physicality of the build, the embodied experience of materials, using tools, Urho’s body and identity as a man. In *Jouluksi kotiin* the haptic takes on a masculine quality as it depicts sweat, grime and body heat rising from men working. The haptic communicates memories of Urho’s rural roots and provides the viewer with intimate insight to his life. These strategies that highlight Urho’s body and his use of tools also position him as a worker. They serve as a reminder that as a manual labourer his livelihood is reliant on body. True to the film’s left-leaning politics *Jouluksi kotiin* depicts the embodied experience of the working man.

5. FRAMING THE WORKER

5.1 A working class film

Jaakko Pakkasvirta (1975, p. 19) described *Jouluksi kotiin* as a story of an ‘unfulfilled human’. Pakkasvirta (1975) argued that this unhappiness is caused by the hard working conditions and disconnected experience of the working classes caused by capitalism. As the film follows the protagonist Urho Suomalainen’s struggle to build a home for his family these political themes become increasingly overt. In *Filmifriikki*’s 1975 interview Pakkasvirta describes *Jouluksi kotiin* protagonist Urho Suomalainen as working class and demonstrating common challenges experienced by his class. Pakkasvirta (1975, p. 45) even describes how the unfinished houses of the working class, like that of Urho’s, ‘highlight the oppressed workers’ desperate and detached

life.¹⁸⁹ *Jouluksi kotiin* is clearly defined by Pakkasvirta (1975) as a film that deals with working class life and culture. The struggle of the working class, the party politics and yearning for one's own home come together in a portrait of a man at the end of his tether. Paradoxically the question of ownership becomes central to *Jouluksi kotiin*. The Finnish word *omakotitalo*, or detached house, is directly translated into own-home-house. As Urho says as he passes the rows of multi-storey dwellings, 'it must be a detached house'.¹⁹⁰ He goes on to criticise the sound proofing of new high-rises and the greed of developers that he feels are building a brand new slums. Urho is apprehensive of the high-rises and of cramming people to live on top of one another like a stack of boxes. However Urho's dream of privately owned property leads him astray and ultimately becomes the reason for his demise.

Sutherland and Feltey (2010 p.20) summarise Marxism thus: 'conflict between classes is focused on control and use of the means of production with struggle between those who labour for a wage and those who derive benefit from the labour of others'. They also describe it as the engine that drives historical development. Through this definition Urho would most certainly be classified as working class. He works in manual labour for his wages and is a part of a political party committed to the workers' cause. The importance of work is paramount in the film and, as Benson (1988) argues in his book about the British working class, in the working class existence. Benson (1988, p. 9) claims that work 'helped to determine most other aspects of working people's lives: the standards of health they enjoyed; the types of accommodation in which they lived; the nature of their family and neighbourhood life; the ways in which they spent their leisure time; the degree of respect with which they were regarded; and even, it seems, the social, political and other values that they came to adopt.' This rings true of the scope of life that *Jouluksi kotiin* shows. Urho's poor health is was brought on by his work at the coal mines, his family and friends are all tied to the SKP and work itself is a dominating present in the film. Actually the many shots of Urho or his wife at their industrial workplaces have very little narrative function, but create a sense of work as an overpowering element. It is also interesting that Benson (1988, p. 174) writes how 'in certain industries and in certain regions the labour movement assumed such a role in people's lives that the history of the movement became virtually synonymous with the history of the working class.' *Jouluksi kotiin* creates a similarly one-sided view of Urho's social sphere. His family and friends all participate in the SKP. The only space

¹⁸⁹ 'Työläisen alistetun elämän lohduuttomuus ja irrallisuus korostuvat näissä keskeneräisissä taloissa.'

¹⁹⁰ 'omakotitalo sen olla pitää'

outside of the triangle of work place, home and clubhouse is Urho's building site where after enduring endless trials he meets his end. Alestalo and Kuhnle (1984) classifies a Finnish worker as anyone employed for primarily manual work. According to Alestalo and Kuhnle (1984) even in the 1980s the Finnish working class had poorer health and less job security than other classes and they note acquiring their own home as a primary concern. According to any of these definitions Urho is a working class man. The party clubhouse is the only place Urho is seen spending his sparse leisure time. It would seem that he does not inhabit any other spaces than his home, work and SKP.

Eteläpää (1975) noticed this social isolation as he wrote the film 'only shows communists socialising amongst themselves, driving in a fleet to the Korso workers' clubhouse - Urho Suomalainen's family apparently the only ones on foot - to talk about the class war... This is really not made for outsiders.'¹⁹¹ This comment also includes the thought that the implied viewer of the film would also be of the working class. As it turns out the political outsider status of the Suominen family in *Jouluksi kotiin* was echoed in the film's reception. Pakkasvirta's film would not only be about the working class, but also for the working class. This focus on the working class and communist ethos also influenced the way the film was received. 'The press critique largely followed the political lines: the left-wing praised it, the unaffiliated were neutrally blaze and the right-wing were negative'¹⁹² (Anon, 1976, *Tiedonantaja*). *Jouluksi kotiin* struggled to find an audience and performed poorly at the box office. Pertti Jokinen (1976) claims the poor reception of the film was caused by the differences in world view between the producers and distributors.

5.2 Isolated workers

Though Urho and his family are working class, this fact is not communicated through juxtaposition with any other classes. The spaces of Urho's working class life rarely overlap with those of the other classes. *Jouluksi kotiin* stays in the sphere of the working class throughout. As Sakari Toiviainen (1975c, p. 21) writes 'the film trusts Urho's fate as representative, or identifiable, or phrases in the dialogue referring to the bourgeois, too much so that the wider connections and mechanisms of this society do

¹⁹¹ 'Se näyttää vain kommunisteja kaveeraamassa keskenään, ajamassa autokolonnana Korson työväentalolle - Urho Suomalaisen perhe ilmeisen ainoina jalkamiehinä - puhumaan "luokkasodasta"...Tämä ei tosiaan ole tarkoitettu ulkopuolisille.'

¹⁹² 'Lehdistön elokuva-arvosteluista laadittu sisällön erittely osoitti, että kritiikki noudatteli ensisijaisesti lehtien poliittista linjaa: vasemmistolehdet kiittivät, sitoutumattoma suhtautuivat innottoman kantaaottamattomasti ja oikeistolaiset kielteisesti.'

not open up to the viewer.¹⁹³ The building project is only shown as a manual process instead of a financial one. Problems funding the building project are mentioned in passing, but Urho never enters a bank. The viewer's point of view is strictly tied to Urho's experiences and more accurately, his spaces. Not once does Urho enter the home of his landlord or the office of his boss. These figures of authority come out into the public space to address Urho, on a common neutral ground. Even when ill Urho does not enter a hospital, but the doctor visits him at home. The only time there is a reference to other outside elements in Urho's world is when his well-off relatives pull in and park their Volkswagen Beetle next to the row of Ladas owned by Urho's SKP friends. Despite being a struggling worker this oppression is not personified. It also holds an almost anarchic rejection of the outside world. Urho refuses to go the state hospital to receive medical care. In no part of the film, even when securing building supplies, does he use money. The family never enters a bank. Everything is received for free, labour from friends, building supplies bartered from the construction site boss, timber from the childhood home. Urho is strangely apart from the larger social and economic structures of society.

A shot shows Urho speaking to his supervisor about being allowed to take home some scrap pieces of wood from the construction site. Instead of going into the supervisor's office the discussion is held outside the building in the rain. This already strips some authority from the supervisor. He is not positioned behind a desk or in a setting that would underline his dominance. The two men are standing side by side, at almost equal in their eye-line. The black edge of the roof that divides the picture between the modernist white high-rise and the wood panelled barrack places the men on the same side. The only difference between the men's position in the frame is that of shelter. The supervisor is sheltered from the rain as he stands in the doorway, but Urho is left outside exposed to the elements.

5.3 Ideology in film form

As Turner (1999, p.173) writes 'the ideology of a film does not take the form of direct statements or reflections on the culture. It lies in the narrative structure and in the discourses employed—the images, myths, conventions, and visual styles.' Even though *Jouluksi kotiin* makes clear the links between Urho and his political loyalties it

¹⁹³ 'Elokuva luottaa kuitenkin liikaa Urhon kohtalon edustavuuteen tai puhuvuuteen tai dialogin fraaseihin porvareista niin etteivät laajemmat yhteydet, tämän yhteiskunnan mekanismit pääse hahmottumaan'

does not make overt statements about the value of the SKP. The film's realistic, or even naturalistic, style echoes Turner's (1999, p. 180) comment that 'the power of realist film, however, lies in the efficiency of this disguise, its ability to appear to be an unmediated view of reality.' Pakkasvirta (1975, p. 18) described how he attempted to ensure that 'one family and one person's experience would be dealt with in a way that the audience could link to as a subjective experience to their own life.'¹⁹⁴ The director's intentions were to make a realistic depiction of the life of the working class in Finland. This idea of realism is visible in the stylistic choices of the film. Lighting is very natural, even to the point of being insufficient. Several of the actors used had no experience of acting, or whom Kallio (1975, p. 23) calls *aitoja ihmisiä*, real or genuine people. The choice to feature non-professional actors was a popular one at in the 1970s and indicative of the influence of Italian neorealism on the Finnish New Wave (Toiviainen 1975a). The settings are unglamorous everyday environments. Kallio (1975) criticised Pakkasvirta's insistence on using 'natural environments' as sometimes random and not supportive of the narrative. Despite this criticism the environments, and especially the domestic interior, contribute to the characterisation of Urho and his family.

A shot of Urho at home places him in a cosy atmosphere with art, statuettes, textures and soft light. The humble home has low ceilings; an attic apartment stashed away above in a house owned by someone else. Despite the modest setup of the room it is cosy and filled with touches that add personality. The tapestry and tablecloth bring softness and a tactile quality to the space. Small decorative touches add to the effect of a loved and cared for home. The milk carton adds to the feeling of domesticity. The evening sun casts soft shadows on the wall as Urho looks out of the window. The framing gives him an air of loneliness even if the set table works as a reminder of his family. All in all the setting creates an image of a modest, but tidy and lovingly kept home. And draws Urho as the lone head of the family deep in thought still holding a copy of the Finnish Communist Party newspaper *Tiedonantaja* in his hand behind the dining chair. It shows an ideal working class home, calm and harmoniously framed. Despite the pleasing domestic scene in Urho's rented home, his family is constantly berated by their landlady and aware of the temporary nature of their contract.

¹⁹⁴ 'Yhden perheen ja yhden henkilön elämysten kautta käsiteltynä elokuva on koettu tehdä sellaiseksi, että yleisö voi yhdistää sen subjektiivisena kokemuksena omaan elämäänsä.'

6. CONCLUSION

One shot that seems to distil the solitude of the building struggle is that of Urho sitting at his construction site. On the forefront the wooden foundations of his house dominate the image. The piles of planks rest on the dugout foundations of the home, unfinished and untidy. The low camera angle makes the building site look enormous, taking over the majority of the frame and extending out to the sides. Urho looks small in comparison to the foundations and the massive, even overbearing, task ahead of constructing a house. He sits alone surveying his property in silence. As for the most of the film and the building process Urho is alone in facing the challenge. Behind him is a borrowed Lada and some scrap materials taken for free from his work place. These set a tone for the financial difficulties of the project. The building materials look woefully insufficient for creating a house. Further in the background stands a cross. The cross carries a premonition of the fate of Urho's building project, and ultimately that of Urho himself.

Jouluksi kotiin approaches the Suomalainen family's situation both through the personal and the general. Urho's struggles are placed into a greater historical context of urban and political change. The film renders visible the experience of the migrant worker who builds the suburbs, a perspective which is left abstract in the other suburban films examined in the thesis. *Jouluksi kotiin* offers a class-conscious take of Finnish suburban history. *Jouluksi kotiin* has social class and ideology running through it on several levels. Overtly Urho is a representative of the Finnish working class. The reminiscences and flashbacks draw out the history of the socialist movement. But the architecture and spaces that Urho and his family live in depict a world that is exclusively working class. The social struggle Urho is experiencing is made clear, but the other side of the argument and the world seems to be left out. The sphere of life is entirely restricted to working class environments. Even the modernist high-rises that Urho despises are built for other working class people. The film seems to create a portrait of working class life being pressured by the conditions of society, but it leaves out whom that society consists of. This lack of broader context or agency is shared with many of the earlier films discussed in the thesis. In *Yksityisalue* Koski is driven to suicide due to the greed of the housing industry. Helinä is forever caught in the web of surveillance in *Yksityisalue*'s Tapiola. The threat of regeneration in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* is shown as a force sweeping across the city. The role of the oppressor is encapsulated in the modernist architecture. Urho's modest and tactile private sphere is juxtaposed with the cold concrete world of modernity that takes the

role of the antagonist. It is the ultimate impersonal oppressor that Urho is trying to escape from.

The wider landscape shots from the beginning of the film begin moving to a lower vantage point as Urho's building project begins to swallow him. The camera angles in the exterior shots begin to look to the ground. It watches surveying and monitoring the building process as the house structure begins to rise from the ground. It draws the viewer to see on what Urho sees as he desperately tries to dig out stones from the dirt. The earth fills the visual space like it fills Urho's mental space. In a film of dirty hands, digging, pouring cement and laying bricks the viewer is brought to focus on what is important, what happens on ground level. In a scene where Urho drives to his rural hometown he narrates the story of poor quality high-rises and the plight of those building their homes. The shot accompanying the voiceover fills the screen with dirt with only a small sliver of sky visible. This framing is turned around at the end of the film as the camera shows where Urho is buried. It is as if the golden ratio has been turned around and the shade changed from dark to light. Urho's focus has moved from earth to the sky. The rows of tombstones echo the angular aesthetic of the rows of high rises Urho was trying to avoid. While the films discussed so far in the thesis have all portrayed the suburban milieu as an oppressive alienating place, and the rejection of the suburban housing characterises *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* and *Jouluksi kotiin*, the second generation of filmmakers were beginning to see the space in a different light.

Writing on the Walls: Escaping the suburb in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*

*'Screw the slums!'*¹⁹⁵

Writing on school wall, *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* (*Right on, man!*)

dir. Tapio Suominen 1980

The final case study of the thesis is the film *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* by director Tapio Suominen, who draws the period of the Finnish New Wave cinema to a close. Travelling forward on the cinematic timeline of the Finnish suburb to year 1980, the suburbs are still problematic and at times alienating, but now also home to Suominen's teenagers. This chapter introduces the suburb of Kontula, its cinematic counterpoint in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* and examines these with the help of Marc Augé's theory of non-places. The theme of claiming one's space in the suburb is approached through the example of tagging. The social and political focus of the chapter looks at the school reform and its affect on Finnish teenagers. The chapter also includes discussion on areas outside of the immediate suburban world. Unlike Helinä of *Vihreä Leski*, the young people of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* journey outside of the suburb and to central Helsinki. As previous chapters have approached the suburb from the viewpoints of architects, housewives, those campaigning against it and those building them, it is apt that the closing remarks on the suburb are by those who grew up in them.

Following years of new social policies brought on by the development of the welfare nation, in year 1979 Finland had just finished implementing one of its final major policy changes, that of the schooling reform. It was also the year when Tapio Suominen

¹⁹⁵ 'Slummit vittuun!'

directed his second feature film, *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*. This became the most viewed Finnish film of the year in 1980 reaching an audience of 382 024 (Kovanen 2010). *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* was filmed on set in the Helsinki suburb of Kontula. The film's narrative focuses on a classroom of misfit teenagers and their everyday life of strained family relations, playing pranks and chasing girls. The backdrop to the growing pains of lead characters Jussi, Pete and Lissu is the concrete high-rises of Kontula. This area with its striking, if monotonous, architecture provides interesting visual spaces, which reflect the welfare nation's new aesthetic. They also show the suburb from the distinct perspective of teenagers; the second generation of suburbanites who have grown up in the area. As opposed to the earlier case studies where the protagonists were distinctly outsiders to the suburban milieu, in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* the suburb is their home. The characters have a multifaceted, albeit troubled, relationship with their surroundings. They retreat to hide-outs in the woods, they tag buildings and loiter at the shopping mall. As the Finnish New Wave of filmmaking was drawing to a close, Suominen presents a film where the relationship with ones surroundings is more reciprocal and direct.

1. LEAVING BEHIND THE NEW WAVE

1.1 Funding changes

The Finnish Film Foundation had continued its important work in ensuring the future of the Finnish film industry over the 1970s. In 1977 the Foundation had made a significant film political decision to reorganise its governing style (Pantti 1999c, p. 163). The Finnish Film Foundation changed to a parliamentary structure in 1977, which meant that the board better reflected political power dynamics as well as represented more equally the different film groups and organisations (Pantti 1999c, p. 163). This democratisation of the Film Foundation decision making was necessary to calm the conflicts within the film industry as well as it was a reflection of the party political play that was dominating the political scene in the 1970s (Pantti 1999c, p. 163). It was also a response to critics such as Toiviainen (1975b) who argued that the Foundation was not working in the interest of the smaller producers. After a decade of work the hopes of finding an overall solution to a balanced and thriving film culture, as outlined by Film Political Committee in 1970, had not been realised (Pantti 1999c, p. 163). A decision was made to give the Finnish Film Foundation all of the film industry financial support (Pantti 1999c, p. 163). This further enforced the Foundation's central role in Finnish film culture and according to Pantti (1999c, p. 163) 'the foundation's role in maintaining and

guiding Finnish film production cannot be overemphasised.¹⁹⁶ The distribution of financial aid to films and filmmakers was based on judgement on the quality of the film, which left the filmmakers in a precarious situation (Pantti 1999c, p. 164). The organisational structure and status of the Film Foundation meant it was working with greater autonomy than most cultural organisations (Pantti 1999c, p. 164). The key debate rising from the restructuring of the Finnish Film Foundation was that of choosing between passive or active film strategy, in other words if the Film Foundation should limit its support to funding filmmakers or begin producing its own films (Pantti 1999c, p. 164). Again political leanings played a big part in the debate as 'film cultural organisations support the Foundation's active role while film capitalists and right-wing support a passive role' (Jukka Mannerkorpi 1979, p. 8).¹⁹⁷ Meanwhile the funding criteria of the Finnish Film Foundation was often influenced by political power shifts and personnel changes making the Film Foundation a place of disputes and scandals (Pantti 1999c, p. 164). The early debate between art film and commercial cinema, as well as the preferred structure of the film industry and role of national film followed the Finnish Film Foundation. However after the Foundation's 'much maligned restructuring' Finnish film production stabilised, which was witnessed as increase in both new films and filmmakers (Honka-Hallila, Laine and Pantti 1995, p. 202).¹⁹⁸ Again the state was supporting the emergence of a new generation of filmmakers.

1.2 Suominen and the second New Wave

Honka-Hallila, Laine and Pantti (1995, p. 208) argue that Tapio Suominen's *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* has without exception been considered as the first film of the 'second New Wave' of Finnish filmmaking.¹⁹⁹ Suominen had begun his film career in 1970 with *Narrien illat*, but due to the film's poor box office success his career was put on hold. It was not until a decade later that Suominen's second feature film made the theatres. *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* quickly became the most successful film of the year reconnecting the public with Finnish film. *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* was the first film produced by Sateenkaarifilmi Oy, the production company founded in 1979 by Jorma K. Virtanen, Tapio Suominen and Pekka Aine. This small team all took roles in making the film, as Virtanen acted as producer, Suominen as director and Aine as cinematographer. Suominen (1980, p. 22) clearly stated that he wished the film to be as realistic as

¹⁹⁶ 'Säätiön roolia suomalaisen elokuvatuotannon ylläpitämisessä ja ohjaamisessa on vaikea ylikorostaa.'

¹⁹⁷ 'elokuvakulttuurijärjestöt kannattavat säätiön aktiivista roolia, elokuvakapitalistit ja oikeisto passiivista.'

¹⁹⁸ 'parjatun uudistuksen'

¹⁹⁹ 'Toisen uuden aallon'

possible in its portrayal of the suburban milieu and the school environment. The script was written by Yrjö-Juhani Renvall who was an old supplementary class teacher, as was the actor, Pertti Reponen, who played the role of the understanding teacher in the film. The film, like *Jouluksi kotiin*, used amateur actors. The film was considered by critics as a bridge between the 1970s socially conscious dramas and the emerging realist style which explored contemporary society (Honka-Hallila, Laine and Pantti 1997, p. 208). *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* dealt with the gulf between teenage and adult, a theme which sparked a revival in youth films such as Suominen's *Syöksykierre* (*Gunpoint*, 1981), Mikko Niskanen's *Ajolähtö* (*Gotta Run!*, 1982) and *Mona ja palavan rakkauden aika* (*Mona and the Time of Burning Love*, 1985), Janne Kuusi's *Apinan vuosi* (*In the Year of the Ape*, 1983) and Jaakko Pyhälä's *Jon* (1983). Salakka (1999, p. 503) argues that *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* can be considered as a modern youth film in that it considers its protagonist as a subject, not only an example or victim of social problems. Salakka (1999, p. 503) argues that Suominen is not portraying all suburban youth through Jussi, but rather has as a distinct focus on the individual, which sets the film apart from previous socially conscious cinema. Though reworking some of its features, Suominen's film shows a break in style from the Finnish New Wave. It also presents a different approach to the portrayal of suburban space in film.

2. HIGH-RISES OF KONTULA

2.1 Kontula as milieu

At the time of the filming *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* Kontula was a rather new neighbourhood, the six-year building works that created the area only finishing in 1970 (Kokkonen 2002, p. 114). These works were prompted by the growth of Helsinki's population, as repeatedly established in previous chapters. This massive building project executed between 1964-70 resulted in over 7000 new homes in Kontula (Kokkonen 2002, p. 28). Aesthetically, Hannula and Salonen (2007, p. 33) argue, Kontula with its white facades demonstrates the style of functionalism. The functionalist design of Kontula's high-rises were built around use of concrete elements, right angles, open layouts, gently sloping roofs, lightweight internal walls and big glass surfaces (Hannula and Salonen 2007, p. 34). Hannula and Salonen (2007, p. 35) claim the 'ribbon windows' that dominate the exterior, were designed to emphasise the harmony of the minimalist, Japanese influenced architecture. Kontula's architecture is a balancing act between modernist architectural ideals and standardisation of building methods typical of the 1960s. Quantrill (1995) explains how a new wave of

rationalisation began to replace the values of architectural modernism with an emphasis on technique resulting in a loss of Aalto's humanistic approach. This striving for efficiency, reductionism and a certain loss of humanism seems to be present in Kontula's architecture. Quantrill (1995, p. 135) calls this the threat of the 'rule and calculator' and the 'men of measurement'.

The architecture of the area reflects this need for efficiency in its area plan full of identical high-rises. As Tapiola before it, Kontula's architecture and town plan also represented the welfare nation's vision of a new generation of healthy suburban living. Though more focused on cost-efficiency and quantity Kontula's design did not reach the status of its predecessor. Connah (2005, p. 182) argues that as 'systematic thinking was married with the neutrality expected from social equality' Finnish architecture of the time 'suddenly became pragmatic, untalkative and dull.' It is the way Suominen examines and interprets this dull space that makes the suburb of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* so engaging. Pallasmaa (2007, p. 23) gives a starting point to investigating this cinematic space as he writes:

'The architecture of cinema does not possess a utilitarian or inherent value - the characters, events and architecture interact and designate each other. Architecture gives the cinematic episode its ambience, and the meanings of the event are projected on architecture.'

This is the area of overlap between the visual world of the architectural reality and the cinematic interpretation. Kontula may be impersonal to begin with, but Suominen's interpretation renders it at times unapproachable or oppressive on screen. The real Kontula and the experience of living there become reinterpreted. Simultaneously the architecture and spaces featured in the film are not stylised sets, but very real arenas of life in the suburbs. While Suominen captures the milieu of Kontula in 'an almost semi-documentary style' (Malmi 2003)²⁰⁰ the suburb equally reflects the personal journeys and attitudes of the fictional characters. As with earlier examples of the thesis, the architecture and environment in Kontula both represent a real place and the protagonist's relationship with it.

The protagonist Jussi takes one last look before running away from home at the high-rise building and its rigid vertical lines. The threatening backdrop towers over Jussi

²⁰⁰ 'melkein puolidokumentaarisesti vangitut miljööt'

filling the entire screen and adding to a sense of its infinity. The building becomes a grid filled with allocated slots where people, homes and lives are literally boxed in or contained. In its efficiency and flatness it looks like something drawn, not built. This effect of a drawn two-dimensional space resurfaces elsewhere in the film through the use of lines, lack of camera movement and selective range of colour.

The shot illustrates how the Suominen is able to use framing and camera angles to simultaneously show the architecture of Kontula whilst communicating the relationship of the environment and character. The relationship between the real Kontula, its history and community, and the setting of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* can never be one of unbiased presentation. Suominen's stylised cinematic version does however go beyond using Kontula as an insignificant backdrop. Besides using the neighbourhood as the set and setting of the film, Suominen brings up social issues of the area in his portrayal. His visual style addresses the architecture. The cinematic space explores and interprets the real space. One way of opening up the relation of the real and the cinematic is with the help of Marc Augé's (1995) theory of non-places.

2.2 Non-places

The suburb of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* holds similarities to Marc Augé's non-places. He describes these places, such as supermarkets or airports, as ones born from the late-capitalist supermodernity, a time which by the film's release in 1980 was fast approaching. Augé (1995, p. 77) writes: 'if a place can be defined as relational, historical and concerned with identity, then a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity will be a non-place.' Rather than the traditional towns and villages that centre around a communal space and interaction, non-places are ones of consumption and transport: driving alone in a car along a motorway, waiting for an airplane in an airport terminal, or wandering along the corridors at a supermarket. Augé (1995, p. 87) claims these are 'spaces in which solitude is experienced as an overbearing or emptying of individuality'.

The newly built Kontula as a place would also be difficult to describe as historical, relational or concerned with identity, thus making it a non-place. Its architecture certainly enhances the feeling of isolation in an anonymous environment. There is a lack of history and monuments that Augé (1995, p. 104) describes as creating a feeling that 'everything proceeds as if space had been trapped by time, as if there were no history other than the last forty-eight hours of news.' Kontula's white buildings in 1979

show no sign of years gone past, development or change. The way the area was built makes all the houses roughly the same age, new.

Augé (1995, p. 103) wrote of how ‘the face and voice of a solitude made all the more baffling by the fact that it echoes millions of others.’ This comment brings to mind a range of shots emphasising Jussi’s role as one of many. He stands in front of a grey grid of balconies or his point of view shot from a kitchen window staring out at dozens of similar windows. Jussi’s life is not exceptional or abnormal, a fact highlighted by the equally troubled young man who immediately takes his place in the classroom. If the real Kontula as a neighbourhood fits Augé’s description of the non-place, Suominen communicates the psyche of the person caught in these spaces.

2.3 Clean white buildings

The newness and lack of history of the architecture of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* is emphasised by its white colour. While white served the purpose as a blank canvas in *Yksityisalue*, in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* it incorporated into the surrounding landscape. The film’s autumn browns are contrasted against the dazzling white buildings. This bright white draws the geometric shapes of the high-rises onto the skyline. It draws out contours of roads, maps out the infrastructure, but not on paper as in *Yksityisalue*, but onto the landscape. These buildings do not show that any time had passed since their completion 6 years earlier. They have kept their pristine glow. In these shots white colour is reserved only for buildings and otherwise the suburban world of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* is that of muted autumn colours. The limited use of a bold bright white ties it with a distinctive effect. White becomes a structural colour, sketching out the blueprint of the suburb. The town plan becomes visible as it was drawn out on the architect’s table. Similarly as in earlier suburban portrayals, as demonstrated in the previous chapters, the architectural plan of the area permeates the cinematic world. In *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* it echoes the vision of Pentti Ahola, the architect who was set the task of designing the area. The film’s suburb of Kontula, has a very unified aesthetic about its functionalist design. This curiously harmonious backdrop was made possible by Helsinki city council’s 1962 decision to give the building project to two large developers thus allowing the new suburb of Kontula to have Finland’s largest unified area plan surpassing Tapiola, as Kokkonen (2002, p. 27) states. Suominen frames this unique area in a way that highlights its design, showing it as a blueprint rather than a home. The immaculately placed rows of white high-rises that continue into the distance are not only an alienating feature of the film, but a rather accurate depiction of the

premeditated spaces of Kontula. The functionalist white geometry draws attention to itself and thus to the fact Kontula was a drawn and developed area. The timelessness of the crisp white reminds us that the area was built in a short period of time, without history or gradual development.

