
English Summaries

Jacqueline S. Stoeckler

Borders and Boundaries of National Cinema

"National Cinema" has served as an evaluative category, almost unquestioned and at best ambiguous. While researchers and critics valorize the domestic (domesticated) and malign the industrial (out of control) Hollywood there is a tendency to sublimate discussions of the material artifact: film and the attending aesthetics. If in early cinemas, as Gunning and Hansen have pointed out, the ways of spectating as well as the sources of material were more heterogeneous, by what process did cinemas circumscribed by nationality become identified with a particular "aesthetic". How much was/is an imagined, fabricated and reinvented notion to parle bourgeois interests of market controls into a relativized compendium of artistic/painterly/literary attributes. In this essay I will try to outline what may seem a familiar trajectory: language/ethnicity/nation-state, and suggest that film has become hostage to a non-salient evaluative regime which misconstrues the medium in favor of a perceived "home" nation. Those

cosmopolitan venues where film is/was produced/distributed and viewed, have developed a yet unrecognized aesthetic buried in discussions of social history, gender and genre. Look to the horizon; seek out the edge of the frames; and there you find a landscape.

Kimmo Laine

Ne 45 000 and the State of National Cinema

This article explores new attempts to "nationalize" (in a figurative sense) the Finnish cinema in the early 1930's. The first phase of this "nationalization" took place early this century, characterized by attempts to link the domestic film output to established national by imagery in order to oppose the internationality of the film trade. The second phase concerned the embourgeoisement of Finnish film culture in the 1910's and 1920's (also rooted in anxieties regarding the international supply and its debasing and immoralizing effect). These processes continued and heightened during the 1930's, although partly with a new emphasis: what was important now was

first, to enhance the status of cinema; second, to prop up the identity of domestic film production in relation to other film cultures; and finally, above all, to construct and define the Finnish film audience in larger terms than ever before or after.

I examine these processes through a feature film entitled *Ne 45 000* ("Those 45 000," Finland 1933), based on public education campaigns about tuberculosis. The production history of the film is closely linked to a turning-point in production practices in Finland, specifically the emergence of "studio system," which tightened the domestic competition and compelled producers to pay attention to a wider variety of audience emergence of "studio system," which tightened the domestic competition and compelled producers to pay attention to a wider variety of audience groups. I argue that during this transitional period tuberculosis, tagged as "the whole nation's disease," provided the film industry with an ideal topic for building cinematic (narrative, social, and cultural) space for the national film audience.

Translation: Martti Lahti

Mervi Pantti

Enlightening (and Subsidized) Art Cinema for the People

The opposition between popular and art cinema, typical to Finnish public discussion about cinema, culminated in the 1950's with the establishment of analytical film criticism and such institutions as film societies, the film archive, and specialist film magazines. The aspirations of the so called "militant film criticism" included, on the one hand, defending high art against its lower counterpart and, on the other hand, helping to consolidate popularity of the non-commercial European art film by enlightening the audience.

This article explores how 1950's discourse about cinema (and art in general) constituted the cornerstone for the ideal of a national (art) cinema and its opposite, the cinema as passive entertainment, found in critical and state discourses. I also show how closely these concerns are related to the tradition of pessimistic mass culture theories and debates on cultural imperialism that had wide currency in the sixties and seventies.

In the post-war years, state film policies of several European countries were conceived, above all, to promote and support the art cinema in order to counter the influx of Hollywood film, which was deemed to weaken national cinemas. In Finland, the era of state subsidies began in 1961 when the government instituted a new system of support in the form of awards granted for Finnish films of high artistic quality. This policy of *ars par artis*, which mainly legitimated state subsidies at the turn of the 1960's, gave way to the ideal of socially committed art in the late 1960's when cultural life started to become more radical. New views characterized both cultural laws passed in the early 1970's and unrealized plans for new state film policy, as well as (left-wing) film criticism that celebrated such movies as *Kesäkapina* ("Summer Revolt," 1970), a film which criticized consumer culture and advertising.