The fact the buildings are white may have its roots in functionalist architecture, but it also carries a symbolic message, whether in the real setting or the film. Bilz (2007, p. 12) claims that in Western culture white 'is perfect, and symbolises light, faith, the ideal, the good, the beginning, the new, cleanliness, purity, innocence, modesty, truth, neutrality, intelligence, science and precision- but also stands for emptiness and the unknown.' This suggestion of white as a colour of perfect, the ideal and the beginning echoes a *Helsingin Sanomat* article from 4.4.1962 as quoted by Kokkonen (2002, p. 28) describing the housing to be built in Kontula as:

'healthy areas, beautiful children's houses and schools, spacious gardens and parks have grown on borders hosted by a young generation of Helsinkiers. More and more people are able to move away from the noise and dust of the city centre into the fresh air and close to nature.'²⁰¹

The white of the original town plan might have been that of idealism and purity, but Suominen's white in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* is that of its flipside, emptiness. Whereas in films discussed in previous chapters white takes the role of the blank paper, or symbol of the modernist advancement threatening the traditional housing stock, in Suominen's film white is the colour of non-spaces. Even if the buildings depicted in the film are white by necessity Suominen's removal of other white elements and the strong contrasting enhances its effect. This role as a structural colour of the urban plan is then challenged in the last shot. It is again white that takes over the screen in the final shot of the film, as the camera pans away from the school building and a winter landscape. The off-white snow covers the landscape, blending the architecture into its background. The pure glorious white of the urban development is stripped away from its value as the snow falls making it a part of its surroundings. It softens the world of contrasting colours into a unified grey. In a film of otherwise sharp focus, the view is blurred with falling snow that softens both focus and colour palette. Nature reclaims its colour. Similarly to the opening shot of childbirth, the film finishes on an overwhelming display,

²⁰¹ 'Terveellisiä asuma-alueita, kauniita lastentaloja ja kouluja, avaria pihvoja ja puistoja on kasvanut uusille liitosalueille, jolla nuori helsinkiläispolvi isännöi. Yhä useammat pääsevät muuttamaan pois keskustan melusta ja pölystä raittiiseen ilmaan ja luonnon tuntumaan.'

not of society or the power of the welfare nation, but that of nature and life itself. Suominen (1980, p. 22) has talked about wanting to confront the viewer with the authentic realities of life and 'grabbing life so that you truly feel it'.²⁰² Suominen (1980, p. 22-23) specifically mentioned both the birthing scene and the final shot as striving for authenticity and representing the true experience of life. Visually both of the shots lack the cool static aesthetic of the harmonious compositions that dominate the film. They feature an element that is both the overwhelming and uncontrollable calling attention to the human experience rather than the architecture. The shots most concerned with honesty and human experience leave out the built environment and in the case of the final shot go as far as wiping it away.

2.4 The loitering camera

One major element in interpreting the spaces of Kontula onto screen is the use of camera movement. Camera movements in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* are slow and keep their distance to the subject. There are very few close-ups in the film. The shots are predominately long, with a slow pace of editing. Often the camera is placed in a way that would invite to join the protagonist, but it remains static, rather observing than participating. Camera movements are limited and mostly reserved for panning along action on a steady pace. The direction of the pans remains horizontal and slow. There are no shock effects or abrupt editing. An example of this lack of movement and slow pacing is when Jussi walks from his home to the shopping centre. The position of the camera stays the same whilst the pan follows the movement keeping Jussi in the centre of the frame. The camera is placed on eye level in the courtyard creating an effect of standing by, watching what is happening. The lack of intimacy of the long distance of the shots along with keeping the camera eye level puts the viewer in the space of the suburb as a loitering observer. The viewpoint of the camera, and thus the viewer, is that of a person following Jussi around at a distance. The very few point of view shots are set indoors when the viewer is invited into the private realm. The camera quietly trails through the school halls, following action rather than participating or creating it. This effect of silently staying at a distance, on the surface of the action, enhances the effect of Jussi's alienation.

²⁰² 'ottaa elämää kiinni sillä tavalla, että tuntuu'

Henry Bacon (2005) wrote about the importance of perspective and movement in viewing spaces in his book *Seitsemäs Taide*²⁰³.

‘Even though arts can, according to Lessing, be divided into temporal and spatial arts, spatial arts open up to the viewer in time as they are perceived from different viewpoints. This is the case most strongly with architecture, where understanding the work requires moving both around and inside the building. Thus the building opens up to the viewer through the continually changing perspective of movement.’²⁰⁴

(Bacon 2005, p. 223-4)

It is therefore strange and significant that *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* is filled with shots that place architecture as a main element, but not moving through it. There are several shots where it would seem as if the viewer was invited to move into or through the space, but the camera remains static. Buildings are approached through still shots, not through movement. The camera might tilt up to view the height of the building, but doesn't circle it. Even though the film was shot in a relatively small area the viewer never learns their way around as they do in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. Despite seeing several shots of Jussi's home, the viewer would be hard pressed to point it out from the neighbourhood. Without camera movement the architecture remains two-dimensional on the screen. Even wide shots with harmonious compositions remain flat. The space becomes a theoretic construction of functionalism instead of a lived space. They are symmetric and clean, but do not allow us in. The viewer is never amidst them, never knowing how the view continues outside the frame. This use of camera movement enhances the effect started by the use of the colour white. The architecture remains as a planned space, a flat blueprint of an area, not a space to live in and explore. It has an air of an architectural photograph, which the characters have invaded. Though flatness and the planned space are featured in previous chapters, for Suominen they take on these play a different role. For example in *Yksityisalue* these qualities served the purpose of limiting architecture onto paper or in *Vihreä leski* the planned is overtly challenged by the lived experience. For Suominen the emphasis on

²⁰³ no English title, translates to *The Seventh Art*

²⁰⁴ ‘Vaikka taiteet voidaan Lessingin tapaan jakaa aika- ja tilataiteisiin, tilataiteetkin avautuvat katsojalle ajassa katsojan syntyessä niihin eri näkökulmista. Kaikkein vahvimmin tämä pätee arkkitehtuuriin, johon perehtyminen edellyttää liikkumista niin rakennuksen ympärillä kuin niiden sisälläkin. Näin rakennus avautuu katsojalle liikkeen myötä jatkuvasti muuttuvan perspektiivin kautta.’

the flatness of the planned is part of the fabric of suburban milieu itself which Jussi struggles to get to grips with.

2.5 Surfaces and touch

Besides the lines and colour the nature of the suburban landscape is also expressed through touch or lack thereof. Unlike *Jouluksi kotiin*, where the haptic embedded deep and personal narratives into one's surroundings, the high-rises of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* are of smooth concrete surfaces, even-coloured and pristine. Their texture does not have a tactile quality. With wooden houses you can feel the grain of the wood, see the texture that forms the building. With bricks you see the building process, how each brick was laid by hand. The bold high-rises may be visual, but they don't speak to the other senses, they lack the haptic. Previously discussed in chapter four in relation to the process of building, the haptic can also be applied to the larger scale architectural developments. Pallasmaa (2005, p. 18-19) offers a new perspective on this claiming that 'the inhumanity of contemporary architecture and cities can be understood as the consequences of the negligence of the body and the senses, an imbalance in our sensory system.' This lack of touch, of warmth, of feeling translates quite well to the visual medium of film.

The high-rises show no signs of decay that haunted another Aalto inspired building, London's Brunswick Centre designed by Patrick Hodgkinson and finished in 1972. This concrete building comprising a shopping area and residential housing fell into disrepair after the finishing touches of paint were not applied to the structure, Steve Rose (2006) writes. As the dirt and years began to show on the walls the building became an eyesore, a state of disrepair which Rose (2006) calls a 'sad illustration of how politics, business and neglect can ruin a utopian vision.' Luckily a good clean and a coat of white paint brought it back to its original glory. The vision of new crisp architectural design is still very much in place in Kontula six years after its completion. Unlike the Brunswick Centre, Kontula had not fallen to disrepair; it had not been neglected in the same way. The surfaces are as clean and smooth as in the initial design and do not show signs of decay. The surfaces have been impeccably maintained. Kontula has remained a space to be looked at, but not touched. While the exteriors of Kontula are ones of hard smooth surfaces, the interiors offer a more tactile environment.

We see the view from Jussi's kitchen, looking outside from the domestic space. The window creates a frame around the urban landscape. The juxtaposition of the light

outside and dark kitchen adds to a feel of being safe, private and inside. In contrast to the solid impenetrable buildings outside, the indoor space is that of frilly soft materials. The wavy curtain not only breaks the lines of the shot, it allows light through and has a fringe that would invite touch. The fabric of the lampshade is delicate and decorative. The window is framed with softness, tactility and objects that are individual and homely. From this soft personal space one could be tricked into forgetting that viewed from the opposite building this space becomes just another dark window in a white building. You are standing inside a building identical to the one the blocking your view.

‘Architecture tends to be engaged with visual effects, and it lacks the tragic, the melancholy, the nostalgic, as well as the ecstatic and transcendental tones of the spectrum of emotions. In consequence, our buildings tend to leave us as outsiders and spectators without being able to pull us into full emotional participation.’

Pallasmaa (2007, p. 91) writes. However cinematic interpretation allows for adding these emotions to spaces, as Jarva so expertly does in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. Therefore in a cinematic context lack of emotional participation is as significant as its inclusion. The lack of emotion, humanity and feeling of being left outside Pallasmaa (2007) writes about is one that describes Jussi’s attitude to his home. The way the Kontula is shot and the use of white highlights its planned qualities and makes it seem like an architectural blueprint. Borrowing from de Certeau (2011) yet again, the suburb the film presents is a planned space rather than a lived one. The lines and geometry of the composition give it an alienating quality in all its symmetric beauty. The viewer is left outside, on the surface, much like Augé’s individuals inhabiting the spaces of supermodernity. Like Augé’s urban wanderers Suominen’s teenagers are continuously in transit, never staying or resting in one place for long, on a continuous search for a space or place of their own.

3. SOCIAL HOUSING

3.1 Early Wooden Houses

In a similar strategy as Pakkasvirta in *Jouluksi kotiin*, Suominen includes a small segment in the film which condenses Finnish suburban development into one continuous visual timeline. Early on in the film the teacher Pappa cycles along a dirt road past a row of one-and-a-half-storey wooden houses before reaching a smooth

asphalt driveway and multi-storey concrete buildings set along the roadside. This short journey in the film takes place as a journey between spaces, but also holds significance as a journey between times. The change in building style, from the single-family home to the concrete high-rises, maps out the development of Finnish social housing. In a way Pappa cycles from the 1940s to 1979. The camera is positioned on the road and pans along as Pappa cycles past, first on a dirt road past the wooden houses and pulling onto asphalt at exactly the point where he passes the camera. Both the old and modern houses are positioned on the right edge of the screen constructing a line and creating almost a timeline effect. This feeling is enhanced by camera positioning, looking behind on the wooden houses and forward towards the high-rises. This bicycle ride opens up an opportunity to explore the phases of social housing in Finland and understanding Kontula's role in its continuum. As *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* is the first film of the corpus to direct attention to wooden detached houses, this segment also serves the purpose of positioning Pena's house into a wider framework of Finnish architectural history.

According to Connah (2005, p. 111) the first steps of Finnish social housing were taken after the Winter War in 1942 with the establishment of the Reconstruction Bureau, which concentrated on designing single-family dwellings, and the creation of the Rakennustietokortisto²⁰⁵ by Alvar Aalto and associates. These two organisations laid the basis for the architectural style of the post-war reconstruction and the development of the wooden single-family home. The Reconstruction Bureau's style, Connah argues (2005, p. 112) was heavily influenced by the Swedish donation of 2,000 prefabricated wooden housing units. The RT system, which contained information and instructions for building processes, built on Aalto's American influences of using wooden construction elements (Connah 2005, p.112). These circumstances shaped the style and building process of what was to become Finnish social housing.

The Reconstruction Bureau developed flexible and energy efficient housing types of one-and-a-half stories with one centralised chimney to house those returning from the Frontier and the more than 400,000 refugees fleeing from areas ceded to the Soviet Union (Connah 2005, p. 114). 'A small plot of land and loans were given along with regulated conditions to build according to standard solutions; the basis for the creation of the Finnish social housing system using prefabrication was laid out' Connah (2005, p. 114) writes. This resulted in suburban communities made up of rows of standardised

²⁰⁵ no English name, but translates directly to Building Information Bureau

wooden houses with small gardens, such as the one where Pappa begins his bicycle journey. This new building type also affected Finnish architecture as a whole. According to Connah (2005, p. 114) 'by integrating modest, small-scale and careful prefabrication techniques made possible by standardisation systems, architecture was approaching the idea of product.' As prefabricated elements became the norm, buildings became standardised products, thus creating a unified visual style for new areas. In 1940s this unified visual style of suburban living was made up of neat rows of one-and-a-half-storey wooden dwellings with painted walls and private gardens. Years later the suburban aesthetic took a drastic turn as use of prefabricated elements changed.

3.2 Later Concrete High-rises

In the mid and late 1960s when Kontula was designed the use of prefabricated elements was still very much in place, but now the wood was replaced by concrete. Pentti Ahola, who designed the area (Kokkonen 2002, p. 27), had worked under Aarne Ervi after graduation. Ervi pioneered the use of concrete in Finnish building, also designing the town plan for Tapiola and its shopping centre. The design influence and use of material is quite apparent. These concrete houses of Kontula are where Pappa concludes his bicycle ride through the eras. The ride has taken him from the original form of social housing, the small wooden homes, to the modern equivalent, the concrete high-rise. Connah (2005, p. 115) draws a historical parallel between the 'small-scale, modest, even serial communities, popular for edge-of-city living' of the post-war era opening the way to 'more ambiguous, neutral planning ideas' resulting in mega-box housing districts such as *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*'s Kontula. Besides the development of prefabricated elements and standardised design they also stem from the same social agenda. Connah (2005, p. 115) argues that these high-rise districts share the same 'solidarity, agenda and passion' as their 1940s predecessors. In a way the white high-rise boxes are new interpretations of the ideas and needs that were first answered by the wooden clad single-family homes decades earlier. They were both built to answer housing demand brought on by mass migration, but more importantly their building was financed by the national authorities, either the government or Helsinki city, for their citizens. They share the ideals of social housing, but the changing architectural design works as a visual chronicle of how society has changed and role architecture has played in this change.

4. THE SUBURBAN SCHOOL

4.1 Lines of the school

The Kontula suburb in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* is dominated by lines. These bold lines divide and order the space. The pine forest is cut through by evenly spaced symmetric high-rises. Stark lines in white steel and concrete interrupt the organic shapes and textures of the rocky landscape and forest. The framing of shots enhances and plays with the shapes and geometry of the existing architecture. The entire film is shot on location, away from carefully constructed sets where the director could impose order. Still the environment comes across as very controlled and orderly. The symmetry and positioning of the buildings could not be any more even had Suominen planned them out himself. This strong architecture of rigid lines, smooth surfaces and symmetry is utilised to tell stories of the spaces and the events taking place in them. An example of the way Suominen uses the lines and framing to communicate the architecture can be seen in the first shots of the school building.

Suominen introduces the school through four still shots moving gradually closer to the building, but not going in. The camera does not move nor does anything within the frame. In the first shot there is a neat row of bicycles that along with the buildings create parallel lines. This symmetry is broken by the brown tree trunks the colour and vertical lines echoed in the window panels of the school. The symmetry of the lines and a spacious glimpse of the sky create a harmonious effect, to which the colourful bicycles bring a softer human edge.

The second shot brings the viewer closer to the school building and leaves the personal touches of the bicycles behind. It is a shot of severe lines and a vantage point in the centre of the screen. The setting would invite the viewer to move forward in the space, but the camera remains static. Again the vertical brown lines of the tree trunks are duplicated in the building's structure, but this time they create a barrier between the nature and the school building. Despite the same style the pillars and trees have quite a different effect. In the vertical lines of the nearby pines, the green foliage breaks the line and allows the sky to show. The line of the pillars is cut off by concrete and left in the shade. The viewer is caught on the side of the grey concrete. The lines and perspective add to the feeling of being in a planned space, a constructed space.

Even the third shot leaves the viewer outside. If the previous two shots were a harmonious melody of parallel lines running through the screen, the final shot would be off-key notes, an unsettling cacophony. The lines created by the blinds are out of synch, jarring and quite literally broken. Interestingly the neat symmetry of the previous shots is still present on the outside elements of the building. The exterior of the school is intact. The viewer is introduced to the school through its exterior, its shell, and the first look to the internal reveals something shattered. The lines created in the first two shots are made of iron, concrete and tree trunks, solid strong materials, the internal lines are delicate paper or slender metal rods. The balanced exterior holds inside something frail and fragmented.

The fourth and final shot of the school shows the white wall scribbled with green text 'Rock 'n' roll is here to stay'. Though still not seen in the shot the presence of the students is made visible. The text is tucked around the corner of the building, hidden from sight for those using the school entrance but available for those who care to look behind the facade of the building. The writing on the wall preempts the troubled relationship the films protagonists have with the school.

4.2 New design for new policy

At the time of the filming of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* in 1979 the Finnish school system had just undergone a restructuring changing the way schools were organised and taught. According to René Nyberg (1970) this education reform began on 28th of July 1968, when the Finnish Parliament passed an act creating a nine-year comprehensive school. Prior to this the schooling attended by all pupils was four years, after which the students were divided between grammar and comprehensive school (Aho 2006, p. 7). Behind the schooling reform were the welfare nation's hopes of creating a high-quality educational system, like that of neighbouring Sweden, making it available throughout the country and providing the right to education as a basic civil right (Aho, 2006). Nyberg (1970, p. 13) argues that strong demands for the replacement were 'raised not only of social considerations but also for purely practical and economic reasons. The present system is very unjust socially, because of both economic and geographical factors.' This new school system was supposed to be more equal and give students opportunities and access to a wider range of education choices, as Iisalo (1989, p. 255) writes. The schooling reform changes started from Lapland, advancing south and reaching Helsinki in 1977, just two years before *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* was filmed. The

film was made at a time when both teachers and students were still adapting to new policies and class structures.

Critics also noted Suominen's treatment of the social issues at hand. Massinen (1980) wrote that *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* 'brings a strong contribution to the ongoing school discussion.'²⁰⁶ Suominen's film made a strong and compelling case showing what the real life experience of Finnish schools after the school reform was (Massinen 1980, Fränti 1980). The school of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* is Vesala secondary school,²⁰⁷ which only two years before filming had changed its name due to the schooling reform. The school was previously known as Kontula co-educational school²⁰⁸ and was founded as a privately run school by the inhabitants of area in 1966, as Kokkonen (2002, p. 76) notes. The school building was built in 1967 and expanded in 1969. Like Kontula itself the student population grew rapidly over a short amount of time. In 1966 the school had 144 students and only ten years later in 1976 the figure had grown to 748 (Salminen 2005). The school of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* had recently gone through a modernisation, which the architecture of the school reflects. In fact the education reform contained guidelines for school and classroom design (Nyberg 1970). These images show a design very similar to that of Vesala secondary school. It was a modern design for modern policy.

The halls of the school are shiny and pristine. The white and brown of the exterior continue as the colour scheme inside. The cool colours and reflections in the hallway make it impersonal and distancing. It looks like a space where sounds echo. The cleanness of the lines, colours and shiny textures give the space a distinctly modern feel. The framing places a white block in front of the screen, dividing the space. The viewer is left hovering on a corner, a hallway meant to be moved through. There are not any reminders of the school's function or the presence of students. Its functionalist design might as well be that of any other public building.

4.3 Bars on windows

The horizontal lines that introduced the viewer to the school building run throughout its interiors as well. These lines create a feel of imprisonment. An interior shot shows a contrasting element that stands out from the light modern style. The massive doors

²⁰⁶ 'Se tuo jo pitkään jatkuneeseen koulukeskusteluun oman vahvan panoksensa.'

²⁰⁷ Vesalan yläaste

²⁰⁸ Kontulan Yhteiskoulu

behind the school councillor underline the division of interior and exterior. The door of the school is heavy, dark and closed. The horizontal lines on the window create an almost prison-like effect of bars controlling and confining the space. The white lines of the walls next to the door look gentle and light in comparison. Through the bars of the door are trees, light shining through and freedom. Inside is Jussi's visit to the councillor and the risk of being removed from his class.

A second instance the inside of the school is divided from the outside by bars is when after pulling a prank Pete peeks into the teachers' lounge to see where Jussi has been captured. The silver and reflections of the blinds make them look like thick metal rods distorting Pete's face and barring him outside. Again the outside has shades of green and sunshine, being viewed through vertical lines that disrupt the landscape. They mark the end of the space, its limits beyond which exists a blurry green freedom. It divides the two worlds, leaving the real world outside the white pristine halls of the school. Or on the other hand this leaves Jussi, along with the camera and us, jailed inside. This prison metaphor becomes even clearer when Jussi is forced to remove his shoes to prevent him from running away. The curtains add some softness and texture to the harsh bars they cover. Light streaming through the fabric curtain contrast with the metal blinds it has been paired with. They create a tension of traditional and modern, perhaps reflective of the discussions circling the same teachers' lounge on new teaching policies. The functionalist design ideals of efficiency and standardisation seem to move beyond physical structures. There is a dialogue in the film set in the teachers' lounge that echoes this division of hard and soft values. The teachers are discussing what subjects the students need in life. One teacher argues for maths, stating that they are stuck in technology up to their teeth and thus require maths to succeed. Another teacher argues that maths is already over-emphasised and hindering the students' enjoyment of the school. 'We don't need more maths in this world, they need imagination, feelings and humanism.'²⁰⁹ he says. 'Oh not communism?'²¹⁰ the principal asks mockingly.

²⁰⁹ 'Ei minun mielestäni ihminen tässä maailmassa matematiikka lisää tarvitse. Se tarvitsee mielikuvitusta, tunteita, humanismia.'

²¹⁰ 'Kas kun ei kommunismia?'

5. OTHER SPACES

5.1 Nature

Despite the neighbourhood of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* being dominated by white housing blocks and freeways, nature is ever present in the suburb. The trees and plants in the film are not landscaped or mapped out in the same way than the other structures of the suburb. They are untamed, not only forest, but wilderness. This echoes the ideology when building Tapiola's garden town, which Connah (2005, p. 170) calls 'forest romance'. Connah (2005, p. 116) goes on to explain how in the design 'groups of buildings were sited within the free-form forest; buildings could be placed on high points, areas of forest left natural and the green fields used for innovative terrace and low-rise housing.' The city planning at the time was not really concentrating on creating city-like spaces, but rather idealised a spacious layout set among a woody landscape (Mattila 2006, p. 151). An example of suburban planning incorporating nature is the Fingerplan, Copenhagen's strategy based on five fingers of development reaching from the city centre leaving green areas in between. Kontula's town plan was also interested in developing suburbs close to the unspoilt nature. But Helsinki's expansion was not quite as strategical as the Fingerplan. According to John Jørgensen (2011) the Fingerplan was developed in stages attempting to reach the five surrounding provincial towns also including transport in the plan. In the beginning Kontula was very much secluded in the woods, with poor services and infrequent public transport (Kokkonen 2002, p. 57). Kontula's town plan certainly achieved the ideal of building suburbs in quiet areas close to nature and away from the bustle of cities. In the film however nature has a role beyond being a setting for an architectural experiment. Shown rather the opposite of the forest in *Vihreä leski*, it is a safe space to escape to. Whilst school or home fail to provide the characters with solace or home they find a peaceful spot in nature. Jussi retreats to his cave to contemplate life, drum and hide from the authorities. It is nature where he is most relaxed, most at home. The forest is a space where the woman whose handbag Jussi steals cannot follow or where his father cannot find him. It is also a space where the overbearing design of the suburb doesn't reach. It is a rough place, with texture, colour and the warmth of campfire. Whilst most of the film the characters are between spaces, moving and never really arriving home, in the forest they slow down and sit still.

5.2 Pete's home

Alongside the white high-rises *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* also uses different older building types to demonstrate a range of issues. Besides Pappa's cycle ride through building history the old wooden houses are featured in the film as Pete's home. Pete grabs an apple from the tree in his yard and stands outside his home inspecting the flaking paint of the walls and a board of mismatched paint in the corner of the wall. His house, despite having a garden, a history, isn't much better than that of the film's protagonist Jussi's anonymous white tower. The path to his house is gravel, lined with trees, the surfaces of the house have an uneven texture. The house shows the passing of time in the way it is slowly crumbling apart. This time the white colour has texture and it shows time. Nature, instead of having defined borders, creeps into and blends with the domestic space. Differently from Jussi's high-rise, Pete's home reaches outside the building's walls. Jussi's home is confined to an interior space sectioned off from other similar ones, with only the front door being visible to the neighbours. Jussi's home only has internal walls. In Pete's home the sphere of privacy is taken outside the building, into the yard, and unto the exterior walls of the building. For better or for worse their home becomes a part of the neighbourhood and the shared architecture of Kontula. It also displays the private to the public, the walls in need of new paint, overgrown garden and messy yard. It reflects the inner workings of the family onto the building itself, unable to cope, keep up or take care of oneself; both the family and house are deteriorating. Tuomola (1980) comments on the broken family relations of the film 'Right on, man! floods the screen in a natural and credible portrait of troubled youths the main reasons for the brokenness of the nuclear family, the uneasy parent-child bond which is replaced by caring for animals and abiding by the internal laws and rules of conduct of the gang.'²¹¹

As Kokkonen (2002, p. 127) states Kontula kept the child welfare officers and social aid busy in the 1970s, pointing out alcoholism as one of the key issues. The theme of alcohol abuse comes up through Pete's family, the only one fully shown in the film. Jussi's mother is only shown as a silent presence in the other room, or behind closed doors and his father never entering the home. Pete's home however has a family, as dysfunctional as it may be, that inhabits the same rooms and communicates. As

²¹¹ "“Täältä tullaan, elämä!” vyöryttää luontevassa ja uskottavassa ongelmanuorison kuvassaan pääsyyt juuri ydinperheen varhaiselle rikkinäisyydelle, ehjän vanhemmat-lapsi-suhteen turvattomuudelle, joka korvautuu tässä lemmikkieläinten hellimisen kuviossa ja jengin sisäisten lakien ja käyttäytymismallien toteuttamisessa.”

miserable as they seem they still are a model nuclear family of a mother, father, two kids and a dog. Inside the house however they have a division of spaces. The mother doesn't leave the kitchen, the father sits in the solitude of his own room, Pete sneaks into his own room upstairs and the little sister seeks quiet in the yard.

The living room becomes the father's private space. The camera remains outside, blocked by the doorframe, not invited in. It is the only room Pete or the other family members never cross the threshold to enter. The mother, sister and Pete share the other rooms, stand close and moving around with ease, but they never venture to the living room. The positioning of the chair enhances this sense of not being invited in. Pete and the viewer see the father from profile, almost turning his back to the camera. What would normally look like a cosy domestic space, softened by carpet, plants, curtains and afternoon shadows on the walls, becomes isolated and repelling. Still if Jussi is never seen interacting with his family, Pete's family still talk to one another, worrying about his schooling and future.

5.3 Reflections

In a film that doesn't play with special effects, fancy editing or even bold camera movements, *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* does use reflections to create abstract spaces. As Jussi and Lissu take the bus to central Helsinki the camera follows their journey with a blurred shot reflected from the bus window. Their bus journey captures the in-betweenness Augé (1995, p. 97) recounts happens as one travels on a motorway. Whilst moving between places, past landmarks and towns without stopping, Augé (1995, p. 97) claims 'motorway travel is doubly remarkable: it avoids, for functional reasons, all the principles places to which it takes us; and it makes comments on them.' In the reflection on the window, familiar places and spaces outside of the bus meld together into a blur of superimposed images. The screen creates three spaces. On the surface of the glass is the warped forest, dreamlike, distorted, but rather beautiful. Second is the private enclosed space of the bus, which with no other passengers becomes an intimate zone. Finally in the background through the bus windows is the built world of housing blocks. Jussi and Lissu are placed between these two worlds. It is as if their spaces are being overexposed to show a mental landscape of their world. The otherwise clear, organised locale of housing blocks neatly divided from the untamed forest that usually makes for a tidy and ordered surrounding become meshed together. Instead of reality the screen draws a picture of feeling. The framing quite literally gives them head room, space to paint their inner world. The white

buildings do dominate the background, as in the realistic shots, but now they are blurred. They remain as a dominant feature but in motion are rendered more into shapes, windows into voids. On the surface, overriding everything is nature, green and lush. Between in a hazy intimate space are Jussi and Lissu travelling in the dark bus. The soft music and sunshine filtering through the reflections creates a peaceful and happy mood. As the camera moves back the viewer sees Jussi and Lissu too are only reflections on the glass. The shot allows them to escape the unforgiving aesthetic of the suburb and leave worries behind, something Jussi is quite literally doing running away from home.

6. YOUTH

6.1 Kill City

Täältä tullaan, elämä! also features spaces reclaimed by youth. These concerts venues and squatted houses echo a punk aesthetic. The spaces have been tagged by graffiti, quite literally taken over and made their own by the youth. The dilapidated old wood house is covered in slogans such as or 'Finland in Ruins'²¹² and 'Down with Bureaucracy'.²¹³ The building itself is a traditional wooden house, reminiscent of old social houses. For viewers familiar with the Helsinki punk scene the house is recognisable as Kill City. Built in 1897 as a school for the disabled the house was left empty in 1953 (Nenonen and Toppari 1983, p. 102). Taken over by musicians in the late 1970s the venue hosted concerts and became an informal meeting place until its 1980 demolishing, which Suominen documents. It is somewhat ironic that the teenagers, themselves separated from the main school population, find refuge and place of community within an old school for the disabled.

It is clear that the youth of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* lack space. This building is the only one in the film that the teenage characters have ownership over. A building they have taken charge of, appropriated and branded with their own aesthetic and style. The flaking paint is a vibrant red in contrast to the sterile white of modern structures. Handwritten messages on the walls shout out the feelings and thoughts of the people using the building. The clinical white high-rises with anonymous rows of identical

²¹² 'Suomi Rappiolla'

²¹³ 'Byrokratia Alas'

windows seem miles away. In fact it is a space that screams out its identity through its design and how people use the space.

When Jussi and Pete go into the squat they meet musician Maukka Perusjätkä the film shows its only example of intercutting to play with time and space. The characters discuss how the building will be demolished the next day while the camera intercuts them sitting inside with shots of tearing down the building. This creates a strange effect of the world around them being torn down as they sit inside in silence. Shots of the building violently being ripped apart and crashing down are cut with the young men sitting together as if in a wake. They look as if mourning the loss of their clubhouse, their space. Vibrant reds, purples and yellows replace the white cleanliness of the high-rises and schools. The furniture is old, appropriated to its new use in the clubhouse. They have taken an old traditional building and made it their own, placing themselves as a part of the historical narrative of the building. Where Kontula and its buildings do not have a long history Jussi and his friends find this continuum and their place in it from the clubhouse. They create their own visual style that stands out from the bland surroundings.

6.2 Writing on the walls

This visual strand of tagging is also carried out within the school. The slogan written on the school wall in the introduction is followed by more writing on the walls. Able and Buckley (1977, p. 16) state that scribbles onto surfaces 'are announcements of one's identity, a kind of testimonial to one's existence in a world of anonymity. They are scratched, carved, or painted onto some surface seemingly for the sole purpose of leaving one's mark.' Though unsophisticated in content and execution the marks on the walls are the teenager's way of making their presence seen in the suburban landscape. They reclaim a small part of the suburban landscape to themselves and voice their objections on the white canvas of the concrete wall. As Freeman (1966, p. 13) writes, 'amateur scrawls and scratchings... reflect the nature of the society that produce[s] them and more particularly the emotional make-up of the individual graffitists.'

The back wall of Pappa's class room is covered with paper that has been scribbled full of slogans, slurs and drawings. The thick brown paper is filled with messy text written

with colourful pens. The largest slogan reads 'Screw the Slum!'.²¹⁴ The colours again reflect the squat's reds, blues and purples. It seems odd the tidy and neutral school would allow for such a wall of profanities and swastikas. The classroom becomes divided into two opposing worlds challenging each other. This is shown in a humorous way while juxtaposing Pete's character and his rebellious background with Pappa and the rigid lines behind him. Again geometry imposes order around an authority figure and the visuals of youth are colourful, hectic and hand drawn. The shot cuts from one static mid-shot to another allowing for comparison.

Pappa and Pete look oddly alike, almost as the same person divided by a few decades. While Pete is unquestionably a teenager and Pappa an adult, a fact underlined by their backgrounds, they bear a physical resemblance. Pete's downy moustache is the first model towards Pappa's beard. Their shirts are almost identical. When looking at Pappa, Pete looks like he is staring at himself in 30 years time. This brings up the question of how much of the portrayal of space is tinted by the teenage viewpoint. How different would Kontula be on the screen if filmed from Pappa's perspective? Similarly were the film made 20 years earlier would it have shown neat rows of wooden one-and-a-half storey houses as oppressive and alienating? Before long will Pete be in Pappa's position watching another generation struggling to claim their space in the suburbs?

6.3 Future hopes of Finland

It is here in Kontula where the new generation was supposed to flourish, but the kids of the remedial class are struggling to find their place. One of the teachers notes with disgust that the misbehaving Jussi and his classmates are the 'future hopes of Finland'.²¹⁵ The comment draws a parallel to the initial hopes for the new neighbourhood and a new generation of Helsinkiers expressed in a Helsingin Sanomat article from 4.4.1962, as quoted by Kokkonen (2002, p. 28). The youth of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* are the first generation brought up in the suburb. Their attitude towards the place is rather opposite to the hopes and dreams projected onto the area when it was built. Kokkonen (2002, p. 42-44) writes of a joyous mood shared by those moving to Kontula in 1966, excited about the spacious flats and modern appliances. Several of the movers, interviewed by Kokkonen (2002, p. 46, 50) said they felt like they had won

²¹⁴ 'Slummi Vittuun!'

²¹⁵ 'yhteiskunnan toivot'

the lottery when told they had been approved for one of the city's rental flats in Kontula high-rises. In 1966 there were 8000 applicants waiting to move to Kontula according to Kokkonen (2002, p. 46). Twelve years later this enthusiasm has been replaced by 'Screw the Slums!' scribbled on walls.

The shot of Jussi on a bus, camera looking up to him, draws a picture of this new generation. The framing and tilted camera angle gives the shot a feel of a grand portrait. It is the face of new generation of Helsinki youth. The colour scheme of the blue sky and white houses bring to mind, besides the obvious comparison to the Finnish flag, a popular Finnish song by Jukka Kuoppamäki. In 1972, some seven years before *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*, Kuoppamäki recorded the hugely popular song *Sininen ja Valkoinen, Blue and White*. In the song Kuoppamäki ponders what words would capture Finland's essence.

The chorus goes:

Blue is the sky, blue are its eyes.

Blue are the lakes, reflecting their blue.

White is the snow, white are the summer nights.

White are the clouds, sheep of the blue sky.²¹⁶

Kuoppamäki followed this theme of the colours of Finland in the album cover as well. In Jussi's case white as nature is replaced with the crisp white of the concrete high-rises. Quite a literal take on the mass migration to the southern cities that took place after World War II. Forests and fields were replaced by roads and high-rises, as the Finnish population left behind its country roots. Rather than Kuoppamäki's natural and romantic description of Finland Suominen's is a portrait of modern identity. The blue and white of Suominen's Finland are no longer the colours of nature, but those of the urban setting.

When Kuoppamäki released his song there was another mass migration taking place, that of Finns moving to Sweden in search of work. There were hundreds of thousands of Finns, mainly from the countryside, who moved to Sweden in the 1970s in search of work (Hilson 2008, p.158). At the time of an economical downfall that hit Finland, Sweden had a thriving industry that even sent regular recruiters to Finland in search of

²¹⁶ 'Sininen on taivas, siniset on silmänsä sen. Siniset on järvet, sinisyyttä heijastaen. Valkoinen on hanki, valkoiset on yöt kesien. Valkoiset on pilvet, lampaat nuo taivaan sinisen.'

labourers (Ruotsinsuomalaisten Keskusliitto 2010). This context could open a viewpoint to understanding the lyrics of leaving behind one's homeland. This theme also comes up in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*. The class receives a postcard depicting the Swedish royal couple from their old classmate Reiska, who now lives in Stockholm. The boys and Pappa discuss the employment opportunities Sweden, wages and the possibility of moving to join Reiska. This is the only time the film Jussi discusses future prospects. For him to progress in life he seems to need to break free from Kontula, and even leave the country. *Täältä tullaan elämä!* acts as a portrait of a generation of urbanites, not unlike the earlier case studies in the thesis, but it is set apart in the way the characters interact with their surroundings, claim them as their own and leave their mark on the suburban landscape.

7. CENTRAL HELSINKI

7.1 Underground in Helsinki

Though Kontula may be portrayed as an alienating non-place consisting of rows of identical buildings, it still remains home for the Jussi and Pete. When the boys visit central Helsinki they are faced with a very different environment which makes their suburban home seem almost inviting in contrast. Asematunneli, the underground maze of shops adjacent to the main Helsinki railway and metro station, takes a central role in the boys' excursions. Architect Viljo Revell designed the shopping centre and the Makkaratalo²¹⁷ building connecting to it, that feature in the film. These were the only parts of Revell's larger plan for the Helsinki city centre that ended up being built (Keskitalo 2010). The design of City-Centre, or Makkaratalo as it is better known, finished in 1967, has received much criticism. Jorma Keskitalo (2010) argues that Revell was made a symbol for the destruction of the old city milieu of the 1960-1970s, despite the fact he died in 1964. In *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* the area is portrayed as a murky building of underground passages only lit up by the shops and bars the boys get thrown out of. The shopping arcade of Suominen's film echo Augé's (1995, p. 100-101) notes on shopping as an act of a ritual of supermodernity, a space bound by social contracts and one where the sole purpose of the customer is to spend money. Without money and not conforming to the rules of behaviour Jussi and Pena are unwelcome visitors to the building. The boys are unable to take part in society and consumerism.

²¹⁷ English translation is Sausage House do to the distinctive rim that surrounds it

For them the space becomes a threatening locale culminating in the Makkaratalo's parking halls which plays hosts the film's finale.

These spaces are dark with harsh shadows and jarring lines. Hiding from guards that taunt them Jussi and Pete crouch in a corner. Again they they are surrounded by a medley of lines. Lines running through each other and fragmenting the screen into small geometric shapes and sections. The architecture and time of construction is similar to Kontula's high-rises, but both the colour scheme and lines are the polar opposites. Makkaratalo is a space of greys and black shadowy corners. Its lines do not run parallel creating harmonious shapes, but cutting into each other. The surface textures range from dirty tiling to brown panelling in the ceiling to metal handrails and concrete. Modern design here is an assortment of elements and shapes stacked on top of one another. The characters blend into the shadows and get lost in this disorder. They are not lit to reveal facial features, but rather the lighting draws the attention to the structure and the panelling of the ceiling. Where the boys were left on the surface of the high-rises, had their clubhouse torn down, now they are swallowed up by the city.

7.2 Lights in the dark

Henry Bacon (2005, p.223) wrote about lighting:

'It is true that the framing and lighting almost inevitably define the space, frame the characters' existence and take part in articulating the relationship between space and character. In doing so they in part create the film's own architectural system in the same sense as the architecture of symphony that is built on developing musical elements.'²¹⁸

A scene in which Jussi runs away from a security guard illustrates Bacon's point effectively. Light and architecture come together to form their own cinematic architectural system while commenting on Jussi's despair. The spaces between the lit patches are not only black they are unknown. The composition looks like house with lit windows being looked at from the dark. The black of the parking hall is not only a building structure, but rather it is a void. Nothingness of this black hole is speckled with

²¹⁸ 'Totta onkin, että kuvarajaus ja valaistus lähes väistämättä määrittävät tilaa, kehystävät henkilöiden olemassaoloa, osallistuvat tilan ja henkilöiden väliseen suhteen artikuloimiseen. Tätä tehdessään ne osaltaan luovat elokuvan omaa arkkitehtonista systeemiä samassa mielessä kuin puhutaan esimerkiksi sinfonisen muodon arkkitehtuurista, joka kasvaa musiikillisten motiivien kehittelystä.'

pockets of light, of life and of space. The light creates a frame around Jussi, as if we were watching him from a screen. A rectangular frame drawn out by light in the dark, like the very movie screen the film is projected on. Jussi's story and the space he occupies become one of many. Just one of the fragments of life and stories that play through in night time Helsinki. On another level the screen looks like Jussi's life, scampering in the dark trying to find the light patches.

Whereas Kontula is shown as a space of natural light and very few shadows, central Helsinki is a space of higher contrasts and harsher lighting. The stark shadows slice the space in Makkaratalo. When the light sources at Kontula were natural and hidden outside the frame light takes centre stage at Makkaratalo. Still despite rows upon rows of lamps glaring down and drawing shadows along the walls the space is dark, threatening and claustrophobic. As Jussi and Pete walk through the underground tunnel, which is drawn out by light and its reflections on the glass, the ceiling looks low. They seem as if they are trapped. Even with the strong lights the boys remain in the dark. They are vague silhouettes in a space of bold lights and glaring reflections. They are soft matter that light doesn't reflect off. This effect of threatening darkness was created without artificial lighting as Suominen explained to Sakari Toiviainen (1980) in a *Filmihullu* interview where he recounted the technical difficulties this posed to the film crew. Suominen (1980) described this night time darkness in the interview 'The whole night, its authenticity, the fact it is only night, there is nothing added'.²¹⁹

Commercial spaces become an oasis of light in the dark night. The lighting in Asematunneli is chaotic and almost futuristic in its multitude. The consumer criticism of the New Wave of the 1960s and 1970s is felt in the disjointed editing of the central Helsinki night and the dystopian shopping maze of the Asematunneli. There it is light rather than walls that define a space. Light and dark draw the limits of a space when glass walls blur the area making the private space deceptively public. The glass walls are solid, but don't provide shelter or safety. They only become structural when light reflects from them. In Kontula the frame rarely included the ceiling, whereas in Makkaratalo the ceiling with its lights is constantly visible and hanging over the characters.

7.3 Access to home

²¹⁹ 'Koko yö, sen väärentämättömyys, se että se on todella yötä, siellä ei ole mitään lisää.'

Bacon (2005, p. 225) brings up the question of access to spaces as a theme of a film. *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* is full by spaces from which Jussi is ejected, at times even forcefully. As he and Pete spend their evening in central Helsinki they are thrown out of a taxi, a cafe and eventually left stranded in the streets. When Jussi returns home after his night out he tries to get into the park building and even school in search of shelter. These buildings are present and quite literally built to meet his needs, but are not accessible. He is left sleeping in the children's playground. When Jussi is not escaping outside the constructs of society, to nature or at the squat, he is constantly on the move. The public spaces that surround him are not accessible. He is left on the streets.

Whilst central Helsinki draws the boys in it is ultimately a space that rejects them. In comparison to the darkness, the glossy surfaces and looming threat of violence that Asematunneli presents to the boys, Kontula is rendered a light, airy and almost homely space. When Jussi stands in the kitchen at home looking out the bright view from the window is framed by the darker shades of the interior. For once Jussi is in the safety of soft shadows looking out at the world. It is almost as the reversal of when Augé (1995, p. 99) talks about sitting on the train and looking through back windows into a sphere of private space. Jussi is in a shadowy domestic space looking out into another similar buildings. It is almost as if he is stuck in one non-place within another. Still when the camera turns to face him, the interior is not dark or shady, but well lit.

8. CONCLUSION

'Space gives the grounds for human action and conditions them not only to act but approach things in certain ways. Architecture has a central role in this process - as a human creation that on its part creates the human. Among the arts film has a unique ability to express the relation between existing and space, human and the built environment.'²²⁰

Henry Bacon (2005, p. 224)

Suominen uses the elements of architecture to express how his characters see and experience the world. His suburbs are not about the loss of the rural way of life, or a symbol for welfare state interventionism as case studies in previous chapters, but

²²⁰ 'Tila tarjoaa puitteet henkilöiden toimille ja ehdollistaa heitä paitsi toimimaan myös asennoitumaan tietyillä tavoilla. Arkkitehtuurilla on keskeinen rooli tässä prosessissa- ihmisen luomuksena, joka osaltaan luo ihmistä. Elokuvalle on taiteiden joukossa aivan erityinen kyky ilmentää olemisen ja paikan, ihmisen ja rakennetun tilan välistä suhdetta.'

spaces of disjointed places of consumerism and travel. This is why Augé's theories are particularly fruitful in examining the construction of Suominen's cinematic Kontula. The dichotomy of the suburb simultaneously being a non-space and a home is what makes his suburb so fascinating. It is both an alienating and personal space. The viewer enters Jussi's world and experiences the space as they imagine his character does. This is where the lines between fiction and reality begin to blur.

Suominen (1980, p. 22) stated that 'my personal interest is that a film is not allowed to leave the real world by even one meter'.²²¹ This insistence on representing reality truthfully is also at the core of *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*. Suominen (1980, p. 22) explained the choice of showing the kids back in school at the end of the film: 'I wanted to raise the point, that there are guys LIVING there, sitting in those desks are similar people, the new kid in the class, they LIVE, in this world.'²²² Even if this intention of representing Kontula realistically has stripped the film of artificial elements in the set design the result is of course always a subjective representation.

The suburban dweller is still ill at ease in the suburban landscape, but this time the high-rises are also his home. Where Helinä in *Vihreä leski* and Urho in *Jouluksi kotiin* mourn the loss of their rural past, or Aimo in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* was determined to hold on to the nostalgic past, in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* Jussi has no other home. Troubled though the relationship may be, the suburb is Jussi's only home. As in earlier case studies, the suburb is given its meaning and message through the actions and attitudes of the characters, how Jussi and his friends interact with the spaces. Though themes of the welfare nation policies, in this case the schooling reform, are raised in the film Suominen also gives these spaces and social changes a human interpretation. Unlike the earlier case studies of this thesis Jussi and his friends in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* have the power to alter their surroundings, quite literally leave a mark on the suburb. It is this shift in portrayal that signals a development of the way the suburb is dealt with in Finnish cinema and offers a beginning for a more reciprocal view to the relationship between inhabitant and cinematic space.

²²¹ 'Minun henkilökohtainen intressini on pikemminkin sellainen, ettei elokuva saa mennä maailmasta metriäkään ulos.'

²²² 'Mutta minä halusin viedä sen siihen, että siellä ELÄÄ jätkiä, siellä on pulpetissa samanlaisia ihmisiä, uusi kaveri luokalla, ne ELÄVÄT, ovat tässä maailmassa.'

Conclusion

The five chapters have provided case studies of how the suburban milieu has been negotiated in Finnish film, examples ranging from 1962 to 1980. The chapters chart the problematic nature of the suburban building project, everyday life within the milieu and shifts in attitude towards the space. Each of the films highlights a different facet of the suburbs and the process of urbanisation. The development of the cinematic style of the films also draw a narrative arc which reflects the ways in which the image of the suburb has adjusted over time. In 1962 Kurkvaara's suburbs were still in the stage of blueprints, sketches and ideas. Captured in drawings, flat canvases and clad in scaffolding, the suburban high-rises were still in the hands of the planners and architects. Six years later Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä leski* shifted the perspective to the people living in the suburb. The film highlights the contrast between the planned suburb and the lived experience of the suburb. The white flat surfaces of Kurvaara's architectural sketches are replaced by dark claustrophobic oppressive spaces as experienced by an alienated housewife. The difficulty of adjusting to urbanisation was reflected onto the suburban milieu and architecture, rendering them vastly different from the planned brilliance of architects in *Yksityisalue*. The problems in adjusting to the suburban high-rise living which Pakkasvirta captured in *Vihreä leski*, was approached with humour by Jarva in 1975. In *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* the pastel hues paint a portrait of what is being lost. The anxieties are the same, but what came before the suburbs is far enough to be romanticised and viewed through the soft-focus lens of nostalgia. Despite very different aesthetics, the rejection of the suburban high-rises is equally central in Pakkasvirta's *Jouluksi kotiin*. The problematic notion of ownership and identity within a suburban apartment-living and its ties to class are explored in a very representative style of social drama of 1970s. In the first four films the point of view moves from planners in *Yksityisalue*, to inhabitant in *Vihreä leski* to those fighting against them in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* to those rejecting high-rise living in *Jouluksi kotiin* and finally Suominen's second generation of suburban dwellers in *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*. In Suominen's treatment the suburbs are both home and a disjointed space which the characters struggle to grasp. The boys who have spent their life in the suburb do not have a past to long for, but nevertheless they are shown unable to connect with their environment.

The overarching sentiment in the films is that the suburbs are a force beyond the control of the characters. The overwhelming force of urbanisation leaves very little room for action; the protection of Jarva's Kivimäki is an isolated pocket in an increasingly high-rise city. The ultimate escape is not through changing one's surroundings, moving or adapting to the suburb, but through death. In a staggering three films out of five the protagonist dies, and in one she is left weeping in desperation on the floor of her suburban home. In *Yksityisalue* the disillusioned architect makes one last adjustment to the high-rise 'slum' in construction and commits suicide. In *Jouluksi kotiin* the lack of alternatives and choice is brought to its dramatic end as Urho dies in his unfinished home. *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* sees its young protagonist's escape from the suburb end abruptly as he falls to his death from the ledge of a central Helsinki landmark. Helinä is driven to despair by her failing marriage and ever present peeping tom in *Vihreä leski*. Only in *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*, the only comedy of the corpus, is there a happy ending. Here Aimo is able to find love and protect his home, narrowly avoiding the fate of having to move to a high-rise suburb.

The films not only question the suburban milieu itself, or the physical qualities of the buildings, but raise wider social issues through problematising the concept of home and belonging. The development and design of the suburbs is the key problem in *Yksityisalue*. In *Vihreä leski* this is done by showing Helinä's isolation having left behind her family and home in rural Finland. *Jouluksi kotiin* rejects the suburban high-rise and portrays ownership of a home beyond the reach of the struggles of the working class. *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* is an impassioned speech on the importance of community, belonging and unity. *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* portrays the social problems of a generation brought up in the suburbs, dealing with schooling reform and broken families. These are wider social and political issues that were not confined to the suburban environment, nor symptomatic of their living conditions. The high-rise suburb rather becomes a physical representation of the urban condition, welfare Finland and its problems. As such cinema refracts the space into an imagined cityscape, a stage where social issues are played out. The way this stage is set, lit and modified is not a reflection of how the suburbs were, but how they were experienced, what connotations and fears they carried. The films trace the transition the area is going through, and society as a whole.

Transport and cars

'Each home would have at least one car' stated the founding papers of Kontula. The suburban landscape is dominated by highways, sustaining arteries connecting the dormitory towns to places of work and leisure. Still, cars are curiously absent from the films. In *Yksityisalue* and *Vihreä leski*, the camera boards a car, zooming through the landscape, but none of the film's protagonists have access to a vehicle. In *Yksityisalue* Pena travels in his boss's car. In *Vihreä leski* Helinä and her children are left standing at the parking lot, as her husband drives off. In *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*, the roads are suspiciously empty of cars, and kept as the domain of the horse drawn carriage. In *Jouluksi kotiin* the family is forced to borrow a friend's Lada to ferry building materials to their site. Here the family are distinctly lacking a car, something that leaves them outside of the suburban experience, a segment of society. *Täältä tullaan, elämä!*'s young men take the bus, or hitch a ride on a teacher's bicycle. Here even the adults do not drive, but use public transport. Though spanning across the two decades when private motoring was going through its boom (Standertskjöld 2011, p. 34) none of the protagonists own their own car.

The selling point of the suburban setting, offering the best of both worlds, city and rural, is lost on the characters wandering on side of motorways. The convenience of modern suburban life is not present in these films but characters are left quite literally stranded in their habitation. The disconnect and sense of being cut off socially is enforced by a physical alienation. The characters are unable to form contacts beyond the limited scope of their suburban lives. The films do not show a single protagonist enjoying the suburban infrastructure in the way it was planned to be enjoyed, driving along wide motorways and parking by your front door. This convenience and sense of freedom is lost on the way from the plans to the cinema screen.

Those selling cars are detested, traitors that have jumped on the consumerist bandwagon. The brother-in-law of *Jouluksi kotiin* drives to the building site, too late to partake in the work, in a new Volkswagen. His job in the auto industry, bragging about cars, is in stark contrast to the SKP members and their Ladas. Here the car becomes a question of class and ideological affiliation. In *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* when Kake is drawn away from his community he plans on opening a gas station. His leaving behind his work as a butcher feeding the community to supplying gas to the fuel the private motoring, is not short of a symbolic dimension.

Changing face of reality

A persistent question throughout the research project has been this: why is the portrayal of the suburbs in these films so negative? Visiting the areas now, the uniformly negative portrayal of the films is perplexing. Similarly the rhetoric in the press in the 60s and 70s, describing the houses as 'deadly white' seems exaggerated. Interviews with the new inhabitants at Kontula (Kokkonen 2002, p. 46, 50, 121) compared getting a home in the suburb to winning the lottery and recount a strong community spirit among the inhabitants of the high-rises. This community spirit and unity is something that is conspicuously absent from all of the films. One explanation is that the time when the Kontula inhabitants were interviewed the majority of the inhabitants were moving in from central Helsinki. The generation of dwellers moving in from the countryside came later, along with the themes of alienation in media, a chain of events documented in *Helsingin Sanomat* newspaper (Roiviainen 1999). Only in the final film *Täältä tullaan, elämä!* which shows the second generation of inhabitants is the suburb a home, albeit one of problems and alienation.

Each of the films reveals a fragment of a hidden truth, about place, space and society. Aside from *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*, all of the films were all praised for their honesty and realism. They capture the change in Finnish society, landscape and film in a way that spoke to the audience. They showed the suburbs from the point of view of those who worked on or lived there. They revealed the realities of the space and the experience of people living in them. However it must be noted that these realities are subject to change, a change which the films negotiate, and play a part in.

The degree of realism of a film is not a measure of its value. Andre Bazin (1967, p. 168) wrote in *Cahiers du Cinéma* about the relationship between painting and film: 'the role of the cinema is not the subordinate and didactic one of photographs in an album or of a film projected as a part of a lecture. These films are works in their own right. They are their own justification. They are not to be judged by comparing them to the paintings they make us of, rather by the anatomy or rather the histology of this newborn aesthetic creature, fruit of the union of painting and cinema.' Thus similar is the relation of architecture and film. Films should be judged not upon the realism of the buildings they depict, but the cinematic spaces they create. These cinematic spaces should not be simply judged upon how truthfully they mimic the real landscape, but on their merit as new spaces. Spaces that add to the canon of the suburb, one image alongside the

architectural drawing of Kontula or the postcard of Tapiola. They are acts of placemaking that add to and enrich the image of the suburb. They capture the attitudes, anxieties and affinities that were directed towards the suburb at a certain point of history.

'I was born in Helsinki, but I have spent my entire childhood in Espoo's Tapiola. My first strong memory of Helsinki is when I was six and we drove through Töölö to my grandmother. I remember looking at the tall buildings of Töölö and narrow streets and thinking that those miserable people who lived there must be very poor. When I was twenty I moved to Helsinki, among the those tall buildings that I feared and hated as a child. Tapiola of the 1960s with its wide green expanses, fragrant rose bushes was a paradise for a small child compared to the paved in Helsinki, and this childhood I find difficult to let go of even as an adult.'²²³

These memories are recounted by film director Kaisa Rastimo (2000, p. 32). She explains that she moved back to Tapiola as an adult to provide an equally wonderful childhood to her own child. Having grown up in Tapiola she embedded the spaces with her own memories, personal histories and narratives. These memories that were so lacking in *Vihreä leski* were built over time by the children who grew up there. Helinä's isolation and alienation would not have been experienced by her children. Similarly Antti Lindqvist viewing *Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* in 1994 found the criticism of high-rises lacking as he wrote 'the obvious attempt to criticise the inhumane (?) high-rise culture and protect old wooden houses is not always convincing.'²²⁴ The fact that the films are a product of their time, reflecting current anxieties and hopes, is made evident in the changing nature of the film's reception. In 1994 Lidqvist (1994) does not find the film as touching as those living under the threat of losing their cityscape in 1975. This is a wider trend that has Heathcote (2000, p. 25) has observed of Modernist architecture in film:

²²³ 'Olen syntynyt Helsingissä, mutta viettänyt koko lapsuuteni Espoon Tapiolassa. Ensimmäinen vahva muistoni Helsingistä on, kun olin kuusivuotias ja ajoimme autolla Töölön läpi isoäitini luo. Muistan kuinka katsoin kummissani Töölön korkeita taloja ja kapeita katuja ja ajattelin, että noiden kurjien talojen asukkaat ovat varmaan tosi köyhiä. 20-vuotiaana muutin asumaan Helsinkiin, niiden korkeiden talojen keskelle, joita lapsena pelkäsin ja inhosin. 1960-luvun Tapiola laajoine, vihreine nurmikkoineen ja kaikkialla tuoksuvine ruusupensaineen oli pienelle lapselle paratiisi verrattuna kiviseen Helsinkiin, ja tästä lapsuudesta minun on vaikea päästä aikuisenakin eroon.'

²²⁴ 'Sen sijaan ilmeinen pyrkimys kritisoida epäinhimillistä (?) kerrostalokulttuuria ja puolustaa vanhoja puutalokortteleita (nykyään entisöidyn puu-Vallilan kohtalo oli tuolloin vaakalaudalla) ei oikein aina vakuuta.'

‘Despite the criticisms, clinical Minimalism and technophile architecture remain popular for those in the trade, while tower blocks are becoming fashionable once more in a kind of post- ironic urban-chic way. In this environment, the categorical acceptance of modern architecture as the enemy, as the embodiment of evil, the de facto style of the villain’s lair or the master criminal’s penthouse may be coming to a close. Increasingly, as it becomes merely another architectural style from which to choose, or as it becomes more acceptable to the broader public and less tinged by association with the epic and visible disasters of modern planning and design, Modernism may yet become one of the good guys - but it will have to overcome the effects of a substantial filmic legacy that will continue to testify eloquently to its many failures.’

As over time the suburban high-rises become commonplace, familiar homes with personal memories and histories attached, the cinematic renderings take different shapes as well. In the early 2000s films set in suburbs were ones of community: the camera allowed open access through hallways, onto the roof and around quiet corners. As inhabitants grew familiar with their surroundings film again reflected this change. The criticism the films analysed in this thesis sparked against suburban architecture and town planning were more indicative of the anxieties regarding urbanisation, the new welfare state policies and loss of traditional rural communities.

This thesis has demonstrated that the topic of the suburb has been problematised in Finnish New Wave filmmaking. These cinematic portrayals have added to the public discourse surrounding the suburban spaces, played a role in their placemaking as much as they have reflected the realities of living in a suburban milieu. They chronicle the journey from space to place, and development of belonging. They highlight human interaction with their surroundings, the yearning for history, ownership and belonging. Very much products of their time, the films reflect upon the changing society structure, the burgeoning welfare nation. The press responses to the film written decades after their first release make the subjective nature of the suburban portrayal evident. The concerns and fears seem exaggerated, the spaces comically one-sided in their gloomy portrayal. This evolution of the suburban portrayal is not only a cinematic one, but also the evolution of the suburb itself and the suburban lifestyle of those who reside there.

‘Architecture has always represented the prototype of a work of art the reception of which is consummated by a collectivity in a state of distraction.’ wrote Walter Benjamin in *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1968, p. 239). Film has the

ability to shake the viewer awake from this distraction and question their relationship towards their surrounding spaces. Through its ability to capture movement, touch, smell and navigation film is able to translate the experience of using a space. Film language is a web of meanings, references, histories that come together as a fictive narrative to refract a version of our reality. As AlSayaad (2006, p. 3) writes about his book 'its underlying assumption is that the boundaries between the real and the reel are no longer useful to maintain.' This thesis shares that goal and AlSayaad's (2006, p. 4) hope to 'raise film to its proper status as an analytical tool of urban discourse'.