Translation: Martti Lahti

Petri Pietiläinen

Irish Cinema: Changing Images and Definitions of National Cinema

This article explores the definition of Irish cinema as national cinema, complicated by the fact that the Irish film industry emerged rather recently, Irish films are made in English, and several British and U.S. films, among others, have depicted Ireland. In addition, during the recent years several sizable international productions have been shot and financed in Ireland. Thus, films regarded as Irish don't always fit the general understanding of what counts as a national production.

As a background for this current state of affairs, the article provides the reader with an outline of the history of cinema in Ireland and shows that the recession experienced by the national motion picture industry has its roots in censorship laws, the dominating market-position of American films, and the society's impoverishment. Prior to the 1970's, most films about Ireland, although perhaps shot in Ireland, were produced outside Ireland. Although the situation has changed since then, internationally distributed films still tend to be mainly picturesque portrayals of Ireland or violent accounts based on the current political crisis in Northern Ireland and made for international markets.

The article examines new tax legislation instituted for shoring up the national film industry, debate on these laws, and their actual effects. Regardless of the regular claims made for the importance of a critical national cinema that would represent "us and our reality," the Irish film culture hasn't witnessed the emergence of a popular cinema of this kind. Quite the contrary, the tax relief legislation that was supposed to protect Irish film production often ends up channeling financing assets to large international co-productions at the expense of smaller national ones.

I hope to demonstrate that the criteria for national cinema, however admirable, given by scholars such as Andrew Higson don't necessarily

apply to the situation in Ireland. This is mainly due to factors including the subsidizing policy adopted by Ireland, the treating of cinema as part of foreign trade, Ireland's belonging to Anglophone dominant culture, and a demand by the large Irish-American population to see Irish stories on the screen result in a situation where Irish national film production has to adapt to the needs of the U.S. film market. Although my aim in this article is to question the definition of "national cinema" as a positive ideological demand — "our films should represent us in this way" — I also want to underscore the importance of the term "national" for studying film in that film audiences find it important to see stories which are deemed as being nationally relevant, regardless of who has made them.

Translation: Martti Lahti

Jari Sedergren:

The Film Censorship Code as Production Code

Finland's film censorship code of 1935 exemplifies Ludvig Wittgenstein's defining rules which indicate what is allowed and what is forbidden. However, the praxis of film censorship produces new rules since censorship is a point where film production and state censorship cross and private entrepreneurship meets the state economy. This game which determines how agents really act in the case of film censorship can be called the strategic rules of film censorship. This article explores film censorship in both these senses. A new film censorship code was created by the Ministry of Education in 1935. At that time, the State Office of Film Censorship (SOFC), a semi-official institution financed by private film companies, administered these regulations. This practice was to be changed by the 1938 bill for state film censorship. However, it wasn't passed in Parliament due to the lack of agreement on the political criteria for banning a film. The disagreement between social democrats

and other parties was most clearly expressed in the class-conscious arguments of the former party's left wing and the nationalist agenda of the latter groups' right wing.

Nonetheless, when the Winter War (1939-40) started a year later, much of what the political right had demanded was realized in new political criteria for film censorship established by the Ministry of Education. Moreover, during the Winter War and Continuation war (1941-44) the Foreign Ministry and the military issued some additional censorship orders referring most often to the current political situation. Still, the code of 1935 lasted until 1946, when the first law of film censorship was put into force in Finland.

The film industry had been able to establish good relations with the state. Finnish films had been exempted from taxes in the early 1930's, under a policy that lasted until 1941. Even the new film tax turned out to be only a slight problem for the industry. Since movie going was the most popular form of recreation during the war years, practically every Finnish film remained profitable at that time. This points to the fact that the form that the strategic rules of censorship took can't be explained by a recourse to mere economic models. Ideological, political and social factors played an equally important role in these formations.

I argue that film production companies adapted to the nationalistic rhetoric and ideology of the young nationalistic state and avoided politically perilous topics to avert the risk of banning their films. Instead, the bounds of the censorship code were tested in less dangerous fields such as morality, ethics, and decency. Furthermore, this strategy received extensive media coverage which, of course, only helped to sell the films. Even in those cases when a risk was actualized and a censorship cut was made, the avoidance of banning was central since it left the economic prospects of a film untouched.