Appendix 1

	FILMS	Director	Setting	Produced by	S	V
1960	<i>Lumisten metsien tyttö</i>	Wiliam Markus	Hallava, Lapland small town	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Avaruusrakettilla rakkauteen</i>	George Freedland	Lapland	Alfu-Film GmbH/Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Oho, sanoi Eemeli</i>	Ville Salminen	Logging camp, rural	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Nina ja Erik</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki, rural idyll	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Isaskar Keturin ihmeelliset seikkailut</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Pekka ja Pätkä neekereinä</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Kiusausten vuori</i>	Viljo Lampela	Jerusalem and Palestine	Viljo Lampela		
	<i>Justus järjestää kaiken</i>	Lasse Pöysti	Helsinki	Fennada-Film		
	<i>Skandaali tyttökoulussa</i>	Edvin Laine	Porvoo	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Taistelujen tie</i>	Risto Orko et al	Battlefields around Finland	Suomi-Filmi		
	<i>Kaks' tavallista Lahtista</i>	Ville Salminen	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Iskelmäkaruselli pyörii</i>	Harry Orvonmaa	Helsinki	Filmi-Tria		
	<i>Kankkulan kaivolla</i>	Toivo Särkkä, Aarne	Rural village	Suomen Filmitoimisto		

		Tarkas				
	<i>Komisario Palmun erehdys</i>	Matti Kassila	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Autotytöt</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki, Hanko	Kurkvaara-Filmi		
	<i>Opettajatar seikkailee</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Porvoo, Helsinki, ocean/island	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Iloinen Linnanmäki</i>	Jack Witikka	Helsinki, Linnanmäki	Veikko Itkonen		
	<i>Myöhästynyt hääyö</i>	Edvin Laine	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Molskis, sano! Eemeli, molskis!</i>	Ville Salminen	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
1961	<i>Tähtisumua (Stardust)</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Minkkiturkki</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Nuoruus vauhdissa</i>	Valentin Vaala	Helsinki, Turku	Suomi-Filmi		
	<i>Tulipunainen kyyhykynen</i>	Matti Kassila	Helsinki, summerhouse	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Toivelauluja</i>	Ville Salminen	Studio set	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Mullin mallin</i>	Veikko Itkonen	Studio set	Veikko Itkonen		
	<i>Olin nahjuksen vaimo</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Porvoo, Paris	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Tyttö ja hattu</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Rakas..</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki, island retreat	Kurkvaara-Filmi		x
	<i>Hetkiä yössä</i>	Eino	Helsinki	Eino Ruutsalo		

		Ruutsalo			
	<i>Voi veljet, mikä päivä!</i>	Sakari Jurkka, Veikko Itkonen	Summer house	Veikko Itkonen	
	<i>Kaasua, Komisario Palmu!</i>	Matti Kassila	Helsinki	Fennada-Filmi	
	<i>Miljoonavaihtoliikenne</i>	Toivo Särkkä	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto	
	<i>Oksat pois...</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Rural milieu and hotel	Suomen Filmitoimisto	
	<i>Kultainen vasikka</i>	Ritva Arvelo	Porvoo, small town	Fennada-Filmi	
	<i>Pikku Pietarin Piha</i>	Jack Witikka	Porvoo, small town	Suomi-Filmi	
	<i>Kertokaa se hänelle...</i>	Åke Lindman	Häme, rural	Suomen Filmitoimisto	
	<i>Me</i>	Toivo Särkkä	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto	
1962	<i>Kuu on vaarallinen</i>	Toivo Särkkä	Summer house near Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto	
	<i>Häyö</i>	Erik Blomberg	Poland	Allotria-Filmi international coproduction	
	<i>Älä nuolase...</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto	
	<i>Pikku Suorasuu</i>	Edvin Laine	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto	
	<i>Taape Tähtenä</i>	Armand Lohikoski	Helsinki	Mainoselokuva Oy	
	<i>Pinsiön Parooni</i>	Edvin Laine	Tampere	Suomen Filmitoimisto	
	<i>Se alkoi omenasta</i>	Teuvo Tulio	Helsinki	Mainoselokuva Oy	
	<i>"Ei se mitään" sanoi Eemeli</i>	Åke Lindman	Pösökylä, rural village	Suomen Filmitoimisto	

	<i>Hän varasti elämän</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Village	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Naiset, jotka minulle annoit</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki, Lahti	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Mäki Moore maailmanmestaruus</i>		Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Tähdet kertovat, Komisario Palmu</i>	Matti Kassila	Helsinki	Fennada-Filmi		
	<i>Varjostettua valoa</i>	Jarno Hiilloskorpi	Helsinki	Tähtelä-Filmi Oy		
	<i>Yksityisalue</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki, Espoo	Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy	x	x
	<i>Kun tuomi kukkii</i>	Åke Lindman	Rural milieu	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Tuulinen päivä</i>	Eino Ruutsalo	Island and Helsinki	Eino Ruutsalo		
	<i>Vaarallista Vapautta</i>	Veikko Itkonen	Helsinki	Filmi-Kuva Oy		
	<i>Yö vai Päivä</i>	Risto Jarva, Jaakko Pakkasvirta	Puumala, Helsinki	Elokuvaosakeyhtiö Filminor		x
	<i>Pojat</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Oulu	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Näkymätön käsi</i>	Veronica Leo, Anelma Vuorio	-	Elokuva Oy		
	<i>Kolmen kaupungin kasvot</i>	Matti Kassila	Turku, Tampere, Helsinki	Suomi-Filmi		
	<i>Ihana seikkailu</i>	Toivo Särkkä	Mansion house	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
1963	<i>Tie pimeään</i>	Ossi Skurnik	Helsinki,	Sagittarius-filmi Oy		

			Tampere			
	<i>Villin pohjolan kulta</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Lapland	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Sissit</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Battlefields	Fennada-Filmi		
	<i>Meren juhlat</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki, island retreat	Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy		
	<i>Totuus on armoston</i>	Valentin Vaala	Helsinki, Hämeenlinna	Suomi-Filmi		
	<i>Jengi</i>	Åke Lindman	Helsinki	Suomen Filmitoimisto		x
	<i>Turkasen tenava!</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki, Kouvola	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Suomalainen ratsuväki</i>	Kari Uusitalo, Veikko Laihanen	Archival footage	Veikko Laihanen Oy		
	<i>Teerenpeliä</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Helsinki, Hämeenlinna	Suomen Filmitoimisto		
	<i>Lauantaileikit</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki	Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy		
	<i>Hopeaa rajan takaa</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Finnish-Soviet border	Fennada-Filmi		
	<i>Villin pohjolan salattu laakso</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Lapland	Keskus-Elokuva		
	<i>Kesällä kello 5</i>	Erkko Kivikoski	Helsinki, camping by ocean	Elokuva Oy		x
	<i>Luonnon kätköissä</i>	Harry Lewing, Bernt von Grönhalgen	Various woodlands	Suomi-Filmi		
1964	<i>Naiset</i>	Maunu	Helsinki	Kurkvaara-Filmi		x

		Kurkvaara				
	<i>Harha-askel</i>	Erik Häkkinen	Helsinki and briefly Espoo	Filmiteos M.E.Häkkinen		
	<i>Raportti eli balladi laivatytöistä</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki, Lebanon, Egypt, etc	Kurkvaara-Filmi		
	<i>Käyntikorttini...</i>	Erkko Kivikoski	Helsinki	Elokuva Oy		
	<i>X-paroni</i>	Spede Pasanen, Risto Jarva, Jaakko Pakkasvirta	Helsinki and rural idyll	Spede Pasanen/Hupiklubi Oy/Filminor		
	<i>Onnelliset leikit</i>	Aito Mäkinen, Esko Elstelä	Helsinki and rural mansion	Suomi-Filmi		
	<i>Juokse kuin varas</i>	Palmer Thompson, Åke Lindman	Helsinki, Tapiola	Veikko Laihanen Oy/VP-Productions		
	<i>Viheltäjät</i>	Eino Ruutsalo	Paris	Eino Ruutsalo		
1965	<i>Jäinen saari</i>	Erik Häkkinen	Järvenpää, Helsinki	Filmiteos M.E.Häkkinen		
	<i>4x4</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki	Kurkvaara-Filmi		
	<i>Laukaus Kyproksessa</i>	Åke Lindman	Cyprus	Oleg Jakolvew		
	<i>Kielletty kirja</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki	Kurkvaara-Filmi		
	<i>Onnenpeli</i>	Risto Jarva	Helsinki	Filminor		x
	<i>Laituri</i>	Eino Ruutsalo	Helsinki, rural idyll	Eino Ruutsalo		

	<i>Vaaksa vaaraa</i>	Aito Mäkinen	Helsinki	Suomi-Filmi/Aito Mäkinen		
	<i>Täällä alkaa seikkailu</i>	Jörn Donner	Helsinki, Espoo	Sandrews/Fennada-Filmi	x	x
	<i>Väreitä</i>	Ilmari Sarki (Martti Saarikivi)	Lake setting	Suomi-Filmi		
1966	<i>Tunteita</i>	Kalevi Korte, Leena Salokangas, Asko Tolonen, Jaakko Talaskivi	Helsinki	Suomi-Filmi		
	<i>Johan nyt on markkinat!</i>	Aarne Tarkas	Santahamina, Porvoo	Suomi-Filmi		
	<i>Topralli</i>	Yrjö Tähtelä	Hämeenlinna, Helsinki, Stockholm	Tähtelä-Filmi Oy		
	<i>Millipilleri</i>	Spede Pasanen, Ere Kokkonen, Jukka Virtanen	Helsinki, brief segments abroad	Nova-Filmi		
	<i>Tänään olet täällä</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Ibiza, Helsinki, Lapland, N-Africa	Kurkvaara-Filmi		
	<i>Käpy selän alla</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Forest by lake	Fj-Filmi		x
	<i>Rakkaus alkaa aamuyöstä</i>	Jarno Hiilloskorpi	Rural milieu	Fennada-Filmi		
1967	<i>Työmiehen</i>	Risto Jarva	Tampere,	Filminor	x	x

	<i>päiväkirja</i>		Helsinki			
	<i>Pähkähullu Suomi</i>	Jukka Virtanen	Road trip around Finland	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Lapualaismorsian</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Helsinki	Fj-Filmi/Jörn Donner Productions		x
1968	<i>Vihreä leski</i>	Jaakko Pakkasvirta	Espoo, Tapiola	Filminor	x	x
	<i>Äl'ylä päästä perhana</i>	Matti Kassila	Helsinki, brief segments abroad	MK-Filmi		
	<i>Kuuma kissa?</i>	Erkko Kivikoski	Lahti	Fj-Filmi		
	<i>Mustaa valkoisella</i>	Jörn Donner	Helsinki, Lassila, Porvoo, Kotka	Fj-Filmi/Jörn Donner Productions	x	x
	<i>Rottasota</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki	Kurkvaara-Filmi		
	<i>Noin 7 veljestä</i>	Jukka Virtanen	Forests	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Täällä Pohjantähden alla</i>	Edvin Laine	Rural town	Fennada-Filmi		
	<i>Punahilkka</i>	Timo Bergholm	Small town, Helsinki	Fj-Filmi/Jörn Donner Productions		
	<i>Miljoonaliiga</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki, Cöpenhagen, Stockholm	Kurkvaara-Filmi		
	<i>Vain neljä kertaa</i>	Aito Mäkinen, Virke Lehtinen	Helsinki, areas by sea	Filmiryhmä Oy		
	<i>Mannerheim-Suomen Marslakka</i>	Kari Uusitalo	Around Finland	Suomi-Filmi		

	<i>Asfalttilampaat</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Naantali	Fj-Filmi		
1969	<i>Ruusujen Aika</i>	Risto Jarva	Helsinki, studio	Filminor		
	<i>Lapualaisballadi</i>	Gösta Ågren	Pohjanmaa	Gösta Ågren, Sandrew Film & Teater Ab, Svenska Filminstitutet		
	<i>Näköradiomiehen ihmeelliset seikkailut</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Helsinki, studio	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Se oli vuonna 1923... kun isällä oli hammassärky</i>	Kari Uusitalo	Helsinki	Suomi-Filmi Oy		
	<i>Leikkikalugangsteri</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Helsinki	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Vodkaa komisario Palmu</i>	Matti Kassila	Helsinki, Moscow	Fennada-Filmi		
	<i>69-Sixty-nine</i>	Jörn Donner	Helsinki	Fj-Filmi/Jörn Donner Productions/Omega Film		x
	<i>Punatukka</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki, summer house	Kurkvaara-Filmi		
	<i>Kesyttömät veljekset</i>	Erkko Kivikoski	Helsinki, Pitäjänmäki	Fennada-Filmi		
	<i>Pohjan tähteet</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Road trip to Lapland	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
1970	<i>Kesäkapina</i>	Jaakko Pakkasvirta	Summer houses, Helsinki	Filminor, FJ-Filmi Oy		
	<i>Naisenkuvia</i>	Jörn Donner	Summer house in archipelago	Fj-Filmi/Jörn Donner Productions		x

	<i>Julisteiden liimaajat</i>	Tuomi-Juhani Vuorenmaa	Helsinki	Anar-Cinema		
	<i>Muurahaispolku</i>	Aito Mäkinen, Virke Lehtinen	Road trip around Finland	Filmiryhmä Oy		
	<i>Jussi Pussi</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Helsinki	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Speedy Gonzales-noin seitsemän veljeksien poika</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Wild west set	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Takiaispallo</i>	Veli-Matti Saikkonen	Valkeakoski	Filmi-Jatta		
	<i>Bensaa suonissa</i>	Risto Jarva	Jyväskylä, various motorways	Filminor/Fj-Filmi		x
	<i>Anna</i>	Jörn Donner	Summer house	Fj-Filmi		
	<i>Päämaja</i>	Matti Kassila	Mikkeli	Suomi-Filmi/Filmi-Jatta		
	<i>Narrien illat</i>	Tapio Suominen	Around Finland	Mark-Filmi/Pentti Lintonen		
	<i>Pilvilinna</i>	Sakari Rimminen	Helsinki	Fj-Filmi		
	<i>Akseli ja Elina</i>	Edvin Laine	Rural milieu	Fennada-Filmi		
1971	<i>Kreivi</i>	Peter von Bagh	Several towns in Southern Finland	Filminor/Fj-Filmi		
	<i>Kahdeksas veljes</i>	Spede Pasanen	Helsinki, Kivilampi	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Perkele! Kuvia Suomesta</i>	Jörn Donner et al	Forssa, Helsinki, Pori, Turku etc.	Fj-Filmi		x

	<i>Saatanan radikaalit</i>	Heikki Huopanen et al	Helsinki	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Musta lumikki</i>	Matti Sokka	Helsinki	Matti Sokka/Filmi-Jatta		
	<i>Hirttämättömät</i>	Spede Pasanen	Wild west set	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Maunu Kurkvaaran Kujanjuoksu</i>	Maunu Kurkvaara	Helsinki	Kurkvaara-Filmi		
	<i>Aatamin puvussa ja vähän Eevankin</i>	Matti Kassila	Rural village	Fennada-Filmi		
	<i>Laulu tulipunaisesta kukasta</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Rural village	AC-Filmi		
1972	<i>Marja pieni!</i>	Eija-Elina Bergholm	Helsinki, Hämeenlinna	Jörn Donner Productions		
	<i>Hellyys</i>	Jörn Donner	Helsinki	Jörn Donner Productions		
	<i>Kun Taivas Putoaa...</i>	Risto Jarva	Helsinki and briefly Espoo	Filminor		
	<i>Kahdeksan Surmanluotia</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Konginkangas	Yleisradio Tv 1/Televisioteatteri/Käpy-Filmi Oy		x
	<i>Haluan rakastaa Peter</i>	Matti Kassila	Ruotsi, Helsinki	AC-tuotanto/Adams Filmi		
	<i>Sensuela</i>	Teuvo Tulio	Lapland, Helsinki	Teuvo Tulio		
	<i>Lampaansyöjät</i>	Seppo Huunonen	Road trip around Finland	Filmi-Ässä		
1973	<i>Pohjantähti</i>	Edvin Laine	Rural milieu	Fennada-Filmi		
	<i>Laukaus Tehtaalla</i>	Erkko Kivikoski	Tuusula	Jörn Donner Productions		

	<i>Uuno Turhapuro</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Helsinki	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>Mommilan veriteot 1917</i>	Jotaarkka Pennanen	Nokia	Jörn Donner Productions		
	<i>Meiltähän tämä käy</i>	Matti Kassila	Paper mill in small town	Fennada-Filmi/Mauno Mäkelä		
	<i>Maa on Syntinen Laulu</i>	Rauni Mollberg	Lapland	RM-Tuotanto		x
	<i>Krapula</i>	Jörn Donner	Helsinki, Stockholm	Jörn Donner Productions/Swedish Filmproduction International Ab		
	<i>Herra Huu Jestapa Jepulis Penikat Sipuliks</i>	Jaakko Talaskivi	Helsinki	Suomen Elokuvaosuuskunta		
1974	<i>Yhden Miehen Sota</i>	Risto Jarva	Towns across Finland	Filminor	x	x
	<i>Karvat</i>	Seppo Huunonen	Helsinki, Malaga	Eloseppo Oy		
	<i>Viu-hah-hah-taja</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Helsinki	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
1975	<i>Jouluksi kotiin</i>	Jaakko Pakkasvirte	Fringes of Helsinki	Filmityö Oy	x	x
	<i>Professori Uuno D.G. Turhapuro</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Cottage and Helsinki	Filmituotanto Spede Pasanen		
	<i>“Kesän maku”</i>	Asko Tolonen	Turku archipelago	Filmi-Jatta Oy		
	<i>Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei</i>	Risto Jarva	Helsinki, Puu- Vallila	Filminor Oy	x	x
	<i>Rakastunut rampa</i>	Esko Favén, Tarja Laine	Turku	Filmisyndikaatti Ilkka Lehtonen Ky, Osmo A Wilkuna, Esko Favén		

1976	<i>Ingmar Bergmanin maailma</i>	Jörn Donner	Stockholm, Fårö	Jörn Donner Productions		
	<i>Ikäluokka</i>	Pirjo Honkasalo, Pekka Lehto	Konnevesi	2-P-Prod.		
	<i>Luottamus</i>	Edvin Laine, Victor Tregubovitš	Leningrad, Moscow, Helsinki	Fennada-Filmi Oy/Lenfilm		
	<i>Lottovoittaja UKK Turhapuro</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Summer house	Funny-Films Oy		
	<i>Muotoilijan maailma Timo Sarpaneva</i>	Aito Mäkinen	Ateljee and German factory	Filmiryhmä Oy/Ky Aito Mäkinen & Co.		
	<i>Pyhä perhe</i>	Anssi Mänttari	Helsinki	Jörn Donner Productions		
	<i>Antti Puuhaara</i>	Heikki Partanen, Katariina Lahti, Riitta Rautoma	Karjala	Ay Partanen&Rautoma, Sveriges Radio TV2		
	<i>Kuumat kundit</i>	Jussi Itkonen	Helsinki	Filmituotanto Jussi Itkonen Ky		
	<i>Loma</i>	Risto Jarva	Helsinki, island of Rhodes	Filminor Oy		
1977	<i>Pulakapina</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Nivala	Käpy-Filmi Oy		
	<i>Yön sylissä</i>	Jon Lindström	Stockholm, Hanko	Jörn Donner Productions/Swedish Filmproduction International Ab		
	<i>Häpy endkö?</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Helsinki, summerhouse	Spede Productions Oy		
	<i>Aika hyvä</i>	Rauni	Small town	Arctic-Filmi Oy		

	<i>ihmiseksi</i>	Mollberg				
	<i>Viimeinen savotta</i>	Edvin Laine	Rural milieu	Suomi-Filmi Oy		
	<i>Kaunis muisto</i>	Per-Olof Strandberg	Summer house	Per-Olof Strandberg		
	<i>Jäniksen Vuosi</i>	Risto Jarva	Journey through Finland	Filminor Oy	x	x
1978	<i>Tuntematon ystävä</i>	Lars G. Thelestam	Helsinki, Tanger	Filmi-Jatta Oy/TV- ja Filmikonsultit Dennis Livson Ky		
	<i>Bergman-kansio</i>	Jörn Donner	Stockholms, Göteborg, Cannes	Jörn Donner Productions Oy/Sveriges Radio TV 1		
	<i>Miestä ei voi raiskata.</i>	Jörn Donner	Helsinki	Jörn Donner Productions Oy/Stockholm Film Ab		
	<i>Lintumies</i>	Seppo Putkinen	Rural village	Ateljé Seppo Putkinen		
	<i>Rautakauppias Uno Turhapuro Presidentin vävy</i>	Ere Kokkonen	Helsinki	Amusement Films Oy		
	<i>Syksyllä kaikki on toisin</i>	Mikko Niskanen	Konginkangas	National-Filmi Oy		x
	<i>Runoilija ja muusa</i>	Jaakko Pakkasvirta	Helsinki	Filmityö Oy/Oy Mainos-TV-Reklam Ab		x
	<i>Vartioitu kylä</i>	Timo Linnasalo	Kainuu	Reppufilmi Oy		
	<i>Piilopirtti</i>	Seppo Huunonen	Rural milieu	Vasarakuva Oy		
	<i>Kirje</i>	Pekka Hyytiäinen	Summer house	Suomi-Filmi Oy		

1979	<i>Risto Vanarin piilokamera</i>	Risto Vanari	Helsinki, Tampere	Filmi-Jatta Oy/Adams Filmi Oy/Spede-Yhtiöt, Oy Mainos-TV-Reklam Ab		
	<i>Seitsemän veljestä</i>	Riitta Nelimarkka, Jaakko Seeck	Studio set	Nelimarkka&Seeck		
	<i>Ruskan jälkeen</i>	Edvin Laine	Koilismaa	Fennada-Filmi Oy		
	<i>Koeputkiakuinen ja Simon enkelit</i>	Spede Pasanen	Helsinki	Funny-Films Oy		
	<i>Ihmemies</i>	Antti Peippo	Helsinki	Filminor Oy		
	<i>Kainuu 39.</i>	Pirjo Honkasalo, Pekka Lehto	Finnish-Soviet border	Jörn Donner Productions Oy/Sveriges Radio TV 1		
	<i>Natalia</i>	Matti Kassila	Lapland	CineArt Oy		
	<i>Herra Puntila ja hänen renkinsä Matti</i>	Ralf Långbacka	Häme, rural	Reppufilmi Oy/Svenska Filminstitutet		
1980	<i>Tulitikkuja lainaamassa</i>	Risto Orko, Leonid Gaidai	Pohjois- Karjala	Suomi-Filmi, Mosfilm		
	<i>Voi juku - mikä lauantai!</i>	Visa Mäkinen	Road trip around Finland	Curly-Production		
	<i>Täältä Tullaan Elämä!</i>	Tapio Suominen	Kontula suburb, Helsinki	Sateenkaarifilmi Oy	x	x
	<i>Korpinpolska</i>	Markku Lehmuskallio	Lapland	Markku Lehmuskallio, Suomi-Filmi Oy, Sveriges Television Luleå		
	<i>Mitäs me sankarit</i>	Visa Mäkinen	Pori	Produktion Visa Mäkinen		

	<i>Espanjankävijät</i>	Mikael Wahlforss	Spain	Pekka Pajuvirta, Kari Kekkonen, Oy Yleisradio Ab TV-1		
	<i>Tup akka lakko</i>	Spede Pasanen	Helsinki	Funny-Films Oy		
	<i>Tulipää</i>	Pirjo Honkasalo, Pekka Lehto	Around Finland and USSR	P-Kino Oy		
	<i>Aurinkotuuli</i>	Timo Linnasalo	Helsinki	Filminor Oy		
	<i>Tullivapaa avioliitto</i>	János Zsombolyai	Budapest, Helsinki	Finn Co-Producers Oy/Ma-film Hunnia Filmstúdió		
	<i>Milka</i>	Rauni Mollberg	Lapland	Arctic-Filmi Oy		

Appendix 2

Under the Scaffolding: Cinematic Representations of High-rise Buildings in Tapiola and Malmö

Pei-Sze Chow and Essi Viitanen

University College London

The subject of this paper was first presented as a dialogue between Pei-Sze Chow and Essi Viitanen at the Nordic Research Network conference.

Introduction

This paper grew from an ongoing exchange of ideas between two research projects that seek to understand the multifaceted representations of architecture as depicted on film and in television. In this essay, we analyse two examples of Nordic landmarks and the ways in which these are interpreted and re-imagined on screen. In both examples, Tapiola in Finland and Malmö in Sweden, the focus is on innovative welfare state residential housing projects that have been pioneering in their vision for redefining Nordic social housing.

Both examples draw on Michel de Certeau's 1997 work *Walking in the City*, in which he differentiates the experience of looking at the city and that of walking through it:

An Icarus flying above these waters, he can ignore the devices of Daedalus in mobile and labyrinths far below. His elevation transfigures him into a voyeur.

[...]

The ordinary practitioners of the city live 'down below,' below the thresholds at which visibility begins. They walk – an elementary form of this experience of the city; they are walkers, Wandersmänner, whose bodies follow the thicks and thins of an urban 'text' they write without being to read it. (1997: 92-93)

Describing looking down at the Manhattan city grid from the 110th floor of the World Trade Centre, de Certeau argues that this elevated viewpoint allows him to read the city visually, similar to the same scopical drive that 'haunts users of architectural productions by materialising today the utopia that yesterday was only painted' (*ibid.* 92). He sees the city through the perspective of the 'totalizing eye' of architects and

planners – as a perfected 'panorama city' to be gazed upon. However, de Certeau writes that it is necessary to 'disentangle' ourselves from this 'voyeur-god' perspective, and he argues for an experience of the city from 'down below'. In other words, seeing becomes an impediment to understanding and experiencing 'hidden and familiar meanings' in the various pockets of lived spaces that are only made apparent through walking (*ibid.* 104). These forms of operation transform the space by misappropriation through misappreciation as walkers reinterpret the cityscape, weaving their own paths among the buildings.

We draw on film as an analytical tool to make visible this disconnect between planned space and lived space, as described by de Certeau. Through our discussion of the two residential sites, their planned attributes, and the representations of these buildings on film, we show how the cinematic reworkings of these sites present an alternative dimension of social commentary and criticism that are otherwise absent from the planned vision of the spaces.

Tapiola

Täyttäköön tähän nouseva puutarhakaupunki siihen kiinnitetyt toiveet ja olkoon se voimakkaana sysäyksenä asuntopoliittiselle kehitykselle koko maassa. (Von Hertzen, 1984: 53)

(Let the garden city which rises here fulfil the hopes we have for it, and let it be a strong launch for the development of housing policy in the whole nation.)¹

These hopeful words form the final sentence of the charter of Tapiola, laid into the ground alongside the foundation stone in the official groundbreaking ceremony of Tapiola on 5 September 1953. They launched the building of Finland's first garden city, which defined the white modernist aesthetic of Finnish suburban high-rise developments (*ibid.* 219). Located on the outskirts of Helsinki, this was an area where plans carefully devised by famed Finnish architects came to life; where Otto-livari Meurman's (1954) theories on suburban settlements served as a basis for townplanning, and Aarne Ervi's award-winning design for the Keskusallas, a central water feature complete with fountains, was realised. Tapiola was also the culmination of Heikki von Hertzen's vision for progressive suburban housing, which provided inhabitants with a healthy living environment away from the dust and noise of central Helsinki. Von Hertzen, the executive director of the housing organisation Asuntosäätiö, which was in charge of developing Tapiola, had already outlined his views on the future

of housing in his 1947 book *Koti vaiko kasarmi lapsillemme (Homes or Barracks for our Children)*. This new area was to become a model of architectural elegance, whilst setting the benchmark for egalitarian housing policy (von Herzen, 1984). In many ways Tapiola succeeded in this, as Asko Salokorpi described it as 'a model for success' in the field of social planning (1970: 45). This suburb of white high-rises on the outskirts of Helsinki became known as a showcase of Finnish architectural skill and an attraction to show foreign visitors (von Herzen, 1984).

In the 1960s, a decade after building started, the suburban town of Tapiola sparked an interest among filmmakers, such as Maunu Kurkvaara and Jaakko Pakkasvirta. Their films captured the architectural glory of the newly built area whilst simultaneously developing the cinematic style of Finnish New Wave filmmaking. This new style of cinema broke away from the conventions of the rural melodramas of the studio system and focused on examining the urban experience (Toiviainen, 1975). Kurkvaara and Pakkasvirta's films marvel at modernist architecture and high-rise housing, whilst exposing the viewer to a darker and more sinister side of the suburban experience. Films such as Kurkvaara's *Yksityisalue (Private Property)*, 1962 and Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä Leski (The Green Widow)*, 1968 render the landmarks and skyline of Tapiola into their cinematic landscape and set a localised stage for fictive storylines.

Kurkvaara's *Yksityisalue* begins with the suicide of its protagonist, the architect Koski, and follows his young colleague's investigation into the events that lead to Koski's death. Whilst recounting Koski's last days, the film touches upon the planning process of the suburbs and the moral dilemmas of mass housing. Architecture is ever present in the film. Drawings of buildings decorate the walls of the architect's office, we browse through books on Le Corbusier, visit an exhibition showcasing Oscar Niemeyer's work, and watch Koski's hand as he sketches towering high-rises. The viewer is privy to arguments with developers over cutting corners on the design in order to reach profit margins. Koski's voiceover recounts designing suburban housing, his despair over the ready-made slums they are building, and his disillusionment with his own profession. Despite the film using architecture as a prominent theme throughout, it remains viewed only from the perspective of the designer. *Yksityisalue* does not show a single inhabitant occupying the new buildings, but instead draws attention to the problematic role of the architect and the financial constraints of the construction process.

Whilst most of *Yksityisalue*'s architecture exists on paper, in books or at a construction sites covered in scaffolding, the shot of Tapiola introduces the finished product in all its measured and pristine glory. Kurkvaara introduces the viewer to Tapiola through its

architectural landmarks. The protagonist Koski and his muse drive to Tapiola and pull up by Aarne Ervi's instantly recognizable the water feature. The camera moves in vertical pans drawing attention to the upward lines of the crisp white high-rise buildings. The couple's arrival is followed directly by a shot of them from high above the street level enjoying the views from one of the central high-rises. They sit by a window, which frames a perfectly symmetrical landscape of woodland, bold high-rises, and perfectly straight roads. As de Certeau describes looking down at the uniform beauty of the Manhattan city grid, experiencing the harmonious and precise geometry of roads and buildings (1997: 91), Kurkvaara shifts the perspective in a similar manner. A skyline of memorable landmarks is transformed by a shift in vantage point. The scene gives one of the film's few glimpses of modernist architecture in its finished form.

Pakkasvirta's *Vihreä Leski* also uses Tapiola as its setting, but this time showing the experiences of a housewife living in the area. The opening of the film shows a documentary-style interview with a local inhabitant. The woman praises the area as a nice place to live in, whilst the camera guides the viewer through Tapiola's architectural landmarks. Similar to Kurkvaara, Pakkasvirta introduces the milieu through the familiar landmarks of Tapiola centre, but his camera remains on the street level, following the pedestrians past buildings and into the domestic sphere.

In *Vihreä Leski* the modernist architecture serves as a backdrop to isolation, depression, and an overarching theme of voyeurism and surveillance. Landmarks become a façade which hide a more fragmented and troubled experience of Tapiola. The forest, which von Hertzen hoped would bring residents closer to nature (1984), is now the domain of a peeping tom who is a constant unsettling presence. The welfare state show home is transformed into a dark and oppressive place. The camera in *Vihreä Leski* moves on ground level following the characters as they wander through the space, or assumes the point of view of a peeping tom in the forest. It shows the isolation of those who live in Tapiola, a selection of lonely figures, sectioned off in a grid of identical windows.

Moving from *Yksityisalue*'s harmonious spatial geometry, viewed from on high, to the paranoia of walking through dark woods in *Vihreä Leski*, the cinematic reimaginings of Tapiola echo de Certeau's 'Icarian fall' (1997: 92). Both films capture the initial optimism and private fears of adjusting to an unfamiliar suburban lifestyle, whilst drawing attention to the wide gulf between the planned environment and the experience of living in it. Kurkvaara highlights the aesthetic beauty of the 'panorama-city' of Tapiola, and comments on the problematic nature of realising the planned vision

for suburban housing. Pakkasvirta introduces the planned space, but delves into the 'down-below', showing the intimate everyday interactions between the walker and her surroundings. The portrayals of both films problematise the suburban milieu and draw attention to the disconnect between the place and its residents.

Turning Torso

'Välkommen till Malmö's landmärke.'

'Welcome to Malmö's landmark.' The phrase greets the visitor upon loading the HSB Turning Torso's official website. Elsewhere on Sweden and Malmö's tourism websites, the Turning Torso appears either in an unassuming pose at the centre of a tranquil waterfront development, or shot from a worm's-eye angle drenched in all colours of the rainbow promoting the top eleven gay-friendly places to visit in Malmö. From virtual spaces to the physical space itself, the Turning Torso is ever-present and dominates the visual field: while walking around Malmö, you are always playing hide-and-seek with the skyscraper, and whether you are flying into Kastrup, hiking in Lund, or watching a television crime drama series set in Öresund, a view of the building is unavoidable. While also serving as a navigational tool and a symbol of the city's rejuvenated character, the Turning Torso's twisted shape is typically depicted in the media as a cool, cosmopolitan artefact in urban Malmö. What is unseen, however, are the internal conflicts and tensions that constitute the place. *Sossen, arkitekten och det skruvade huset (The Socialist, The Architect and the Twisted Tower)*, the 2005 documentary by Fredrik Gertten tracing the building's genesis, makes visible the disconnect between the planned vision for the building and its reception by the local community.

The Turning Torso was first conceived by world-renowned 'starchitect' Santiago Calatrava as a sculpture that accompanied his entry for the architectural competition for the Öresund Bridge project in 1999. The idea to translate the design into a residential skyscraper in Malmö's new Western Harbour district was proposed by Jonny Örbäck, then-Managing Director of Hyresgästernas sparkasse och byggnadsförening (HSB), one of Sweden's largest housing organisations and co-operatives. Construction began in 2001 and was finally completed four years later, with many lauding its architectural innovations.

As is expected of large-scale prestige projects, the construction process for the Turning Torso was not without its controversies. This included negative reactions to its

architectural design, engineering challenges, an ever-increasing budget, the delayed schedule, and declining interest from buyers of the apartments over time. While these concerns are certainly no different from other projects of starchitectural status,² what made the Turning Torso a contentious topic was the state's branding of the project as the city's new landmark. It was to replace Malmö's beloved landmark, the Kockums crane, which was due to be dismantled (*Guide: Western Harbour. Sustainable City Development*, 2009: 4). Inhabitants of Malmö had come to form strong emotional attachments to the crane, which was also the subject of one of Gertten's documentaries set in the region, *Bye Bye Malmö* (2002).³ In its place, the Turning Torso was to be several things at once: a landmark for inhabitants of the city, an architectural shorthand for Malmö (and to a certain extent, the Öresund region), and a new beacon of the city's post-industrial modernisation and transformation from a working-class community into a white-collar knowledge-based economy. In Malmö's tourism material, images of the Turning Torso dominate websites and brochures, while also featuring regularly in film and television productions, *Bron/Broen (The Bridge*, 2011–2013) and the 2013 Eurovision Song Contest broadcast being recent examples. Embedded within the city council's emphasis on sustainable development, these representations of the Turning Torso contribute to a coherent image and narrative of Malmö as a 'City of Tomorrow', attracting various streams of human and cultural capital and commercial investment (Jansson, 2005: 1672; Tryggestad and Georg, 2001: 188).



The Turning Torso.

(Creative Commons license, from Wikipedia:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Turning_Torso_3.jpg)

To say the design of the Turning Torso is unique is an understatement. In the context of Swedish housing design, the construction of the residential skyscraper certainly broke away from tradition and presented a radical and perhaps even provocative interpretation of Swedish residential housing. As noted by architecture commentator Paul Goldberger in *The New Yorker*, the building's design is out of sync with the rest of the immediate surroundings and there is 'little interest in connecting to street life' (2005). Its distinctive design by an international architect was certainly no guarantee for a warm welcome by the locals, as is made very clear in the dramatic narrative of *Sossen, arkitekten och det skruvade huset*, particularly in scenes where HSB shareholders expressed their firm dislike of the building alongside a lack of faith in Örbäck as a leader. The documentary charts the various struggles faced by Örbäck to deliver the building on time and within budget, and to convince the HSB stakeholders of the Turning Torso's relevance to Malmö while managing the tensions between the

Swedish engineering and construction team and Calatrava and his team of architects. By the end of the film, Örbäck is forced to resign while the completed building goes on to win international awards.

The film comes to an end just as the building begins to come to life, as it were. The only full images of Turning Torso within the film are the various planned and symbolic representations of the building, particularly in the form of architectural sketches and models, the original sculpture, and Calatrava's commentary on the building's design being inspired by the movement of the human body. Calatrava's voice commands this narrative of the building as a desirable 'body' and inspiration for its inhabitants and the local community, and throughout the film, we see the design process of this body as it is being constructed. Örbäck emphasises in the film also that the Turning Torso is an opportunity to revitalise standards of housing in Sweden: 'We see this as housing's Formula One today. We want it to be the standard tomorrow.' Indeed, these are idealised images from the perspectives of the architect, the planners, builders, and developers. To underscore this conceptualisation of the building, the film features grand long-shots of the Turning Torso from a distance, from a ground-level perspective looking upwards, or panning across the wider landscape with the building prominently standing out amidst the flatter silhouette of the Western Harbour. While these images create a sense of awe and monumentality, they also project a sense of the building as uninhabited and notably void of human activity. Furthermore, the camera is not allowed inside the completed building, the architect and builders have moved on to other projects, and all the film is able to capture is an emphatic rendering of the Turning Torso as a landmark from afar, and nothing else. Writing about the Öresund rhetoric, Orvar Löfgren suggests that popular visions of the region using enthusiastic language of cosmopolitanism and progressiveness 'run the risk of turning into empty rhetoric, a trivial cliché, as in the hyped poetics of event management or place marketing' (2000: 53). In a similar vein, the film seems to project an ambivalence regarding the building's relationship with its locality.

The film, produced and funded by various local (Film i Skåne, Malmö Kulturstöd) and foreign organisations,⁴ might therefore be interpreted as a reflection on the various identity constructions for this new urban space that was only just in the process of coming into being in the early 2000s. Throughout the course of the film, we see the Turning Torso co-opted by various actors – first by Örbäck and then Calatrava, and after Örbäck's resignation, the larger HSB Malmö community comes around to the idea of it being a symbol of rejuvenation for the city. On the one hand, it is a local prestige

project driven by economic imperatives to direct attention to a rejuvenated Malmö, southern Sweden, and the transnational Öresund region. Indeed, the building has also been adopted by various state actors for the place-marketing of the Öresund region, alongside the Öresund Bridge (Eskilsson and Högdahl, 2009: 76). On the other hand, the international success of its architecture has also confirmed the city's position as 'a node in the global network society' (Jansson, 2005: 1672).

Conclusions

In the first instance, the films discussed in this essay are physical fragments of the respective moments in the histories of the sites. As moving image artefacts that capture the processes of urban change, these films are also in dialogue with the rhetoric surrounding the buildings. Apart from contributing to the public discourse that surrounds the buildings, the films also present an opportunity for viewers to critically reflect on questions of place identity and the motivations and meanings projected onto such landmark architectural projects. An example of this role of architecture as social catalyst is the fervent debate on suburban lifestyle and architecture that *Vihreä Leski* sparked in the press (Miettinen, 1968; Talvi, 1968; Tuomikoski, 1968; Eteläpää, 1968; Luoma, 1968). Pietari Kääpä (2013) argues that early Finnish cinema used Helsinki's architectural wonders 'as a way to support Finnish self-conceptions of cosmopolitanism' and notes how the films of the 1960s and 1970s captured the social problems and changes in lifestyle caused by migration to Helsinki from rural areas. The dual nature of Tapiola as both an architectural wonder of modernism and a symbol for urbanisation and mass migration is captured in the ways in which Kurkvaara and Pakkasvirta transport the architecture onto the screen. *Sossen, arkitekten och det skruvade huset* is only one of Gertten's several documentary projects examining various aspects of Malmö life - the local football team, the dismantling of the Kockums crane, and the construction of the Öresund bridge. This particular collection of films forms a visual tapestry of the life and space of the region, and offers alternative visions and critical interpretations of the official narratives surrounding various public spaces and entities. Indeed, while some of the debates documented in *Sossen, arkitekten och det skruvade huset* were certainly reported in the news media, the film presents an otherwise unseen view of the personal, cultural, and ideological conflicts that are woven into the construction of the building.

Secondly, whether fiction or documentary, films go beyond simply documenting the buildings in which they are set. Cinema's capacity to communicate sound, movement, and even touch, allows it to bridge the gap between the acts of viewing architecture

and experiencing it. The interaction between the characters and their surroundings can make visible the spatial practices of everyday life. Similarly, the camera itself can take an active role within the space, wandering through and gazing at the architecture. This cinematic landscape is an intricate and rich one that can facilitate a dialogue between real and imagined spaces. As de Certeau writes, 'the panorama-city is a "theoretical" (that is, visual) simulacrum, in short a picture, whose condition of possibility is an oblivion and a misunderstanding of practices' (1997: 93). In describing the disconnect between the planned cityscape, viewed from afar, and the experience of travelling through it on foot, he suggests that the city is transformed from a visual experience to an embodied one as the perspective shifts from a viewer to a flâneur (*ibid.* 92). Cinema is unique in its capacity to articulate these misunderstood practices of urban architecture in a visual medium, expanding the panorama-city to the domain of lived experience. Especially in the case of well-known landmarks, which already have a host of visual representations, drawings, photographs, and postcards that celebrate the architectural form, film can provide a critical take on the space. Films that take architecture as their subjects are not mere replications of the built space; they expand upon the physical world and communicate the relationship between community and building, and, in the case of the films analysed here, they make visible the public debates and intimate grievances that are housed within these developments.

Notes

1 All translations are our own.

2 After Frank Gehry's construction of the Bilbao Guggenheim Museum was completed in 1997, the former industrial city of Bilbao suddenly became a popular tourist destination and hotspot for other spectacular architectural projects. This effect which star architects (hence the term, 'starchitect') and iconic architecture can have on place-making and the urban development of a city has since been termed 'the Bilbao Effect' (McNeill, 2009: 81).

3 Mixing archive footage and documentary footage in the style of a film essay, *Bye Bye Malmö* documents the dismantling of the Kockums crane and loss of a landmark for a

whole community. The crane was dismantled in 1997 after the demise of Malmö's shipbuilding industry and sold to South Korea for US\$1 (Cho 2007).

4 The film was also funded and supported by the following groups: RTVV Valencia (Spain), TV Ontario (Canada), YLE Teema (Finland), NPS (The Netherlands), ORF (Australia), ETV (Estonia) and The Media Program of the European Union (MEDIA).

Works Cited

Bye Bye Malmö. Dir. Fredrik Gertten. WG Film, 2002.

Cho, Kyung Bok. 'Korean Shipbuilders Hold Off China on Pricier Orders.' *Bloomberg* 8 May 2007. 7 Jan. 2014.

<<http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=21070001&sid=aDm.5.mEHJnU>>

De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1997.

Eskilsson, Lena and Elisabeth Högdahl. 'Cultural Heritage across Borders? – Framing and Challenging the Snapphane Story in Southern Sweden.' *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 9.1, 2009, 65-80.

Eteläpää, Heikki. 'Leski on labiili.' *Uusi Suomi*. 21 Jan. 1968.

Goldberger, Paul. 'The Sculptor.' *The New Yorker*. Condé Nast, 31 Oct. 2005. 14 Oct. 2013. http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2005/10/31/051031crsk_skyline

Guide: Western Harbour. Sustainable City Development. Malmö: Malmö Stad - Environmental Department, 2009.

Jansson, Andre. 'Re-encoding the Spectacle: Urban Fatefulness and Mediated Stigmatisation in the "City of Tomorrow".' *Urban Studies* 42.10, 2005, 1671–1691.

Kääpä, Pietari. *World Film Locations: Helsinki*. Bristol: Intellect, 2013.

Luoma, Matti. '...ainakin yhden keskustelun arvoinen.' *Aamulehti*. 28 Jan. 1968.

Löfgren, Orvar. 'Moving Metaphors.' *Invoking a Transnational Metropolis: The Making of the Øresund Region*. Eds Per Olof Berg, Anders Linde-Laursen, and Orvar Löfgren. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2000, 27–54.

McNeill, Donald. *The Global Architect: Firms, Fame and Urban Form*. New York; London: Routledge, 2009.

Meurman, Otto I. *Asemakaavaoppi*. Helsinki: Otava, 1954.

Miettinen, Irmeli. 'Tunnetteko te vihreitä leskiä?' *Uusi Maailma* 3.68, 1968, 29.

Salokorpi, Asko. *Modern Architecture in Finland*. London: Weldenfeld & Nicolson, 1970.

Sossen, arkitekten och det skruvade huset. Dir. Fredrik Gertten. WG Film, 2005.

Standertskjöld, Elina. *Arkkitehtuurimme Vuosikymmenet: 1960-1980*. Helsinki: Rakennustieto Oy, 2011.

Talvi, Jussi. 'Vihreät aviomiehet.' *Uusi Maailma* 3.68, 1968, 13.

Toiviainen, Sakari. *Uusi suomalainen elokuva*. Helsinki: Otava, 1975.

Tryggestad, Kjell and Susse Georg. 'How objects shape logics in construction.' *Culture and Organization* 17.3, 2001, 181-197.

Tuomikoski, Eero. 'Vihreä Leski.' *Aamulehti*. 30 Jan. 1968.

Vihreä Leski. Dir. Jaakko Pakkasvirta. Filminor, 1968.

von Hertzen, Heikki. *Koti vaiko kasarmi lapsillemme*. Helsinki: WSOY, 1946.

von Hertzen, Heikki. *Raportti Kaupungin Rakentamisesta: Tapiolan arkea ja juhlaa*. Espoo: Länsiväylä Oy, 1984.

Yksityisalue. Dir. Maunu Kurkvaara. Kurkvaara-Filmi, 1962.

Appendix 3

The Cinematic Land of Tapio: Suburban Finland Reimagined

Essi Viitanen

Department of Scandinavian Studies, UCL

The paper examines how the suburban spaces of Tapiola in Finland are cinematically reimagined in Jaakko Pakkasvirta's film *The Green Widow* (1968). The film was produced during a time of rapid urbanization, the development of the Finnish welfare nation, and the birth of the Finnish suburb. The design, renaming, and construction of the Tapiola area especially became an exercise in creating a visual representation of the welfare policies and thus quite literally contributed to the building of a nation. This official vision of Tapiola is challenged by Pakkasvirta's *The Green Widow*. The film focuses on the lived experience of the suburb from the point of view of a housewife and constructs a very different visual world. The relationship between the concrete built environment and the cinematically-imagined one become competing versions of reality.

In 1968, Jaakko Pakkasvirta directed his first solo feature film, *The Green Widow* (*Vihreä Leski*). The film features drug use, peeping toms and a lesbian couple, but it was not these that sparked the fervent public debate around the film. It was the cinematic setting and Pakkasvirta's depiction of new suburban landscape that caused such uproar in the press. *The Green Widow* was set and filmed in Tapiola, a then new suburb just west of Helsinki, Finland. It follows the daily life of housewife Helinä Lehmusto as she cares for her family in increasing isolation from the society surrounding her. At the time of filming, Tapiola was the epitome of new modern architecture of the welfare state; , and Finland's first garden city.

This article firstly discusses the Finnish welfare state's process of building space, identity, and belonging through architecture and design. This vision of a new society is then investigated through the cinematic reimagining of the same setting. Despite being shot on location with minimal interference in the physical surroundings, the cinematic suburb Pakkasvirta conjures up a world apart from the glossy images of Tapiola showcased in architectural posters. Cinema can give us a nuanced impression of the tension between the planned environment and the lived experience of the suburb. In film, Tapiola's inhabitants can enter the space and interact with their surroundings, revealing that planned environment and lived experience are like circles in a Venn diagram with very little overlap. The built and the cinematic environments struggle to find common ground. Discrepancies between these conflicting representations of space draw upraises questions of power and access within the welfare state.

Making the model

The Green Widow is set in suburban Tapiola, some 8 kilometers from central Helsinki. It was Finland's premier garden city designed with a unified town plan. The building works began in 1952 and it was planned and financed by Asuntosäätiö, a building society made up of a number of welfare and housing organizations. The layout for the town plan was chosen by a public design competition that was won by architect Aarne Ervi. Ervi's design consisted of 'three residential neighbourhoods of approximately equal size, each with a mixture of terrace houses and tall flats built to a fairly low overall density among trees and winding roads' as Richards (1966: 90) describes. In the 1960s, the population of Helsinki was growing annually by 10,000 new inhabitants and this type of 'dormitory town' was seen as a modern answer to housing needs. It was built as a beacon of modern Finnish housing development. Richards (1966: 18) compliments Tapiola for its high standard of architecture and landscaping and cites it as providing 'reassuring evidence that forethought is being exercised' in managing the sprawling urban population of Helsinki and its surrounding areas. The development of this modern area was tinted with idealism, a new home for the welfare nation. The selling points of this welfare state show home were clean lines, spacious layouts, and close proximity to nature. The crisp white high rises were surrounded by forest, as 50 per cent of the town plan was to be kept in its natural state. Roads and paths between houses were wide creating a spacious layout with ample parking. There were playgrounds for children sheltered between the houses. Tapiola was built as a model town.

Tapiola, however, was not an isolated building project, but a major component in the development of the Finnish welfare nation. In the 1960s, Finland went through a period of rapid change marked by a shift in social structure, as the mechanization of traditional farm work forced people to leave their rural homes in search of work in the cities (Standertskjöld 2011). In 1950, 67 per cent of Finns lived in the countryside, but by 1970, the figure had dropped to 49 per cent (Vahtola 2003: 410). The emptying of the countryside coincided with the development of new social policy to build Finland into a welfare nation. This was strongly influenced by Pekka Kuusi's 1961 book *1960-luvun sosiaalipolitiikka* in which he outlined a model for social policy including state-backed healthcare, pensions, and childcare. Women joined the workforce in greater numbers driving more extensive and readily-available childcare facilities (Standertskjöld 2011: 12). The Finnish family was moving away from the rural extended family and into an urban nuclear family. Cars became commonplace after the automotive industry was released from government control in 1962 (Standertskjöld 2011: 12). This too placed new demands on the urban infrastructure and begun to alter the Finnish landscape. The combination of building the welfare state, urbanisation, and changes in technology drastically altered the everyday life and family dynamics of Finnish people. It was this combination of lack of housing in Helsinki, the rise of private motoring, and development of social services that laid the groundwork for Tapiola. As a state-funded development it played a part in quite literally building an identity for welfare state ideals.

The construction and development of Tapiola can usefully be described as an act of 'placemaking'. Richard Marback (2011: 58) describes placemaking as 'a material act of building and maintaining spaces that is at the same time an ideological act of fashioning places where we can feel we belong, where we create meaning, and where we organize our relationships to others.' In the case of Tapiola the process of placemaking went as far as developing a whole new name for the area. The land on which Tapiola was built was previously known as Hagalund, sharing the name of a local manor house. The Asuntosäätiö decided this Swedish name was not suitable for the new garden city, both because the old manor house kept its name and because of the fear of associating the area with the North Stockholm slum of the same name, as Heikki von Hertzen (1984: 52) recalls. The new name for the area was chosen through a public competition. Out of over 4000 entries, a total of nine hundred and seventy-eight names, the Asuntosäätiö chose Tapiola. The name Tapio was taken from the Finnish national epoch Kalevala. Tapio was the god of forest and the territory he ruled over was also known as Tapio's land, Tapiola. Von Hertzen (1984: 52) reminisces how apt the name was as 'the new town was after all built on virgin land, for the most part

covered by sturdy Finnish forest, a real kingdom of Tapio.’ (Rakennettiinhan uusi kaupunki neitseelliseen maastoon, jonka suurimmalta osalta peitti jyrkät suomalaisen metsä, oikea metsän kuninkaan Tapiolan valtakunta.) The new houses and suburban setting were given their own mythologically-inflected identity, whilst simultaneously erasing a part of history in the process. Despite the Asuntosäätiön’s hopes, the Swedish-speaking population continued to use the name Hagalund instead of Tapiola.

Modern design for a modern era

The social changes in Finland in the 1960s were also accompanied by changes in architectural practice. Town planning and architectural design were harnessed to cater to the demands of the newly urban masses and their cars. Inspired by Otto-livari Meurman’s 1947 book *Asemakaavaoppi* (1954: 215) that had originally theorised independent suburban settlements outside city centres, town plans were developed into larger and more unified entities. The emphasis in designing housing areas thus moved towards constructing communities. The architectural designs of the time were dominated by standardisation through the use of modular units. Concrete became the building material of choice. Roger Connah (2005: 182) argues that during this time in Finnish architecture ‘systematic thinking was married with the neutrality expected from social equality’. Housing was designed in accordance with welfare state’s egalitarian ideals. Colin Wilson (1992: 12) described the suburban building projects of Finland as ‘a happy moment in history, the self-awareness of a growing nation somehow became encoded and embodied in architecture.’ Building the suburbs was an act of forging the welfare nation. The carefully-designed aesthetic was to become a visual representation of the new policies, and of a new time. In a quest to hastily provide essential housing for the newly urban population, Finnish architecture drifted away from Aalto’s connection to nature and the senses, and towards the functionalist aesthetic of mass-produced housing blocks. The scale of development and design were supersized.

The job of designing the Tapiola town plan, housing and public buildings were given to architects selected through an open architectural competition. The group of architects chosen shared a functionalist aesthetic in their design and an interest in the possibilities of concrete as a building material. Along with Aarne Ervi, this group included Aulis Blomstedt, Viljo Revell and Aarno Ruusuvuori. When architectural theorist Scott Poole (1992: 12) writes about the architects trusted with designing Tapiola, a sense of austerity and functionalism comes across in his language. Poole (1992: 12) described how the work of architect Aulis Blomstedt is ‘aimed at purifying architecture through intellectual consideration’ and ‘asceticism, simplicity, and silence

were essential to his idea of architectural form'. Of Aarno Ruusuvuori, who designed the Tapiola church and parish centre in 1965, Poole (1992: 31) wrote:

His architecture at that time and to this day remains uncompromising and devoid of sentimentality. There is no narrative, no longing for another idyllic time, and no representational content. The hard edge of strict geometric forms creates a distinct boundary between his architecture and the natural aspect of things — a distance between civilization and the forest.

It was modern design for modern policy. The boundary between nature and architecture was maintained in Tapiola, as most of the forest remained in its natural state, only interrupted by the brilliant white geometric block housing rising in stark contrast amongst the trees. The hub of services and commerce Tapiola Centre boasted a water feature, tower, and shopping plaza. These features, designed by Aarne Ervi, gave the Tapiola a centre, and a recognizably individual style. It gave the area its character.

The carefully designed and crafted identity of Tapiola was not restricted to the Finns inhabiting it. Postcards were made of the area highlighting the beauty of its architecture. One such card from the 1960s shows a compilation of five images that portray the buildings of Tapiola bathing in sunshine, surrounded by impeccably kept lawns, and tall trees. The focus is drawn to the well-planned beauty of the buildings; there are no people in the images. Tapiola became a staple of state visits showcasing Finnish design and architecture, as von Herten writes (1984: 340). Foreign officials were driven around in a fleet of black cars and introduced to Finnish government-funded housing, regular people living in Tapiola, and of course the sauna. The garden city became a calling card for a new Finnish way of life. The vision for the area had travelled through policy makers, to the blueprints of the architect and hands of builders into a real place, with its own name, identity, and finally inhabitants.

Cinematic Tapiola

Pakkasvirta's cinematic Tapiola differs dramatically from this architectural ideal. The film begins with the camera panning through lush natural woods to reveal the edge of a

shiny Chevrolet parked in front Aarne Ervi's water feature complete with fountains. The pan moves higher to observe the buzzing suburban landscape of Tapiola accompanied by a soundtrack of melodic violins and piano. A series of slow pans drift across houses, motorways and children playing on a sunny summer day. Crowds of people pass through the screen, along them a blond woman with two children. The scenic portraits of the Tapiola landscape and inhabitants end with a young woman speaking into a microphone held by an out of shot interviewer. 'Thank you, I do enjoy living here. It is so nice walking around here, a good place to live. With a husband and a child, what more is there to desire?' ('Kiitos, Kyllä minä viihdyn oikein hyvin täällä. täällä on niin hauska kävellä ja on hyvä asuinpaikka. Mies ja lapsi, niin mitä muuta kaipaa?') The style in which *The Green Widow* introduces Tapiola echoes the public information films, such as *Contractors and Builders (Rakennuttajia ja rakentajia)* (1953) or *New Housing Areas (Uusia asuntoalueita)* (1957), that originally introduced the Finnish public to the same suburban areas. The official vision of Tapiola shines through the shots of architecture and is repeated in the statement of the interviewee. The interviewer remains anonymous and out of frame, only present via the visible microphone. The film takes on the voice of a documentary. The camera then singles out the previous blond woman with her two children from the crowd and follows her into the fictive narrative of the film. The camera drifts away from the carefully framed postcard like shots of Tapiola as it gradually moves closer to Helinä. The documentary style of the interview is left behind and the camera becomes an invisible observer. The woman interviewed does not reappear. She is not a part of the fictitious world of the film.

Pakkasvirta introduces Tapiola as a stylised show home for the welfare state, but then steers the viewer towards the darker side of life in the area. Helinä bridges these two worlds of Tapiola: the one printed on postcards and shown to foreign officials, and her own personal experience of life in the suburb. She leads the viewer away from the familiar landmarks of Tapiola Centre, through a shadowy forest to her flat in a multi-storey concrete house. On the accompanying soundtrack a man sings, 'people live in their houses, like beetles' (Ihmiset asuvat kodeissaan kuin koppakuoriaiset). The documentary style and familiar polished imagery of Tapiola give way to one individual's story set in their personal experience of that space.

Dark forests of the garden city

The lush forests of the garden city are transformed into oppressive places with lurking predators. The parks and forests in *The Green Widow* are not quite the areas for sports and play that head of Asuntosäätiö Heikki von Hertzen (1984: 131) envisioned them as.

Pakkasvirta's forest is the dark underbelly of Tapiola, a space of threat and losing control. Beyond the ordered rows of pristine white houses is a shadowy place outside the realms of social control. It is where peeping toms and adulterers go, and along them Helinä. However not all forests are sinister in *The Green Widow*. A flashback to the forest of Helinä's rural hometown shows the sun shining, her naked on the grass with her husband, at ease and uninhabited in her environment. In this forest, she is the one holding the binoculars and observing her surroundings. It is only the suburban forests of Tapiola that are threatening and uncomfortable. Tarmo Malmberg (1968) described the constant presence of the peeping tom in *The Green Widow*'s forest as a kind of fairytale troll, 'an evil ruler of the forest, a reminder of primeval force' (metsän paha haltija, muistutus alkulähteistä). Tapio, the ruler of the forest, is transformed into a troll. As the facade of Helinä's life as a good housewife comes crumbling down, finally she walks into the woods and invites the darkness in.

Watchful eyes and bleeding realities

The theme of surveillance follows throughout the film. Helinä is being watched by a man in the woods, listened in on by a market researcher, and checked up on by her husband. In the forest the camera angles take the peeping tom's point of view peering up at lit windows from the darkness of the woods. The viewer joins the market researcher in his radio control room to listen in on women. Helinä is constantly followed, watched and regulated. The viewer is privy to the delicate inner workings of market researcher's radio control room, pulsating dials, flashing light bulbs and whirling aerials. Pakkasvirta creates a fictitious big brother watching over the suburbs. We see close-ups of technical details and a wall covered with a map detailing the movements of the housewives. As the viewer is allowed into this clandestine space, or to share the peeping tom's view from behind a tree, we become the voyeur. We are made aware of, and a part of, the structure of surveillance that looms over Helinä. We are given privileged access to spaces exerting control, to hidden gazes that follow her. We hear the radio signal that monitors her everyday. When the web of surveillance tightens around Helinä and she is distressed the background sound of her radio signal becomes overwhelming, filling the space with its relentless beeping. We hear her distress pulsating through the radio. As Eero Tuomikoski (1968) wrote in an article about *The Green Widow* 'We live a fear-filled life. The structures of society are above us.' (Elämme pelonsekaista elämää. Yhteskunnan rakenteet ovat yläpuolellamme.). The structures of surveillance range from the erotic male gaze of the peeping tom to the prying questions of the research specialist. They keep a watchful eye over Helinä and

her attempt at holding up a facade of happy family life. The market researcher's voice narrates a sociological study of the housewife's family dynamics and role in society. The structure of surveillance the viewer is complicit in becomes a structure of society looking in on its inhabitants.

The *Green Widow* plays with levels of reality and versions of truth. The tension between the documentary and fiction established in the beginning of the film continues throughout allowing for characters to penetrate the divide. The film covers several instances that challenge the time/space continuum of the narrative. When we are watching TV with Helinä and her children, flickering images of cowboys fill our screen as well as complete with the rounded edges of the television set. We move from observing her to watching the television show on a shared fuzzy screen. This shift in perspective is made clear by decreased image quality and the screen within a screen effect. At times the narrative voice of the researcher overlaps with fiction. When Helinä dreams of her own murder, the style of storytelling is the same as her reality. What is true, what is fantasy, and what is documentary meld into one another. Layers of fiction are built upon one another. The authoritative voice of the market researcher leaves his sheltered and privileged control room to appear in Helinä's living room. The divides between reality, fiction, fantasy, and documentary are brought together and allowed to bleed into each other. To add to the blend of reality, and fiction, cinema and surveillance, Pakkasvirta borrows themes, such as the man spying on women in the woods and the housewives' alcohol abuse from real-life news headlines from the suburbs of the time.

This blending of documentary, surveillance, and fantasy create a Tapiola where reality becomes elusive. The official Tapiola as a crowning glory of Finnish housing and architecture is lost in Pakkasvirta's *The Green Widow*. The much lauded forests and healthy green spaces become dark threatening domains of peeping toms and illicit affairs. Pakkasvirta shows an alienating and threatening Tapiola of bare landscapes. Rather than play with her children at the communal playground, the mother walks her children to play at the side of a muddy barren logging area. The setting of *The Green Widow* is easily recognisable as the real Tapiola, but the way it is recreated onscreen tells a very different story from the official take on the area. The wide paths become alienating, lush forests threatening, and the new suburban lifestyle lonely. The film unveils the everyday life of the environment drawing a divide between the planned and the experience of lived space. The cinematic exposes the unpredictable human interaction with the spaces of Tapiola.

Blending visions of the real

Michel de Certeau (2011: xviii-xix) writes in *The Practice of Everyday Life* about the misappropriation of language through speech and likens it to redefining planned spaces through the act of walking. Describing looking down at a city grid de Certeau (2011: 93) argues 'the panorama-city is a "theoretical" simulacrum, in short a picture, whose condition of possibility is an oblivion and a misunderstanding of practices.' He goes on to describe how the act of walking recreates and redefines the parameters of the urban space, drawing a personal and intimate map of paths and observations. This shift in perspective exemplifies the division of the planned and lived spaces. This is where the cinematic can offer insight into the experience of the lived space. Whilst policy documents develop the plans for a new welfare state and architectural blueprints draw out the stage for this change, cinema gives us a tool to explore these spaces through the human interaction experienced within them. It brings the human into the equation, both through characters onscreen and director behind it. As de Certeau's urban wanderer, the camera reappropriates its surroundings as it moves through the landscape. It weaves amongst the buildings developing its own interpretation of the space. The difference between the planned environment and the cinematic landscape that Pakkasvirta creates in *The Green Widow* teases out parallel readings of Finnish suburbs. The vantage point ranges between those of the architect or town planner, to that of the inhabitant and director. The carefully curated and planned spaces become misappropriated on screen.

The film's controversial reinterpretation of life in Tapiola provoked a public debate that questioned the architectural design of suburbs, the emerging suburban lifestyle, and even the social policies of the Finnish welfare nation. After *The Green Widow* was released, it functioned as a catalyst in the press questioning the future and development of the Finnish suburbs. Some critics argued that the film was not a realistic representation of suburban life, whilst many felt the portrayal was honest and touching. What most of the commentators did agree on, however, was the film's importance in questioning the suburbs and their design as a whole. As Velipekka Makkonen wrote in *Contact* (1968):

The *Green Widow* takes place in one of those Finnish garden cities that have sprung up in the past few decades, where architecture itself dictates the majority of life conditions for those imprisoned in them ... *The Green Widow* depicts the psychological

violence, whose origins are impossible to define, but that is present in both human and surroundings. Vihreä Leski tapahtuu yhdessä noista suomalaisista viimeisten parinkymmenen vuoden aikana syntyneistä viherkaupunginosista, joissa jo arkkitehtuuri sinänsä sanelee suurimman osan niiden vangiksi joutuneiden elämisen ehdoista. Vihreä leski kuvaa henkistä väkivaltaa, jonka lähdettä on mahdoton yksilöidä, mutta joka kuvastuu paralleelisena sekä ihmisessä että miljöössä.

Makkonen (1968) goes on to note that it would be a mistake to read the film as direct critique of suburban town planning, but rather as a portrait of an individual tied by society. The film challenges the official vision of Tapiola by showing how the experience of living there differs from the ideal lifestyle envisioned for it. Pakkasvirta makes visible the experience of lived environment and adds his version to the competing and conflicting versions of the reality of Tapiola. As always in the case of film, *The Green Widow* offers a framed and edited version of reality, one that it even plays up to with its structural shifts. Similarly to the architectural blueprints, the vision of space is mediated through different channels and viewpoints. Pakkasvirta's strength being in bringing to life characters of the area, the community the welfare nation was working so hard to build. As Matti Luoma (1968) wrote as a response to the film, 'This is how people live. Their problems are worth examining. These are the difficult consequences of urbanisation'. (Näin elävät ihmiset. Heidän ongelmansa ovat tutkimisen arvoisia. Tässä on eräs kaupungistumisen vaikeita kasvannaisia.)

The strong reaction that *The Green Widow* provoked is not surprising. Tapiola was not simply constructed of concrete and the problem of representing it truthfully becomes a matter of capturing its identity, society, and meaning. The development of the area, which was a massive government-backed project, also inevitably ties its identity to the building of the Finnish welfare nation. When Pakkasvirta transforms a pleasant area to a hostile environment he is unavoidably critiquing much more than the architectural design. Transforming the garden city into a maze of dark forests and homes into a patchwork of balconies with people gazing back into the woods in solitude recreates Tapio's land from utopia to dystopia. The fears of a society facing change in all aspects

of life, most importantly in redefining domestic life and the home, become visible onscreen. As in the film, the cinematic world that Pakkasvirta creates onscreen allows for the experience of the space, the fears and uneasiness of a new way of life, to bleed into the official imagery of Tapiola.

References

- de Certeau, M** 2011 *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connah, R** 2005 *Finland: Modern Architectures in History*. London: Reaktion Books.
- von Herten, H** 1984 *Raportti Kaupungin Rakentamisesta: Tapiolan arkea ja juhlaa*. Espoo: Länsiväylä Oy.
- Kuusi, P** 1962 *1960-luvun sosiaalipolitiikka*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Luoma, M** 1968 '...on ainakin yhden keskustelun arvoinen', *Aamulehti*, 28 January.
- Makkonen, V** 1968 *Contact*, 2.
- Malmberg, T** 1968 *Uuden elokuvamme maisemaa*. In *Ylioppilaslehti*, 3.
- Marback, R** 2001 *Learning to Inhabit Writing*. *Composition Studies* 29(1): 51-68.
- Meurman, O I** 1954 *Asemakaavaoppi*. Helsinki: Otava. p. 215.
- Pakkasvirta, J** (dir.) 1968 *Vihreä Leski*. Filminor.
- Richards, J M** 1966 *A Guide to Finnish Architecture* London: Hugh Evelyn.
- Ritari, E** (dir.) 1953 *Rakennuttajia ja rakentajia*. Suomen Filmiteollisuus.
- Roivas, V** (dir.) 1957 *Uusia asuntoalueita*. Oy Filmiseppo.
- Standertskjöld, E** 2011 *Arkkitehtuurimme Vuosikymmenet: 1960–1980*. Helsinki: Rakennustieto Oy.
- Tuomikoski, E** 1968 *Aamulehti*, 30 January.
- Vahtola, J** 2003 *Suomen Historia: Jääkaudesta Euroopan unioniin*. Helsinki: Otava. p. 410.

Wilson, C 1992 Introduction: Finland and Tradition of Modernism. In Poole, S (ed.) *The New Finnish Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli, pp. 11-17.

Appendix 4

Yksityisalue (Open Secret) 1962

Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy

Director	Maunu Kurkvaara
Producer	Maunu Kurkvaara
Cinematographer	Maunu Kurkvaara
Scriptwriter	Maunu Kurkvaara
Editor	Maunu Kurkvaara
Set design	Maunu Kurkvaara
Sound	Tuomo Kattilakoski
Score	Usko Meriläinen

Cast:

Toivo Koski	Kalervo Nissilä
Pentti Vaara 'Pena'	Jarno Hiilloskorpi
Soili	Sointu Angervo
Mäkelä	Pehr-Olof Sirén
Kaisu	Sinikka Hannula
Margit Koski	Kyllikki Forssell

Synopsis of film:

Architect Koski has committed suicide at his summer cottage. His body was found by his younger colleague Pena. Mrs Koski wonders about the reasons for her husband's suicide and why he had chosen to come to the cabin. The family lawyer informs them that Koski has been dead some 2-3 days and cites work exhaustion and mental breakdown as the reasons for his suicide. The lawyer agrees with Mrs Koski that the official cause of death will be recorded as heart failure and the real reason for Koski's death will be kept secret. Pena drives Mrs Koski home and discusses the practical arrangements following from Koski's death.

Pena arrives at the architectural office and evades questioning about where he has

been. He asks Kaisu what she thinks about Koski and if he had had any problems recently. Kaisu is unaware of any issues. The next morning the news of Koski's death spreads at the office as the newspaper article is published. Mäkelä, arrives to meet Koski and is informed about Koski's death. Mäkelä questions Pena about the details of Koski's death and asks if Koski killed himself. Pena informs him Koski died of heart failure.

Pena follows Mäkelä out and into a restaurant. Pena admits Koski's death was a suicide and is troubled by the fact no-one noticed Koski's was depressed. The men discuss Koski's recent win in an architectural competition. Mäkelä recalls Koski taking him to see a new building site designed by a young architect Koski was competing against for an architectural prize. Mäkelä suggests Pena stop investigating the events leading to Koski's death.

The lawyer discusses insurance and other practical matters with Mrs Koski. Pena arrives to discuss the running of the architectural office and Mrs Koski wonders who should take over from her husband. Pena asks about Mäkelä and Mrs Koski tells him Mäkelä is also an architect.

Pena visits a buildings site and meets a developer. The men argue about changes Koski made to the design right before his death. The developer claims that these are too expensive to make and Pena should resign himself to the fact that keeping costs down is more important than the beauty of the design. Pena tries to defend Koski's changes but the developer schools him on the practicalities of housing development. The developer says Koski understood these facts and he found work, and unless Pena adjusts his views he will be out of work. Pena is forced to alter the drawings to their original form.

Pena asks Kaisu about Mäkelä, but she doesn't have answers. Kaisu recalls an evening of drinking listening to music with Koski. Koski was tired and unhappy with the competition design, but didn't speak much about himself. Lawyer Salin comes to the architectural office to sort through Koski's papers. Sorting through the papers Pena finds a toy mouse in Koski's drawers and remembers an incident when a young girl had come to meet Koski at the office.

Pena tries to visit an exhibition on Brazilian architecture, but can't get through the crowds. At home he calls Kaisu to ask if Koski had children from any previous

marriages. He agrees to go to the exhibit with Kaisu. At the exhibit Pena meets Koski's mistress Soili who asks him when and where Koski's funeral will be held. Pena asks if the mouse belongs to Soili. She says she gave it to Koski a few weeks ago. Soili agrees to meet up with Pena later. Pena and Soili go for a coffee to discuss Koski's death. Soili refuses to discuss her relationship with Koski, but Pena tries to ask about Koski's last weeks. Soili admits they fought with Koski and that he had broken up with her a few weeks earlier. She tries to leave and is shocked when Pena tells her Koski's death was a suicide.

A journalist calls the office again and Pena advises them to get lost. Pena receives Soili's diary in the post and rushes home to read it. Her letter describes how stupid she has been and that the diary pages might offer Pena some answers about Koski's final weeks. Flashbacks tell of how Soili met Koski by the ocean and he invited her to visit his cabin. She recalls how she got into a disagreement with friends and decided to go to Koski's cabin. Soili inspects his work and Koski tells her he has lost inspiration. They discuss music and make coffee. Soili advises Koski on how to get rid of his depression and suggests he gets a muse. In another flashback Soili recalls seeing Koski at a cafe and describes how she found out Koski is a notable architect. She sets up a meeting with Koski and they drive off to visit the suburbs.

Pena starts tracing a timeline of the final weeks of Koski's life. He remembers a car ride with Koski, during which Koski called modern Finnish architecture mediocre and driven by the greed of developers. They drive through Kallio and Koski calls the new houses slums and calls for responsibility on the side of architects.

Pena's head is swirling with what the others have told him about Koski's final weeks. He notes Koski and Soili's last meeting when she gave him the mouse. Koski tells her that his muse came too late, and that he is too old and tired. He tells her he does not want to see her again. Koski tells her he is leaving for good and Soili wishes him a nice trip. Pena recalls the final evening. Koski tells Pena that he is going to his cabin and if he is not back by Tuesday Pena should come get him. Pena finds Koski dead in his bed.

Koski's funeral. Pena and Mäkelä discuss Koski's legacy as an architect. Mäkelä says that Koski designed some spectacular buildings and that is enough for one man. Pena leaves with Soili.

Vihreä Leski (*Green Widow*) 1968

Filminor Oy

Director	Jaakko Pakkasvirta
Producer	Risto Jarva
Cinematographer	Heikki Katajisto, Lasse Naukkarinen
Scriptwriter	Jaakko Pakkasvirta
Editor	Jaakko Pakkasvirta, Lasse Naukkarinen
Sound	Tuomo Kattilakoski, Lasse Naukkarinen, Erkki Seiro, Timo Linnasalo
Score	Otto Donner

Cast:

Helinä Lehmusto	Eija Pokkinen
Pentti Lehmusto	Risto Aaltonen
Sociologist	Matti Siitonen
Gertrund Kaira	Mai-Brit Heljo

Synopsis of film:

The film begins with an overview shot of a suburban landscape. The camera pans over parking lots, shopping arcades and school playgrounds. A young woman tells an interviewer how happy she is living in the area. The camera follows another woman and her children further into the suburban housing area.

Cut to a women's exercise class in a swimming pool. A group of women stretch and swim. As the camera moves to a close up of one of the women leaving the class a male voiceover explains introduces her as Mrs Lehmusto and explains the idea of doing radio interviews with housewives. The camera observes the radio interviewer in his control room and the women he interviews. Mrs Lehmusto is shown cleaning and caring for her children. The voiceover explains the secluded lifestyle of the suburban housewife and the importance of the hair salon as a social meeting place.

Children play outside as Mrs Lehmusto tells the interviewer about a tense family trip to

her rural home town with her irritable husband. A phone call interrupts the family dinner and Mrs Lehmusto plays on the floor with her children, as the radio interviewer's voiceover explains the loneliness of the housewife. She calls the radio controller and recalls a story about her rural hometown and a sexual encounter with her husband in the woods.

Cut to children's clothing shop where the kids play as they choose out an outfit for Mrs Lehmusto's youngest child. On the way home a man watches them in the woods. He steps into their path and Mrs Lehmusto grabs her children startled and hurries home. At home the children bicker as Mrs Lehmusto cooks. Outside a man stands in the woods and watches her window. Inside Mrs Lehmusto and the children watch a western on the TV. When the children go to bed she tidies the home and sits alone in silence on the couch. At night she dreams of a young attractive man lathering her in whipped cream.

The next day her husband is home trying to read the newspaper tired and reluctantly reading a book to the children. The husband takes a bubble bath and Mrs Lehmusto puts the kids to bed while the older kids play. Mrs Lehmusto watches her husband snore in their bed.

The following day family goes for a drive in central Helsinki, waiting in the car as the husband goes buy a new car radio. He then drops them at home and drives off to go bowling. Mrs Lehmusto and the children are left standing in the parking lot watching him leave. The husband joins his friends bowling and the men compare pictures of their mistresses. At home Mrs Lehmusto entertains the children and at night has reluctant sex with her husband. Afterwards she hides in the closet and weeps.

At the hair salon Mrs Lehmusto is getting her hair done and she listens to the other women gossip. The hairdresser compliments her on her country looks. The women invite her to a gathering as the radio interviewer appears in the doorway. Later Mrs Lehmusto arrives at the hairdresser's home where people are playing cards, dancing and drinking. She sits in the corner and observes the others.

The voiceover tells how Mrs Lehmusto's radio contact became less frequent. At night she parties at the hairdresser's home dancing and drinking. Other partygoers smoke weed. Mrs Lehmusto retreats downstairs with a man and has sex with him.

She meets with the man in the woods as the peeping tom watches their embrace. Back at the hairdresser's place she again meets with her lover. At home the children play while Mrs Lehmusto puts the smaller one to sleep. When the children are asleep she brings her lover home while the peeping tom watches their embrace from the woods.

The radio interviewer hears about the affair from another woman in the social circle. He tries telephoning Mrs Lehmusto, but reaches her suspicious husband. Later the couple argue about the phone call after which the husband recalls his mistress. Mrs Lehmusto argues with her lover about getting together, money and travel. She ends the affair.

Mrs Lehmusto goes to the exercise class and tells the instructor she will not be returning to class. The peeping tom continues to watch her from the woods. The radio interviewer records the sexual frustrations of one housewife. Helinä takes her children to a muddy building site and tells them a violent fairytale.

At home a lawyer delivers divorce papers to a stunned Mrs Lehmusto. She falls to the floor and watches her sons play. At the hair salon she is given pills for fat loss. The radio interviewer visits Mrs Lehmusto at home and plays with her children. Later she visits her friends and gets drunk. Back at home hung over she cares for her kids and is watched by the peeping tom. In the evening she drinks wine alone at home and staggers outside to be chased by the ever present peeping tom. He follows her back into the apartment, imagining a sexual encounter while she imagines him stabbing her. She pushes him away and out of the door. She leans against the door startled. The camera pans across the dark suburb and into the sky.

***Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei* (The Man Who Could Not Say No) 1975**

Filminor Oy

Director	Risto Jarva
Producer	Kullervo Kukkasjärvi
Cinematographer	Antti Peippo
Scriptwriter	Risto Jarva, Jussi Kylätasku, Kullervo Kukkasjärvi
Editor	Risto Jarva, Matti Kuortti
Sound	Matti Kuortti, Juha-Veli Äkräs
Score	Markku Kopisto

Cast:

Aimo Niemi	Antti Litja
Milla Kurki	Kirsti Wallasvaara
Kauko Aaltonen	Matti Ruohola
Anna Aaltonen	Vivi-Ann Sjögren

Synopsis of film:

The film begins with shots of a quiet early morning Helsinki. Voiceover beings to narrate the history of Kivimäki area as the camera drifts over brightly coloured low-rise wooden houses. The voiceover tells of the modest people of Kivimäki as the camera shows a selection of locals in the morning sunshine. The voiceover is revealed as a horse walking through the quiet streets of the area. The empty streets and horse are intercut with a noisy busy street in central Helsinki.

A passenger boat arrives in Helsinki harbour with a priest on board. The horse stops Milla, a local seamstress's window to eat a few sugar cubes. Local people go about their morning and kids play. A couple is moving away and the whole village helps them pack the moving van. A blind man complains about the regeneration that is tearing down the local houses. The priest walks into Kivimäki and enters the busy butcher's shop. The butcher Kake and his wife Aimo are overjoyed to see him again and welcome him home from the USA. Aimo sets his few belongings in a sparse room and goes on a walk through Kivimäki filming. He reminisces about his childhood and runs into Milla and her laundry basket. He helps her carry in the laundry. A man plays the

harmonica as a local man tries to woo a woman with a vacuum cleaner. Aimo and Milla walk through the yards in Kivimäki and he tells her about his theology studies in the United States. They talk and smell flowers.

Wide shot of a high-rise construction site. Aimo looks up at identical high-rises and walks through an unfinished site in search of Kake's home. Kake and Anna introduce Aimo to the new plans for rebuilding Kivimäki and get Aimo to sign a petition for the regeneration.

Aimo starts a new job as a church marriage councillor. He observes the inhabitants of Kivimäki enjoy a sunny summer day from his window. Aimo goes for a walk and complains his lack of customers to the police officer. The police officer admits that she has an affair with a married man. The drunk painter arrives home to his angry wife who rejects Aimo's offer of marriage counselling. Milla brings Aimo a cactus and she gets him to sign a petition saving Kivimäki from urban development.

The drunken painter goes about his job. Aimo returns to his home, which Milla has transformed into a colourful and bright space. Afterwards Milla visits Aimo at work and confronts him about signing Kake's petition for tearing down Kivimäki. Aimo runs over to Kake to take his name off the list to the chagrin of Kake. Kake gives a good counterargument and Aimo resigns the petition. In the evening Milla listens to Aimo play the guitar. Meanwhile the local men meet up to play their instruments and people open their windows to listen to their music.

In the morning a town planner instructs the locals about the markets and car parks that are set to replace their village. Aimo walks past Kake arguing with his child about the amount of a bribe. Aimo finds Kake in the police officers flat without his trousers, and promises to bring him a new pair. On the way back Aimo bumps into Anna and promises to take a delivery of sausages for her. He accidentally mistakes the sausages for trousers, but eventually gets Kake his trousers. The police officer comes home and Aimo hides in her bathroom while Kake gets told off and kicked out. She runs a bath, undresses and enters the bath only to find Aimo standing in her bathtub. She screams and faints. Aimo carries her into the bed and revives her as water runs over the bath and into the hallway. The superintendent comes over to fix the leak and Aimo gets a reputation as a ladies man.

Aimo tries to help a man win over love and finds a new client base of young women at

his workplace. Due to some misunderstanding's Aimo's reputation is growing by the day. Aimo continues to meddle in the love lives of Kivimäki locals with poor results. He visits the public sauna to persuade Miss Numminen to consider the janitor's proposal. He meets the police commander who plots the murder of his wife and they get drunk together. Aimo visits Milla and due to misunderstandings his reputation continues to worsen.

Kake, Anna, Aimo and Milla go boating to the archipelago. Aimo and Milla continue their courtship, which is full of small misunderstandings and poor timing. The boat escapes and they are left stranded on the island.

Back home the locals are watching a house being torn down, and gather to meet about the regeneration of Kivimäki. Milla gives a speech in defence of their home. Rumors of Aimo continue to swirl and Milla goes on a date with another man.

Kake goes drinking with the police officer. Drunken Kake calls Anna to bring more money after his mistress leaves. Anna puts on a wig for the special occasion and goes meet her husband. Again Aimo messes up trying to fix the love lives of locals. Anna clears up a misunderstanding between Aimo and Milla. Meanwhile the drunken police officer opens up to Aimo about her needs and romantic misfortunes. Aimo and Anna get drunk together and spend the night in a hotel. In the morning Kake does not recognise his wife, but runs away from the hotel room. He later comes home to his wife and tells a story about going drinking with business associates the night before as his excuse for coming home late. Anna realises his cheating ways and Kake understands his mistake. Kake runs to Aimo in search of consolation. Kake sends Aimo to apologise to Anna, but she kicks him out thinking he is there to woo her. Aimo professes his love to Milla but she is still mad at him.

Anna comes over to Aimo to start a new life with him. She falls asleep on his bed and Aimo contemplates leaving back to the USA. The following morning Anna leaves Kake and Aimo buys tickets back to the United States. The locals prepare for a demonstration in the name of protecting Kivimäki. Anna visits Aimo as he is leaving to make Kake jealous. Aimo takes sleeping pills to prevent her advances. Kake and Milla wait outside jealously. Anna throws Aimo out and they all join the demonstration to save Kivimäki. Aimo tries to stop a bulldozer and Milla runs to his rescue. They live happily ever after in Kivimäki, which is saved from demolition.

Jouluksi Kotiin (*Home for Christmas*) 1975

Filmityö Oy

Director	Jaakko Pakkasvirta
Producer	Jaakko Pakkasvirta
Cinematographer	Esa Vuorinen
Scriptwriter	Jaakko Pakkasvirta, Väinö Pennanen, Pentti Saaritsa, Esa Vuorinen
Editor	Jaakko Pakkasvirta
Sound	Olli Soinio, Lauri Tykkyläinen
Score	Otto Donner

Cast:

Urho Suomalainen	Paavo Pentikäinen
Sirkka Suomalainen	Irma Martinkauppi
Leena Suomalainen	Kaisa Martinkauppi
Jari Suomalainen	Jari Erkkilä

Synopsis of film:

The film opens on a family watching pine branches burn, smoke and flames distorting their features.

The protagonist Urho works at a large construction site, while wife Sirkka works at a factory. After work Urho rides his motorcycle home. His landlady reprimands him about a missing rake. At home Sirkka prepares dinner, the children do their homework and Urho sits down with a newspaper. The family sits down for a meal together and dream about the future home Urho is building them.

Urho chats about joining an orchestra with old men on his way to his building site. He sets the parameters for his house in the woods. A friend comes over and they discuss the building project.

In the evening the family are at the Communist Party clubhouse. Urho tries to discuss difficulties with his bank with a party representative, but is brushed off. The old men

practice their instruments and Sirkka prepares food for the members. Urho plays with the trumpet with the orchestra. The family walks home and admires a detached house along the way discussing how theirs will be similar.

Back at work Urho gathers nails and other building material for his own build. His boss allows him to take home some scrap timber. Urho borrows a friend's car to haul the timber back to his site. At the build Urho works on the foundation and takes a break to survey his surroundings. At home he draws the layout of the house for his daughter and shows her new bedroom.

Back at the building site Urho's friends from the Communist Party have gathered to help him lay the foundations of the house. The workers gather together for coffee and Sirkka's sister and her husband show up. One of the old men takes out his tuba and starts to play. Urho invites the crowd to the party clubhouse for a dance. The men drink spirits behind the dance floor while the orchestra plays and couples dance. Sirkka makes sandwiches and Urho joins the orchestra for a song as the crowd listens to the music.

In the middle of the night Urho wakes up to smoke a cigarette. In the morning he packs his things and drives to his hometown in rural Finland. Along the way his voiceover explains why the high-rise houses are poor quality and his determination of building a detached house for his family. He remembers the emptying countryside and what legacy he will be leaving his children. At home he meets with other Communist Party members for sauna and recalls the stories of the Finnish Civil War. At the lumber mill he recounts his boyhood days working at the mill and saws the timber for his new house.

Back at his building site Urho begins work on the frame of the house. He tars the roof with a friend and back home with the family he falls asleep at the table. Again at the building site Urho notices a design flaw and digs rocks from the ground in the dark. Sirkka comes ask him about feeding the children and the couple argues while digging up rocks. The couple has a tense discussion later and Sirkka wakes up at night to Urho gasping for breath. The next morning kids go to school, Sirkka and Urho to work.

The old orchestra men go to meet friends and practice their music. They decide to find Urho a trumpet. One of them goes to Urho's building site to convince him to join the orchestra and discuss the progress of the build. The old men go visit Party

representatives about tracking down a misplaced tuba. They find the instrument forgotten in a fire department storage.

Urho continues work at his high-rise construction site until he kneels over and struggles to breath. Urho gets his colleague to keep his heart attack a secret. He continues work at his own building site setting up the heating system. The children play in the unfinished home. At night Sirkka find Urho with a high fever and calls a doctor. The doctor diagnoses Urho with pneumonia. In a feverish dream Urho sees a young boy with a trumpet at the lake near his childhood home. Urho's recovers slowly as Sirkka goes to work in the factory and the kids feed him his medication. Urho's mother comes for a visit and Urho's health is looking up but continues coughing.

Urho goes back to his building site to continue with the insulation. His mother reminisces about Urho's childhood. Urho's mind returns to the young boy with the trumpet at the lake. Urho and Sirkka go to the building site once more to work on the inner walls and roof, but Urho collapses with exhaustion. He comes back to the snow-covered site alone to do insulation. He sits down by the doorway, closes his eyes and drifts back to the vision of the boy at the lake.

The orchestra plays at Urho's funeral as a Party official gives a speech about the worker's plight and Communist ethos.

***Täältä tullaan, elämä!* (Right On, Man!) 1980**

Sateenkaarifilmi Oy

Director	Tapio Suominen
Producer	Tapio Suominen, Jorma K. Virtanen
Cinematographer	Pekka Aine
Scriptwriter	Yrjö-Juhani Renvall, Pekka Aine
Editor	Tapio Suominen
Sound	Heikki Tapio Partanen
Score	Ralf Örn

Cast:

Jussi	Esa Niemelä
Pappa	Pertti V. Reponen
Pete	Tony Holmström
Lissu	Kati Outinen

Synopsis of film:

The film begins with a woman birthing a child. The shot cuts to a punk concert where youngsters jump to music. Following the camera pans across the school portrait of a group of a remedial class.

One of the boys, Jussi, gets kicked off a school bus for ringing the bell with his friends. He hitches a ride to school on his teacher's bicycle. The class arrives in their room and listens to a morning hymn each of the boys distracted in some way. Jussi carves his name on his desk. The principal comes in and questions the only girl in the class. Lissu remains silent and walks out of the classroom. The principle delivers a post card for the class and confiscates the boy's cigarettes. As he leaves the boys yell curses after him. The teacher Pappa starts teaching a physics class to the reluctant students. One of the boys gets teased and he storms out of the class. Pappa goes after him and restrains the student.

The class walks into a full dining hall and sits down for lunch. They discuss the card

they received from a former student who went to work in Sweden. The boys bicker with each other and Pappa tries to keep the peace.

In the teacher's lounge there is a lively debate about science and arts teaching. A colleague reprimands Pappa for the behaviour of his students.

Pappa and his students play football outside in the sunshine.

Pete walks home and sneaks through his room past the family. He hears his father's drunken rant as he strokes the dog. Jussi arrives to an empty high-rise flat, money left on the table and he looks outside whilst grabbing a snack. He leaves and walks across a children's playground to a cave in the woods. There he drums empty cans.

Jussi rides a bus to central Helsinki and visits a pet store. He chats with the owner about animals and heads off to the central railway station. Jussi arrives at the suburban shopping mall and gets cornered by bullies, but is saved by his friend Pete. They boys go to a squat and discuss the building being torn down soon. On the way home they discuss their classmate Lissu. At home Jussi locks himself in his room and his mother hesitates behind his closed door before going to bed.

At school the boys again listen to announcements and Jussi teases Lissu. After school Jussi visits the pet shop again and buys fish food. On the way home gets caught urinating at a shopping centre corner by security guards. The guards have a dog and they force Jussi to wipe his urine with his jacket.

At woodwork class in school Jussi nails long nails to pieces of wood. The school social worker requests a meeting with Jussi. She explains that they are considering moving him to regular class. Jussi refuses the offer and tells the social worker how he ended up in remedial class due to skipping school.

At night in the shopping centre Jussi and Pete wait for the guards as they arrive in their car. Jussi places spikes under the guard's car tyres as Pete keeps watch.

Back at school Pete swaps the morning music from a hymn to a punk song and Jussi puts chewing gum into the broadcast room lock. As the song changes from hymn to punk students flood the school halls and riot breaks. The teacher sees Jussi fleeing from the scene and grabs him. He is taken to the teacher's lounge and ordered to take his shoes off. Pappa comes to defend Jussi while another teacher calls Jussi's father.

Jussi runs away barefooted while his father makes his way to the school.

Pena goes home and argues with his alcoholic father. He takes the dog and leaves. Meanwhile Jussi hitches a ride with a woman, but runs away at traffic lights and steals her purse. The boys meet at their cave and go through the content of the purse. The boys take the money, go to central Helsinki, get drunk and ride around in a taxi. Leery they walk around Helsinki trying to pick up girls, getting thrown out of a cafe and ending up paying a woman for sex.

In the morning Pete comes home to realise he has forgotten the dog tied in the woods. He runs to retrieve his pet overwhelmed by guilt. Jussi comes home to see the lights on in his window and decides to sleep under a playground structure. He dreams of his childhood and his father's knife. In the morning he meets Lissu and takes her to his home to pack up his guinea pigs. They kiss and leave for central Helsinki on a bus. Lissu has to go home but they agree to meet up later at the railway station. Jussi drops off his guinea pigs at the pet shop and runs away. He waits for the meeting with Lissu and gets a hotdog. Eating his food near the shopping mall Jussi is spotted by one of the security guards. He runs away for the guard, followed by Lissu running on the other side of the road. Jussi enters the parking hall, but cannot escape the security guard. Jussi is backed into a corner and he climbs on a ledge to evade the snarling dog. Crouched on the ledge we see Lissu on the ground watching him. Jussi's body drops from the ledge and Lissu closes her eyes.

The camera tracks through the school halls. A new student is joining the remedial class and takes Jussi's seat. The camera pans out to show suburb in the snow.

Bibliography

A

Abel, Ernest L. and Buckley, Barbara E., 1977. *The Handwriting on the Wall: Towards a Sociology and Psychology of Graffiti*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood press.

Aho, Erkki, Pitkänen, Kari and Sahlberg, Pasi, 2006. Policy Development and Reform Principles of Basic and Secondary Education in Finland since 1968. *Education Working Paper Series*, [online] Available at:

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079967208/Education_in_Finland_May06.pdf>

[Accessed 28 August 2011].

Ahlava, Antti and Ketola, Kimmo, 1999. Outous Hitchcockilla ja nykyarkkitehtuurissa. *Filmihullu*, 4(99), pp.30-36.

Aitio, Tommi, 1999. "Olemme syösykierteessä" – Risto Jarvan 1970-luvun vakavat aiheet. In Uusitalo, Kari ed, 1999. *Suomen kansallisfilmografia 8*. Helsinki: Edita. pp. 108-111.

Ajolähtö, 1982. [Film] Directed by Mikko Niskanen. Finland: National-Filmi Oy.

Alapuro, Risto and Stenius, Henrik, 1989. *Kansa Liikkeessä*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.

Alapuro, Risto and Stenius, Henrik, 1989. Kansanliikkeet loivat kansakunnan. In: Risto Alapuro and Henrik Stenius, eds. 1989. *Kansa Liikkeessä*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä. pp.7-53.

Alestalo, Matti, and Stein Kuhnle, 1984. *The Scandinavian Route: economic, social and political developments in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden*. Helsinki: Research Group for Comparative Sociology, University of Helsinki.

Alho, Olli, 1999. Risto Jarvan värikomediat. In Uusitalo, Kari ed, 1999. *Suomen kansallisfilmografia 8*. Helsinki: Edita. pp. 250-252.

AlSayaad, Nezar, 2006. *Cinematic Urbanism: A History of the Modern from Reel to Real*. New York: Routledge.

Anderson, Benedict, 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Anon, 1962. *Satakunnan Kansa*, 6 April. np.

Anon, 1975. *Tiedonantaja*. 11 April. p. 13

Apinan vuosi, 1983. [Film] Directed by Janne Kuusi. Finland: Elokuvatuottajat Oy.

Arkkitehti, 1975. Jouluksi kotiin. *Tiedonantaja*, 29 April. np.

Astala, Erkki. Mikä helvetin konkreettinen. *Filmihullu*, (3)1980. pp. 16-17.

Asuminen ja luonto, 1965. [video] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Augé, Marc, 1995. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso.

Austin, James F., 2009. Destroying the banlieue: Reconfigurations of Suburban Space in French Film. *Yale French Studies*, 115 New Spaces for French and Francophone Cinema. Yale: Yale University Press, pp. 80-92.

Autotyöt, 1960. [DVD] Directed by Maunu Kurkvaara. Finland: Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy.

Avilés, Gustavo, 2011. Mexico. In: Vincent Laganier and Jasmine van der Pol eds. 2011. *Light and Emotions: Exploring Lighting Cultures Conversations with Lighting Designers*. Basel: Birkhäuser Architecture. pp. 210-213.

B

Bacon, Henry, 2005. *Seitsemäs Taide: Elokuva ja muut taiteet*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Bacon, Henry, 2007. Deforming Helsinki on Film. In: Gareth Griffiths and Minna Chudoba, eds., 2007. *Datutop 29 - City + Cinema - Essays on the Specificity of Location in Film*. Tampere: Tampere University of Technology. pp. 30-37.

Bad Luck Love. 2000. [DVD] Directed by Olli Saarela. Finland: Gnufilms Oy.

Barber, Stephen, 2002. *Projected Cities: Cinema and Urban Space*. London: Reaktion.

Barker, Jennifer M., 2009. *The Tactile Eye : Touch and the Cinematic Experience*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bazin, Andre, 2005. *What is Cinema? Volume 1*. Translated from French by Hugh Gray. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benjamin, Walter, 1968. The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction. In Hanna Adrendt ed., *Illuminations*. Translated by Harry Zohn, New York: Schocken Books. pp. 219-253.

Benjamin, Walter, 1985. *One Way Street and Other Writings*. London: Verso.

Bensaa suonissa, 1970. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy, FJ-Filmi Oy.

Benson, John, 1989. *The Working Class in Britain, 1850-1939*. London: Longman.

Berlin: Symphony of a Metropolis, 1927. [Film] Directed by Walter Ruttmann. Weimar Republic: Deutsche Vereins-Film.

Bertills, Yvonne, 2003. *Beyond Identification: Proper Names in Children's Literature*. Turku: Åbo Akademi University Press.

Beuka, Robert, 2004. *SuburbiaNation: Reading Suburban Landscape in Twentieth Century American Film and Fiction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bilz, Silja, 2007. *The Little-Know-It-All*. Berlin: Die Gestalten Verlag.

Boesiger, Willy and Girsberger, Hans, 1999. *Le Corbusier 1910-65*. Berlin: Birkhäuser.

Borden, Iain, 2013. *Drive: Journeys Through Film, Cities and Landscapes*. London: Reaktion.

Boym, Svetlana, 2001. *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books.

Bruno, Giuliana, 2002. *Atlas of Emotion*. London: Verso.

C

Castle, Helen, 1999. *Modernism and modernization in architecture*. London: Academy Editions.

Caughie, John, ed., 2001. *Theories of Authorship: a reader*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Charney, Leo and Schwartz, Vanessa R. 1995. Introduction. In: Leo Carney and Vanessa R. Schwartz, eds., 1995. *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life*. California: University of California Press. pp. 1-14.

Clarke, David, ed., 1997. *The Cinematic City*. London: Routledge.

Clarke, Shirley, 1968. Liikutuin leskestä. *Uusi Suomi*, 28 January 1968. np.

Colquhoun, Alan, 2002. *Modern architecture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, Jean-Louis, 2004. *Le Corbusier, 1887-1965: The Lyricism of Architecture in the Machine Age*. Köln: Taschen.

Connah, Roger, 2005. *Finland: Modern Architectures in History*. London: Reaktion Books.

Coon, David R., 2013. *Look Closer: Suburban Narratives and American Values in Film and Television*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Cowie, Peter, 1990. *Finnish Cinema*. Helsinki: VAPK.

D

de Certeau, Michel, 2011. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Donner, Jörn, 1961. Suomalainen elokuva vuonna 0. *Studio*, 6/1961. np.

Donner, Jörn, 1962. Finskt på Bioduken. *Dagens Nyheter*, 9 October. np.

DuBois, Thomas A., 2005. "I'm a Lumberjack and I'm Okay": Popular Film as Collective Therapy in Markku Pölönen's *A Summer by the River*. In: Andrew K. Nestingen and Trevor Glen Elkington eds., 2005. *Transnational Cinema in a Global North: Nordic Cinema in Transition*. Wayne State University Press: Detroit, Michigan. pp. 243-260.

E

Elokuvapoliittinen komitea, 1973. *Elokuvapoliittisen komitean 1 osamietintö*. Helsinki: Elokuvapoliittinen komitea.

Eriksson, Jerker A., 1982. *Epäilyksen varjo. Elokuva-arvosteluja ja –esseita vuosilta 1951-1981*. Helsinki: Suomen elokuvasäätiö and Painatuskeskus.

Eronen, Pekka, 2007. Lähiöäidin yksinäinen ahdistus. *Satakunnan Kansa*, 27 March. np.

Eteläpää, Heikki, 1975. Kommunisti teki taloa. *Uusi Suomi*. 13 April. np.

Eteläpää, Heikki, 1975. Komedialla meistä ihmisistä. *Uusi Suomi*, 23 November. np.

F

Fabe, Marilyn, 2004. *Closely Watched Films: an introduction to the art of narrative film technique*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fawell, John, 2001. *Hitchcock's Rear Window: The Well-Made Film*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Fear, Bob, ed., 2000. *Architectural Design, Architecture + Film II*, 70(1). London: Wiley-Academy.

Femina, 1962. Elokuvakatsaus. *Satakunnan Kansa*. 12 October. np.

Foucault, Michel, 2002. Truth and Juridical Form. In: Michel Foucault, 2002. *Power: Essential Works 1954-1984*. London: Penguin. pp. 1-89.

Freeman, Richard, 1966. *Graffiti*. London: Hutchinson & Company.

Fränti, Mikael, 1968. Elokuva. *Savon Sanomat*, 31 January. np.

G

Gemünden, Gerd, 2008. *A Foreign Affair: Billy Wilder's American Films*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Gilloch, Graeme, 2007. Urban Optics: Film, Phantasmagoria and the City in Benjamin and Kracauer. *New Formations: A Journal of Culture, Theory and Politics*. 61(2). pp. 115-131.

Gröndahl, Henry G., 1975. *Hufvustadsbladet*, 23 November. np.

Gunning, Tom, 2010. Landscape and the Fantasy of Moving Pictures: Early Cinema's Phantom Rides. In: Graeme Harper and Jonathan Rayner, eds. 2010. *Cinema and Landscape*. Chicago: Intellect Books. pp. 31-70.

H

H., S., 1968. Kaksi muotokuvaa samasta leskestä. *Työn lomassa* 3(68). p. 50-51.

Haataja, Lauri, Hentilä, Seppo, Kalela, Jorma and Turtola, Jussi, 1977. *Suomen työväenliikkeen historia*. Helsinki: Työväensivistysliitto ry.

Hallam, Julia, Roberts, Les, Koeck, Richard and Kronenburg, Rober eds., 2008. *Cities in Film: Architecture, Urban Space and the Moving Image: An International*

Interdisciplinary Conference, University of Liverpool, 26-28th March 2008. Liverpool: Liverpool School of Architecture.

Hankonen, J., 1994. *Lähiöt ja tehokkuuden yhteiskunta: suunnittelujärjestelmän läpimurto suomalaisten asuntoalueiden rakentumisessa 1960-luvulla.* Espoo: Otatieto.

Hannula, Piritta and Salonen, Marja, 2007. *Rakennukset kertovat- perustietoa asukkaille.* [pdf] Helsinki: Helsingin Kaupunginosayhdistysten Liitto ry. Available at: <http://helka.net/images/stories/julkaisut/rakkert_280207_kaikki_printti.pdf> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Hannula, Risto, 1962. Elokuva. *Parnasso*, 7/November, pp. 334.

Harkki, Paula and Blomqvist Jorma, 1975. Jarvan uusi elokuva kertoo kuinka pappi saa pukin maineen. *Apu*, (28) 11 July, p. 40-43.

Hautajärvi, Harri, 2002. Plastic Bubbles And Capsule Homes- Architectural Utopias of the Space Age. In: Marko Home and Mika Tanila, eds., 2002. *Futuro: Tomorrow's House from Yesterday.* Helsinki: Desura. pp. 56-79.

Hayes, Christian, 2012. Phantom Rides. *BFI Screenonline*, [online]. Available at: <<http://www.screenonline.org.uk/film/id/1193042/>> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Hayward, Susan, 1996. *Key Concepts in Cinema Studies.* London and New York: Routledge.

Heathcote, Edwin, 2000. Modernism as Enemy: Film and the Portrayal of Modern Architecture. In: Bob Fear, ed., 2000. *Architectural Design, Architecture + Film II*, 70(1). London: Wiley-Academy. pp. 20-26.

Heiskanen, Outi and Santakari, Minna, 2004. *Asuuko neiti Töölössä?* Helsinki: Teos.

Helsinki, Forever, 2008. [Film] Directed by Peter von Bagh. Finland: Illume Oy.

Hentilä, Seppo, 1989. Urheilu, kansakunta ja luokat. In: Risto Alapuro and Henrik Stenius, eds. 1989. *Kansa Liikkeessä.* Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä. pp. 213-235.

Hietala, Veijo, 1992. *Kulttuuri vaihtoi viihteelle? Johdatusta postmodernismiin ja populaarikulttuuriin*. Helsinki: Kirjastopalvelu.

Hillier, John, 1972. *John Ford Movie Maker*. [event programme] National Film Theatre London August-September 1972. p. 3.

Hillier, Jim ed., 1975. *Cinema in Finland*. London: BFI.

Hilson, Mary, 2008. *The Nordic Model: Scandinavia since 1945*. London: Reaction Books.

HOK-Elanto, 2005. *HOK-Elanto 100 vuotta*. [online] Available at: <http://mediapalvelu.s-kanava.fi/hok-elanto/hok-elanto_yrityksena/hok-elanto-yrityksena_taso2/fi_FI/historia/_files/75617505473855611/default/HistoriaHOK-Elanto100v.pdf> [Accessed 8 March 2011].

Home, Marko and Tanila, Mika eds., 2002. *Futuro: Tomorrow's House from Yesterday*. Helsinki: Desura.

Hotakainen, Kari, 1997. *Klassikko. Omaelämäkerrallinen romaani autoilevasta ja avoimesta kansasta*. Juva: WSOY.

Honka-Hallila, Ari, Laine, Kimmo and Pantti, Mervi, 1995. *Markan tähden: yli sata vuotta suomalaista elokuvahistoriaa*. Turku: Turun yliopiston täydennyskoulutuskeskus.

Huq, Rupa, 2013. *Making Sense of Suburbia through Popular Culture*. London: Bloomsbury.

Hurme, Jaakko, 1968. Vihreä leski. *Helsinki-lehti*, (4)68, p. 4.

Hurme, Riitta, 1991. *Suomalainen lähiö Tapiolasta Pihlajamäkeen*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Häkkinen, Kaisa, 2004. *Suomen etymologinen sanakirja*. Helsinki: WSOY.

I

lisalo, Taimo, 1989. *Kouluopetuksen Vaiheita: Keskiajan katedraalikouluista nykyisiin kouluihin*. Helsinki: Otava.

Ingemark, Camilla Asplund, 2004. *The Genre of Trolls*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.

Itkonen, Uolevi, 1985. *Tapiolan arkea ja juhlaa*. Espoo: Länsiväylä Oy. pp. 254-351.

J

J-i, E, 1962. No title. *Elanto* 20/62. np.

Jaantila, Kirsi, 1962. Mennäänpä elokuvaan: Kurkvaara edistyy. *Elokuva-Aitta*, 20(62). np.

Jacobs, Lewis 1970. The Mobility of Color. In: Lewis Jacobs ed. 1970. *The Movies as Medium*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux. pp. 189-196.

Jalander, Ywe, 1980. Elokuva jota ei tarvitse hävetä. *Suomen kuvalehti*, 81(90), p.30-31.

Jameson, Frederik, 1986. On Magic Realism in Film. *Critical Inquiry*, 2(2). pp. 301-325.

Jarva, Risto (1974). *Report to the Camera Arts Committee*. [report] 16.4.1974. In: Toiviainen, Sakari (1983). *Risto Jarva*. Helsinki: Suomen elokuva-arkisto A3. pp. 258-259.

Jokinen, Pertti, 1975. Rakentajat tukevat "omaa elokuvaansa". *Kansan Uutiset*, 9th April 1975. np.

Jokinen, Pertti, 1976. Tandemin uusin tutkimus: miksi ei-kaupallinen elokuva ei menestynyt?. *Kansan Uutiset*, 26 November. np.

Jon, 1983. [Film] Directed by Jaakko Pyhälä. Finland: Tambur Oy.

Jouluksi kotiin. 1975. [Film] Directed by Jaakko Pakkasvirta. Finland: Filimityö Oy.

Jussila O & Hentilä S and Nevakivi J, 1999. *From Grand Duchy to a Modern State: A Political History of Finland Since 1809*. London: Hurst.

Jäniksen vuosi, 1977. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Järvenpää, Eeva, 2006. 'Osa 47: Elanto rakensi komean tavaratalon Aasin kortteliin'. [online] 16 September. *Helsingin Sanomat*. Available at: <http://www2.hs.fi/extrat/kaupunki/korttelisarja/47_3.html> [Accessed 8 March 2011].

Jää hyvästi Amuri. 1967. [Film] Directed by Arvo Ahlroos. Finland: YLE.

Jørgensen, John, 2011. Copenhagen: Evolution of the Finger Structure. *Urbamet*, [online]. Available at: <http://urbamet.documentation.equipement.gouv.fr/documents/EQUTEX00010090/EQUTEX00010090_5.pdf> [Accessed 20 March 2011].

K

Kahdeksan surmanluotia, 1972. [Film] Directed by Mikko Niskanen. Finland: Yleisradio, TV1, Televisioteatteri, Käpy-Filmi Oy.

Kajava, Viljo, 1972. *Vallilan rapsodia*. Helsinki: Otava.

Kallio, Kristiina, 1975. Jos emme halua tämän jatkuvan. *Filmifriikki*. 3(75). pp. 23.

Kangasjärvi, Jukka, 2007. Kotiäiti ja betoniseinä. *Aamulehti Valo-viikkoliite*, 12/2007. np.

Karemo, Kari, 1976. Risto Jarvan suomalainen idylli. *Kaleva*, 28 January. np.

Kataja, H., 1977. Kurkvaaran paras? *Iltasanomat*, 13 May. p. 12.

Kaupungin synty. 1972. [Film] Directed by Aito Mäkinen and Virke Lehtinen. Finland: Filmiryhmä Oy.

Kaupungissa on tulevaisuus. 1967. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Keil, Roger, 2013. *Suburban Constellations: Governance, Land and Infrastructure in the 21st Century*. Berlin: Jovis Verlag.

Kejonen, Pentti, 1982. Elämä tulee vauhdilla: Rajun nuoruuden tosi kuvaus. *Kaleva*, 7 May.

Kemppi, Yrjö, 1962. Pakkasvirran leskiraportti. *Iltasanomat*, 20 January. p. 6.

Keskitalo, Jorma, 2010. Makkaratalon arkkitehti piirsi myös pieniä rakennuksia.

Helsingin Sanomat, [online]. Available at:

<<http://www.hs.fi/kulttuuri/artikkeli/Makkaratalon+arkkitehti+piirsi+myös+pieniä+rakennuksia/1135252875455>> [Accessed 12 January 2011].

Kesäkapina, 1970. [Film] Directed by Jaakko Pakkasvirta. Finland: Filminor Oy, FJ-Filmi Oy.

Kettunen, Pauli, 2001. The Nordic Welfare State in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of History*. 26(3). pp. 225-247.

Kilpi, Timo, 1988. Koruton Yksityisalue. *Iltasanomat*, 21 June. p. 38.

Kirby, D., 2006. *A Concise History of Finland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koeck, Richard and Roberts, Les eds., 2010. *The City and The Moving Image: Urban Projections*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Koeck, Richard, 2013. *Cine-scapes: Cinematic Spaces in Architecture and Cities*. London: Routledge.

Koistinen, Anneli, 1974. Vihreät Lesket- muuttumaton ongelma. *Iltasanomat*, 10 February. np.

Koivumäki, Matti, 2001. *Puu-Vallilan Kasvot*. Helsinki: Helsinki-Seura

Kokkonen, Jouko ed., 2002. *Kontula: elämää lähiössä*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Konstantarakos, Myrto ed., 2000. *Spaces in European Cinema*. Exeter: Intellect.

Korso, 2014. [Film] Directed by Akseli Tuomivaara. Finland: Oy Buffo AB, Tuffi Films Oy.

Kortteinen, Matti, 1982. *Lähiö: Tutkimus elämäntapojen muutoksesta*. Helsinki: Otava.

Kovanen, Marjo, 2010. Täältä tullaan elämä. *KAVA*, [online] Available at: <<http://www.kava.fi/esitykset/mediakasvatus/kotimaiset-klassikot/opetusmateriaalit/taalta-tullaan-elama>> [Accessed 9 December 2010].

Kukkapuro, Yrjö, 2008. Ergonominen heräte. *Yrjö Kukkapuro*, [online] Available at: <<http://kukkapuro.fi/kukkapuro>> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Kultainen vasikka, 1961. [Film] Directed by Ritva Arvelo. Finland: Fennada-Film Oy.

Kun taivas putoaa, 1972. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Kuoppamäki, Jukka, 1972. *Sininen ja valkoinen*. [lyric] Helsinki: Parlophone.

Kuusela, Pertti, 1976. *Puoli vuosisataa filmiäänitekniikkaa Suomessa*. Helsinki: Suomen elokuvasäätö.

Kuusi, Hanna, 2005. Työväestö 1960- ja 1970-lukujen suomalaisessa elokuvassa. [online]. *Työväestön rajat*. Available at: <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10224/4077/tyovaesto_elokuva_vv18_2005.pdf?sequence=1> [Accessed 8 March 2011].

Kuusi, Pekka, 1962. *60-luvun Sosiaalipolitiikka*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Käpy selän alla, 1966. [Film] Directed by Mikko Niskanen. Finland: FJ-Filmi Oy.

Kääpä, Pietari ed., 2012. *Directory of World Cinema: Finland*. Bristol: Intellect.

Kääpä, Pietari and Laine, Silja eds, 2013. *World Film Locations: Helsinki: City of the Imagination*. Bristol: Intellect.

Kääpä, Pietari, 2013. Helsinki: City of Imagination. In: Pietari Kääpä and Silja Laine eds., 2013. *World Film Locations: Helsinki: City of the Imagination*. Bristol: Intellect. pp. 6-7.

L

Laakso, Seppo, 2012. *Helsingin seudun ja Helsingin väestökehitys: Toteutunut väestönkasvu ja projektiot vuoteen 2050*. [pdf] Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunkisuunnitteluvirasto. Available at: <http://www.hel.fi/hel2/ksv/julkaisut/yos_2012-3.pdf> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Laakso, Seppo and Loikkanen, Heikki A., 2004. *Kaupunkitalous: johdatus kaupungistumiseen, kaupunkien maankäyttöön sekä yritysten ja kotitalouksien sijoittumiseen*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Laidler, Harry W., 1944. *Social-Economic Movements: An Historical and Comparative Survey of Socialism, Communism, Co-Operation, Utopianism; and Other Systems of Reform and Reconstruction*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Laine, Silja, 2013. Designer City: Architects in Helsinki Films. In: Pietari Kääpä and Silja Laine eds., 2013. *World Film Locations: Helsinki: City of the Imagination*. Bristol: Intellect. pp. 26-27.

Lamster, Mark, ed., 2000. *Architecture and Film*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Laukaus tehtaalla, 1973. [Film] Directed by Erkki Kivikoski. Finland: Jörn Donner Productions Oy.

Lapualaismorsian, 1967. [Film] Directed by Mikko Niskanen. Finland: FJ-Filmi Oy, Jörn Donner Productions Oy.

Last Year in Marienbad, 1961. [Film] Directed by Alain Resnais. France: Cocinor.

Le Amiche, 1955. [Film] Directed by Michelangelo Antonioni. Italy: Trionfalcine.

Le Corbusier, 1937. *Oeuvre Complite 1910-1929*. Zurich: Dr H. Ginsberg.

Lefebvre, Henri, 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lehtola, Erkki, 1968. Kutistuneen maailman pulmat. *Aamulehti*, 21 January. 1968. np.

Leppänen, Veli-Pekka, 1999. *Kivääri vai äänestyslippu*. Helsinki: Edita.

Leskinen, Ulla 1962. Maunu Kurkvaara- vaihtelijan filmimies. *Elokuva-Aitta* 21(62). pp. 18-19

Lindqvist, Antti, 1988. Miksi ihminen tekee itsemurhan?. *Katso!* 25(88). p. 31.

Lindqvist, Antti, 1994. Ujo pappi kompuroi. *Katso!*, 1(94). np.

Lius, Inkeri, 1962. Viikon filmejä. *Sosiaalidemokraatti*. nd. np.

Lius, Inkeri, 1968. Viikon filmejä. *Sosiaalidemokraatti*, 21 January. np.

Lumirae, Pertti, 1968. Merkittävin debyyttielokuvamme. *Pohjan Sanomat*, 20 January. np.

Luoma, Matti, 1968. ... on ainakin yhden keskustelun arvoinen. *Aamulehti*, 28 January. np.

Lynch, Kevin, 1960. *The Image of the City*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.

Lyssiotis, Peter and McQuire, Scott, 2000. Liquid Architecture: Eisenstein and Film Noir. In: Bob Fear, ed., 2000. *Architectural Design, Architecture + Film II*, 70(1). London: Wiley-Academy. pp. 6-8.

Lång, Ossi, 2011. *Yhteisöllisyys kaupungin vuokratiloissa*. [report] 4V, 24.1.2011. Available at: <http://www.4v.fi/files/4812/Ossin_raportti_lopullinen.pdf> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

M

Maaseudun tulevaisuus?, 1970. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Makkonen, Velipekka, 1968. Pakkasvirran Vihreä leski. *Contactora* 2(68). np.

Malmberg, Tarmo, 1968. Uuden elokuvamme maisemaa. *Ylioppilaslehti*, 3(68). np.

Malmi, Timo, 2003. Täältä Tulee Kati Outinen. *Iltasanomat*. 4 June. np.

Malve-Tamminen, Riitta (2013). Puu-Vallilan toinen vuosisata alkaa. *Kiinteistölehti*, [online] Available at: <<http://www.kiinteistolehti.fi/lehti/lehti/puu-vallilan-toinen-vuosisata-alkaa?method=report&target=24050>> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Man with a Movie Camera, 1929. [Film] Directed by Dziga Vertov. Soviet Union: VUFKU.

Mannerkorpi, Jukka, 1979. *Suomalaisen elokuvapolitiikan nykyaika*. Kulttuurivihkot (1)79. Np.

Marback, Richard, 2001. Learning to Inhabit Writing. *Composition Studies*, 29(1). pp. 51–62.

Marja pieni!, 1972. [Film] Directed by Eija-Elina Bergholm. Finland: Jörn Donner Productions Oy.

Marks, Laura U., 2000. *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment and the Senses*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Marks, Laura U., 2002. *Touch: Sensuous Theory and Multisensory Media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Markus, Ruth, 2006. Retour à l'ordre and the Classical Language of French Modern Architecture after the First World War. *Assaph, Studies in Art History, Tel-Aviv University, 2005-2006*. 10-11, pp. 171-186.

- Marttala, Anne, 1980. *Elämänmakuista elokuvaa*. Savon Sanomat, 9 March. Np.
- Massinen, Hannu, 1980. Ongelmanuorisoa. *Etelä-Suomen Sanomat*, 2 August. np.
- Mattila, Hanna, 2006. Puutarhakaupunki utopiana: esimerkkinä Tapiola. In: Arto Haapala and Mia Kunnaskari eds., 2006. *Paradokseja paratiisissa: näkökulmia urbaaniin luontoon*. Lahti: Kansainvälinen soveltavan estetiikan instituutti.
- Maule, Rosanna, 2008. *Beyond Auteurism: New Directions in Authorial Film Practices in France, Italy and Spain since the 1980s*. London: Intellect.
- Meinander, Henrik, 2011. *A History of Finland*. London: C Hurst & Co.
- Meren juhlat*, 1963. [Film] Directed by Maunu Kurkvaara. Finland: Kurkvaara-Filmi.
- Metz, Christian, 1974. *Language and Cinema*. The Hague: Mouton&Co.
- Meurman, Otto I., 1947. *Asemakaavaoppi*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei*. 1975. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.
- Moilanen, Harri, 1988. Ratkaisuna itsemurha. *Kansan Uutiset*, 21 June. np.
- Molendijk, Roos 2011. Emotion is fundamental in lighting design. In: Vincent Laganier and Jasmine van der Pol eds. 2011. *Light and Emotions: Exploring Lighting Cultures Conversations with Lighting Designers*. Basel: Birkhäuser Architecture. pp. 394-395.
- Mona ja palavan rakkauden aika*, 1983. [Film] Directed by Mikko Niskanen. Finland: National-Filmi Oy.
- Mon Oncle*, 1958. [Film] Directed by Jacques Tati. France: Specta Film, Gray-Film, Alter Films.
- Musta jää*, 2007. [Film] Directed by Petri Kotwica. Finland: Making Movies Oy.

Mustaa valkoisella, 1968. [Film] Directed by Jörn Donner. Finland: FJ-Filmi Oy, Jörn Donner Productions Oy.

Muzzio, Douglas and Halper, Thomas, 2002. 'Pleasantville?: The Suburb and Its Representation in American movies. *Urban Affairs Review*, March 37(4). pp. 543-574.

Mäenpää, Pasi, 2004. Kansalaisesta kuluttajaksi. In: Kirsi Saarikangas, Pasi Mäenpää, Minna Sarantola-Weiss eds., 2004. *Suomen Kulttuurihistoria 4: Koti, Kylä ja Kaupunki*. Helsinki: Tammi. pp. 286-315.

N

Narrien illat, 1970. [Film] Directed by Tapio Suominen. Finland: Markfilmi Kommandiittiyhtiö and Pentti Lintonen ja Kumpp.

Neale, Steve, 1993. Masculinity as Spectacle: Reflections of Men and Mainstream Cinema. In: Steven Cohen and Ina Rae Hark, 1993. *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. New York: Routledge. pp. 9-22.

Nenonen, Kaija and Toppari, Kirsi, 1983. *Herrasväen ja työläisten kaupunki: Helsingin vanhoja kortteleita 2*. Helsinki: Helsingin Sanomat.

Nikula, Riitta, 1993. *Architecture and Landscape: the Building of Finland*. Helsinki: Otava.

Nikula, Riitta, 2005. *Wood, Stone and Steel: Contours of Finnish Architecture*. Helsinki: Otava.

Nordberg, Mauri, 1968. Erään avioliiton muotokuva. *Etelä-Suomen Sanomat*, 23 January. p. 17.

Nousukausi. 2003. [Film] Directed by Johanna Vuoksenmaa. Finland: Kinotar Oy.

Nukkumalähiö. 1964. [Film] Directed by Heikki Katajisto. Finland: Taideteollinen oppilaitos/Kamerataiteen osasto.

Nyberg, René ed., 1970. *Education Reform in Finland in the 1970s*. Helsinki: Ministry of Education.

O

Oho, sano! Eemeli, 1960. [Film] Directed by Ville Salminen. Finland: Suomen Filmitoimisto SF Oy.

Onnenpeli. 1965. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Onnen Saari, 1955. [Film] Directed by Maunu Kurkvaara. Finland: Filmiaho.

O'Shaughnessy, Brian, 2000. *Consciousness and the World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

P

Paavonen, Tapani and Kangas, Olli, 2006. *Eduskunta hyvinvointivaltion rakentajana*. Helsinki: Edita.

Pajula, Matti, 1968. Vihreä leski. *Elokuva-Aitta*, 3(68). p. 46.

Pakkala, Leni, 2008. *Seurantalolla toimitaan*, [online]. Available at: http://www.rakennusperinto.fi/rakennusperintomme/artikkelit/fi_FI/seurantalot/ [Accessed 14 January 2011].

Pakkasvirta, Jaakko, 1968. 'Vihreä leski'-edelleen.... *Aamulehti* 10 June. np.

Pakkasvirta, Jaakko, 1975. Päähenkilönä toteutumaton ihminen. *Filmifriikki*, 3(75). pp. 18-19.

Pallasmaa, Juhani, 2005. *The Eyes of the Skin: Architecture and the Senses*. Chichester: Wiley-Academy.

Pallasmaa, Juhani, 2007. *The Architecture of the Image: Existential Space in Cinema*. Helsinki: Rakennustieto Publishing.

Pallasmaa, Juhani, 2009. *The Thinking Hand: Existential and Embodied Wisdom in Architecture*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Pantti, Mervi, 1993. Mitä tapahtui todella. Suomalainen uusi aalto ja yhteiskunnallisuuden vaatimus. *Lähikuva*, 2(1993).

Pantti, Mervi, 1994. Hallittu kurittomuus. Nuorison nousu ja sukupolvikonflikti suomalaisessa elokuvassa 1960-luvulla. *Lähikuva*, 1(1994).

Pantti, Mervi, 1995. Vanhan ja uuden ristiaallokossa. In: Honka-Hallila, Ari, Laine, Kimmo and Pantti, Mervi, 1995. *Markan tähden: yli sata vuotta suomalaista elokuvahistoriaa*. Turku: Turun yliopiston täydennyskoulutuskeskus. pp. 139-200.

Pantti, Mervi, 1999a. Tehtävänä todellisuuden tutkiminen. In: Ari Kivimäki, Mervi Pantti and Jari Sedergren eds, 1999. *Kriisi, kritiikki ja konsensus: elokuva ja suomalainen yhteiskunta*. Turku: Turun yliopisto. pp. 120-134.

Pantti, Mervi, 1999b. Valistavaa (ja valtion tukemaa) taide-elokuvaa kansalle. In: Ari Kivimäki, Mervi Pantti and Jari Sedergren eds, 1999. *Kriisi, kritiikki ja konsensus: elokuva ja suomalainen yhteiskunta*. Turku: Turun yliopisto. pp. 135-159.

Pantti, Mervi, 1999c. Pappa valtio kansallisen elokuvan tekijänä. In: Ari Kivimäki, Mervi Pantti and Jari Sedergren eds, 1999. *Kriisi, kritiikki ja konsensus: elokuva ja suomalainen yhteiskunta*. Turku: Turun yliopisto. pp. 160-183.

Pantti, Mervi, 2000. *Kansallinen elokuva pelastettava: elokuvapoliittinen keskustelu kotimaisen elokuvan tukemisesta itsenäisyyden ajalla*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Pedon merkki, 1981. [Film] Directed by Jaakko Pakkasvirta. Finland: Filmityö Oy.

Penz, François and Thomas, Maureen, 1997. *Cinema & Architecture: Méliès, Mallet-Stevens, Multimedia*. London: British Film Institute.

Pesonen, Pertti and Riihinen Olavi, 2002. *Dynamic Finland: The Political System and the Welfare State*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Pihström Bengt, 1962. Sett på bio: Äntiligen en INHEMSK FILM av INTERNATIONELL klass!. *Nya Pressen*, 8 October. np.

Pikku Pietarin piha, 1961. [Film] Directed by Jack Witikka. Finland: Suomi-Filmi Oy.

Playtime, 1967. [Film] Directed by Jacques Tati. France: Jolly Film, Specta Film.

Plummer, Henry, 2012. *Nordic Light: Modern Scandinavian Architecture*. London: Thames&Hudson.

Poole, Scott, 1992. *The New Finnish Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli.

Pourquoi?, 1965. [Film] Directed by Maunu Kurkvaara. Finland: Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy.

Pääkaupunki- aamusta iltaan, 1952. [Film] Directed by Maunu Kurkvaara. Finland: Filmiveli Oy.

Q

Quantrill, Malcolm, 1995. *Finnish Architecture and the Modernist Tradition*. London: E & FN Spon.

R

Ranti, Tjan, 2002. The Return of the Prototype. In: Marko Home and Mika Tanila, eds., 2002. *Futuro: Tomorrow's House from Yesterday*. Helsinki: Desura. pp.48-55.

Raportti eli balladi laivatytöistä, 1964. [Film] Directed by Maunu Kurkvaara. Suomi: Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy.

Rakas..., 1961. [Film] Directed by Maunu Kurkvaara. Suomi: Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy.

Rakentajia työssään, 1953. [Film] Directed by Eino Ritari. Suomi: Oy Suomen Filmitoiminta.

Rantanen, Miska, 2004. Me ollaan nuorisot. *Helsingin Sanomat Nyt-viikkoliite*, (44)2004. p. 37.

- Rastimo, Kaisa, 2011. Tapiola. In: Outi Heiskanen and Minna Santakari, 2000. *Kinokaupunki: Helsinki elokuvatähtenä - kuvatekstit*. Helsinki: 2000.hel.fi Euroopan Kulttuurikaupunki. p.32.
- Richards, J.M., 1966. *A Guide to Finnish Architecture*. London: Hugh Evelyn.
- Rinne, Matti, 1975. Naurettavaa: Jarva tekee komediaa!. *Iltasanomat*, 30 July. p. 4.
- Rista, Simo, 1973. *Vallilantie. Näkymä Vallilantieltä koilliseen, Mäkelänkadun suuntaan*. [electronic print] Available at:
<<http://www.asfalttiajauringonkukkia.fi/haku/vallila/ser322209#contentwrapper>>
[Accessed 6 July 2014].
- Robinson, Mark, 2012. Designer Yrjö Kukkapuro for Apartamento Magazine #9. *Apartamento Magazine*, [online] Available at: <<http://the189.com/design/designer-yrjo-kukkapuro-for-apartamento-magazine-9/>> [Accessed 17 May 2012].
- Roivainen, Irene, 1999. *Sokeripala metsän keskellä - lähiö sanomalehden konstruktiona*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskuksen tutkimuksia, 1999(2).
- Roos, Jeja-Pekka, 1978. Piirteitä elämäntavan tutkimisesta. *Sosiologia*, 15(2). pp. 75-81.
- Rose, Steve, 2006. Scrubs up beautifully. *Guardian*, [online] Available at:
<<http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2006/oct/23/architecture.communities>>
[Accessed 6th July 2014].
- Runoilija ja muusa*, 1978. [Film] Directed by Jaakko Pakkasvirta. Finland: Filimityö Oy.
- Ruotsinsuomalaisten Keskusliitto, 2010. *Sweden Finns- a national minority* [online]. Available: <http://www.rskl.se/SwedenFinns08.html> [Accessed 12 January 2011].
- Ruusujen aika*, 1969. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.
- Rybczynski, Witold, 2010. *Makeshift Metropolis: Ideas About Cities*. New York: Scribner.

Römpötti, Harri, 2011. Maunu Kurkvaara vaihtoi kuvataiteen elokuvaan. *Helsingin Sanomat*, 5 July 2011. B11.

S

Saari, Mauno, 1972. Uuden rodun jouluevankeliumi. *Helsingin Sanomat*, 24 December. np.

Saarikangas, Kirsi, 2004. Metsän Reunalla: Suomen rakentaminen 1900-luvulla. In: Kirsi Saarikangas, Pasi Mäenpää, Minna Sarantola-Weiss eds., 2004. *Suomen Kulttuurihistoria 4: Koti, Kylä ja Kaupunki*. Helsinki: Tammi. pp. 22-61.

Sainio, Mauri, 1978. Kuin suutari lestissään. *Katso!*, 4(78). p. 9.

Sairanen, Jorma, 1980. Tapio Suominen: Täältä tullaan elämä. *Elokuvalehti Spektri*, (2)80. pp. 26-27.

Salakka, Matti, 1999. Täältä tullaan, elämä! Peruskouluelokuva punkmaustein. In: Uusitalo, Kari ed., 1999. *Suomen kansallisfilmografia 8: 1971-1980*. Helsinki: Edita, Suomen elokuva-arkisto. pp. 502-504.

Salmi, Hannu, 1999. Esipuhe. In: Ari Kivimäki, Mervi Pantti and Jari Sedergren eds, 1999. *Kriisi, kritiikki ja konsensus: elokuva ja suomalainen yhteiskunta*. Turku: Turun yliopisto. pp. 7-10.

Salminen, Jari, 2005. *Suomen yksityisten oppikoulujen digitaalinen matrikkeli 1872-1977* [online]. Available: <http://www.yksityiskoulut.fi/matrikkeli/kontulan.htm> [Accessed 12 January 2011].

Salokangas, Leena, 1967. Vihreä Leski. *Elokuva-Aitta*. (16)1967. p. 25.

Salokorpi, Asko, 1970. *Modern Architecture in Finland*. London: Weldenfeld&Nicolson.

Salomaa, Kalevi, 1975. Valkokangas. *Etelä-Suomen Sanomat*, 23 November. np.

Sarris, Andrew, 1968. *American Cinema*. New York: Dutton.

Savo, Martti, 1968. Pakkasvirran ensimmäinen. *Kansan Uutiset*, 21 January. np.

Scarecrow Press, 2012. *Historical Dictionary of Scandinavian Cinema*. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Seppälä, M-L., Lehtonen, H. and Tihlman, T., 1990. *Suomen lähiöt. Kyselytutkimus 1950–1980-luvulla rakennetuista lähiöistä*. Helsinki: Ympäristöministeriö.

Sharp, Dennis ed., 1978. *The Rationalists: Theory and Design in the Modern Movement*. London: Architectural Press.

Shiel, Mark and Fitzmaurice, Tony, 2001. *Cinema and the City: Film and Urban Societies in a Global Context*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Shiel, Mark and Fitzmaurice, Tony, 2003. *Screening the City*. London: Verso.

Silfverberg, Kari, 2012. Puu-Vallilan vaiheita ja tulevaisuusnäkyimiä: Katsaus historiaan, nykyoloihin ja lähitulevaisuuteen. *Hermannin-Vallila Seura*. [online] Available at: <<http://kaupunginosat.net/heva/index.php/puu-vallilan-historiikki>> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Silius, Veli-Pekka, 1975. Elokuvasykyä suomalaisittain. *Aikamerkki*, 12 December. p. 6.

Siltala, Juha, 2003. The Psychodynamics of Shame in the Autobiographies of Modern Finnish Men. In Søren Ervø and Thomas Johansson eds., 2003. *Molding Masculinities*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited. pp. 208-223.

Smith, Anthony D., 2009. *Ethno-symbolism and Nationalism: a Cultural Approach*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Sobchack, Vivian, 1992. *The Address of the Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Solsten, Eric and Menditz, Sandra W. eds., 1988. *Finland: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress.

Soras, Marjatta, 1990. Raportti Manusta. *Helsingin Sanomat*, 13 August. np.

Spangenberg, Mia M., 2009. *It's reigning men: Masculinities in contemporary Finnish fiction and film*. Phd. University of Washington.

Stam, Robert, 2000. *Film Theory: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Standertskjöld, Elina, 2011. *Arkkitehtuurimme Vuosikymmenet: 1960-1980*. Helsinki: Rakennustieto Oy.

Stenius, Henrik, 1997. The Good Life Is a Life of Conformity: The Impact of the Lutheran Tradition on Nordic Political Culture. In: Øystein Sørensen and Bo Stråth eds., 1997. *The Cultural Construction of Norden*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press. pp.161-71.

Sternberg, Mats, 2013. Lähiötutkimus tuo esiin lähiöiden moninaisuuden. *Kvartti*. [online] Available at: < <http://www.kvartti.fi/fi/artikkelit/lahiotutkimus-tuo-esiin-lahioiden-moninaisuuden> > [Accessed 12 January 2015].

Stoddart, Theodore et al., 1974. *Area Handbook for Finland*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Print Office.

Stålhammar, Leo, 1975a. Ankea elämäntarina. *Suomenmaa*, 17 April. np.

Stålhammar, Leo, 1975b. Valloittava kotimainen komedia. *Suomenmaa*, 25 October. np.

Sundholm, John et al, 2012. *Historical Dictionary of Scandinavian Cinema*. Plymouth: Scarecrow Press.

Suominen, Tapio, 1980. *Nuoruuden sielunmaisema*. Sinä-Minä-Me, 1(80). p. 11.

Sutherland, Jean-Anne and Feltey, Kathryn, 2010. *Cinematic Sociology*. California: Pine Forge Press.

Suuri sävelparaati, 1959. [Film] Directed by Jack Witikka. Finland: Suomi-Filmi Oy.

Syksyllä kaikki on toisin. 1978. [Film] Directed by Mikko Niskanen. Finland: National-Filmi Oy.

Syöksykierre, 1981. [Film] Directed by Tapio Suominen. Finland: Sateenkaarifilmi Oy.

T

Tahdon stadiin. 2000. [Film] Directed by Pekka Parikka. Finland: Yleisradio.

Talaskivi, Paula, 1962. Pimpula. *Helsingin Sanomat*, 6 October. np.

Talaskivi, Paula, 1968. Vihreän Lesken päiväkirjamerkintöjä. *Helsingin Sanomat*, 21 January. np.

Talaskivi, Paula, 1975. Jarvan komedia: Litja on ujo ja rakastaa. *Helsingin Sanomat*, 18 November. p. 13.

Tammi, Eero, 2006. *Yksityisalue*. [online] KAVA. Available at:
<<http://www.kava.fi/esitys/yksityisalue/7166>> [Accessed 13 November 2013].

Tammi, Eero, 2006. Unohdettu mestari. *Voima*. [online]. Available at:
<<http://fifi.voima.fi/voima-artikkeli/2006/numero-5/unohdettu-mestari>> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Tani, Sirpa, 1995. *Kaupunki Taikapeilissä: Helsinki-elokuvien mielenmaisemat - maantieteellisiä tulkintoja*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskuksen tutkimuksia.

Tanttu, Juha, 1962. Tahtoo tehdä filmin. *Suomen Kuvalehti* 29(62). np.

Tapiola. 1967. [Film] Directed by Erkki Kivikoski. Finland: Filmiryhmä Oy.

Tarr, Carrie, 2005. *Reframing difference: Beur and banlieue filmmaking in France*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Tentato suicidio, 1953. [Film] Directed by Michelangelo Antonioni. Italy: Faro Film.

Tervasmäki, Jaakko, 1962. Yksityisalue. *Ylioppilaslehti*, 29(62). np.

Thacker, Andrew, 2009. *Moving Through Modernity: Space and Geography in Modernism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Thompson, Kristin and Bordwell, David, 2003. *Film History: An Introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Toiviainen, Sakari, 1975a. *Uusi suomalainen elokuva: 60-luvun alusta nykypäivään*. Helsinki: Otava.

Toiviainen, Sakari, 1975b. New Finnish Cinema. In Hillier, Jim ed., 1975. *Cinema in Finland*. London: BFI.

Toiviainen, Sakari, 1975c. Siitä kesästä joka ei koskaan tullut. *Filmifriikki*, 3(75). pp. 20-21.

Toiviainen, Sakari, 1980. Luottamus, kosketus. *Filmihullu*, 2(80). pp. 20-25.

Toiviainen, Sakari, 1983. *Risto Jarva*. Helsinki: Suomen elokuva-arkisto A3.

Toiviainen, Sakari, 2008. Suomalaisen elokuvan lyhyt historia. *Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura*, [online]. Available at <http://www.finlit.fi/lehdisto/tiedostot/Suomalainen%20elokuva.pdf> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Tuomikoski, Eero, 1968. Pakkasvirran 'Vihreä Leski' ja suomalainen todellisuus. *Aamulehti*, 30 January. np.

Tuomikoski, Eero, 1968. Vihreä leski. *Kauppalehti*, 21(68). np.

Tuomioja, Erkki, 2003. Pekka Kuusi ja 60-luvun sosiaalipolitiikka Suomen suunnannäyttäjänä. *JANUS-sosiaalipolitiikan ja sosiaalityöntutkimuksen aikakauslehti*, 4(02). 308-320.

Tuomisto, Tero, 2008. 'Työväentalot ja kansantalot'. In: Anna-Maija Halme and Leni Pakkala eds., 2008. *Yhdessä Rakennetut*. Vammala: Suomen Kotiseutuliiton julkaisuja. pp. 82-83.

Tuomola, Simo, 1980. Häirikötkö kuriin?. *Turun Sanomat*, 4 March. np.

Turner, Graeme, 1999. *Film as Social Practice*. London: Routledge.

Tuuli, Markku, 1975. Mies, joka ei osannut sanoa ei. *Katso!*, 49(75). np.

Työmiehen päiväkirja. 1967. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Työtä ylioppilasteatterissa, 1961. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Teekkarien elokuvakerho Montaasi.

Täältä alkaa seikkailu, 1965. [Film] Directed by Jörn Donner. Sweden: Fennada-Filmi Oy, Sandrew Film AB.

Täältä tullaan, elämä!. 1980. [Film] Directed by Tapio Suominen. Finland: Sateenkaarifilmi Oy.

U

Underwood, David, 2004. *Oscar Niemeyer and the Architecture of Brazil*. New York: Rizzoli.

Upton, A.F., 1973. *The Communist Parties of Scandinavia and Finland*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Uusia asuntoalueita, 1957 [Film]. Cinematography Veikko Roivas. Finland: Oy Filmiseppo.

Uusitalo, Kari, 1980. *Suomen elokuvasäätiö 1970-1979*. Helsinki: Suomen elokuvasäätiö.

Uusitalo, Kari, 1981. *Suomen Hollywood on kuollut: Kotimaisen elokuvan ahdinkovuodet 1956-1963*. Helsinki: Suomen elokuvasäätiö.

Uusitalo, Kari, 1984. *Umpikuja?: suomalaisen elokuvan vaikeat vuodet 1964-1969*. Helsinki: Suomen elokuvasäätiö.

Uusitalo, Kari et al ed., 1991. *Suomen kansallisfilmografia 6: 1957-1961*. Helsinki: VAPK, Suomen elokuva-arkisto.

Uusitalo, Kari ed., 1998a. *Suomen kansallisfilmografia 7: 1962-1970*. Helsinki: Edita, Suomen elokuva-arkisto.

Uusitalo, Kari ed., 1998b. Suomalaisen värielokuvan synty. In: Uusitalo, Kari ed., 1998. *Suomen kansallisfilmografia 7: 1962-1970*. Helsinki: Edita, Suomen elokuva-arkisto. pp. 205-209.

Uusitalo, Kari ed., 1999. *Suomen kansallisfilmografia 8: 1971-1980*. Helsinki: Edita, Suomen elokuva-arkisto.

Uusitalo, Kari, 2013. *Maunu Kurkvaara: Biografia*. [online] Elonet. Available at: <http://www.elonet.fi/fi/henkilo/102803> [Accessed 14 December 2015].

Uusitalo, Kari, 2014. *Filminor Oy*. [online] Elonet. Available at: <http://www.elonet.fi/fi/yhtio/714799> [Accessed 14 December 2015].

V

Vahtola, Jouko, 2003. *Suomen Historia: Jääkaudesta Euroopan unioniin*. Helsinki: Otava.

Valkoinen kaupunki, 2006. [Film] Directed by Aku Louhimies. Finland: Solar Films Inc Oy.

Vanha puukaupunki, varo!, 1973. [Film] Directed by Lauri Törhönen. Finland: Taideteollinen oppilaitos and YLE.

Vermeulen, Timotheus, 2014. *Scenes from the Suburbs: Suburban Space in US Film and Television*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Vihreä leski. 1968. [Film] Directed by Jaakko Pakkasvirta. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Virilio, Paul, 1997. 'The Overexposed City'. In Neal Leach ed., 1997. *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge.

Virtanen, Pekka, 1968. *Kuva ja kuvan puitteet*. Uusi Suomi, 28 January. np.

Vivre sa vie, 1962. [Film] Directed by Jean-Luc Godard. France: Les Films de la Pléiade and Pathé Consortium Cinéma.

von Bagh, Peter, 1968. 'Vihreän lesken' ehdottomuus, moraalisuus. *Aamulehti*, 28 January. p. 29.

von Bagh, Peter, 2000. *Drifting Shadows: a guide to the Finnish cinema*. Helsinki: Otava.

von Bagh, Peter, 2005. *Suomalaisen elokuvan uusi kultainen kirja*. Helsinki: Otava.

von Hertzen, Heikki, 1946. *Koti vaiko kasarmi lapsillemme: Asunnontarvitsijoiden näkökohtia asunto- ja asemakaavakysymyksissä*. Helsinki: Väestöliiton julkaisuja.

von Hertzen, Heikki, 1985. *Raportti Kaupungin Rakentamisesta: Tapiolan arkea ja juhlaa*. Espoo: Länsiväylä Oy.

Vuorenmaa, Tuomo-Juhani, 1968. Vihreä Leski. *HOK*, 3(68). np.

Vuosaari. 2012. [Film] Directed by Aku Louhimes. Finland: First Floor Productions Oy, Edith film Oy.

W

Wilhelmsson, Putte, 1999. Talo on koje maailman havaitsemiseksi: Elokvakritiikki ja arkkitehtuuri 1/2. *Filmihullu*, 5-6(99). pp. 49-51

Williams, Richard, 2012. The Architect of the Future that Never Was. *Foreign Policy* [online]. Available at:

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/12/11/the_dark_side_of_oscar_niemeyer?page=full> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Wilson, Colin St. John, 1992. Introduction: Finland and Tradition of Modernism. In: Scott Poole, 1992. *The New Finnish Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli. pp. 11-17

Wilson, Elizabeth, 1995. The Invisible *Flaneur*. In Sophie Watson and Katherine Gibson eds., 1995. *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*. Cambridge: Blackwell. p. 59-79.

X

X-Paroni, 1964. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva, Jaakko Pakkasvirta and Spede Pasanen. Finland: Elokuvatuotanto Spede Pasanen, Hupiklubi Oy and Filminor Oy.

Y

Yesil, Bilge, 2006. Watching Ourselves. *Cultural Studies*, 20(4-5). pp. 400-416.

Yhden miehen sota, 1974. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Yksityisalue, 1962. [Film] Directed by Maunu Kurkvaara. Finland: Kurkvaara-Filmi Oy.

Yli-Ojanperä, Elina, 2011. Puu-Vallila pelastui purkamiselta. *YLE*, [online]. Available at: <http://yle.fi/elavaarkisto/artikkelit/puu-vallila_pelastui_purkamiselta_54999.html#media=55005> [Accessed 6 July 2014].

Yö vai päivä, 1962. [Film] Directed by Risto Jarva. Finland: Filminor Oy.

Z

Å

Ä

Ädit lapsineen Puu-Vallilassa, 1982. [film] Directed by Marjatta Cronvall. Finland: YLE.

Ö