THE ARTIST AND THE REGIME: KAREL KACHYŇA AND FOUR DECADES OF CZECHOSLOVAK FILM

Kenneth Ward

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of PhD, Czech

University of Glasgow

College of Arts

School of Modern Languages and Cultures

January, 2022

ABSTRACT

The Artist and the Regime explores the works of Czech filmmaker Karel Kachyňa during four decades of the communist regime in Czechoslovakia. Despite being a prolific filmmaker who made over forty feature films across five decades, Kachyňa's works outside the 1960s and the Czechoslovak New Wave have gone largely unnoticed in scholarship. This work challenges the uncertainty surrounding the reception of Kachyňa's works in the context of a totalitarian regime and a nationalised film industry and offers the thesis that Kachyňa's works provide a unique perspective on the communist era in Czechoslovakia. As such, this thesis engages with Kachyňa's film poetics from the historical and analytical perspectives, as well as providing an examination of spectatorial theorising which comprises another aspect of film poetics and therefore contributes to knowledge in this field.

This work presents Kachyňa's unusual treatment of socialist realism from the outset of the communist era in Czechoslovakia in 1948, his approach to Army Film, his invocation of issues surrounding the concept of borders, his depiction of child narratives, his dealing with taboo subjects, his influence on and contribution to the New Wave movement, and his engagement with Holocaust narratives as evidence of an artist whose humanist poetics were at odds with his environment, despite working as an agent for the regime within a nationalised film industry.

This paradoxical position offers an appreciation for individuals who experienced the trappings of the regime in Czechoslovakia during four decades of communist rule. By analysing a wide range of films in how they reflect and diverge from one another, this thesis ultimately argues that Kachyňa's humanist poetics challenge a system that attempted to reduce the individual's ability to express themselves freely. This thesis demonstrates how Kachyňa showed that it was possible to provide this challenge from within the state-run film industry without having works banned by the authorities. By examining his works throughout the communist regime in detail, a study of Kachyňa's poetics reveals a filmmaker whose works continued to provide criticism of the regime and the filmmaking culture in an implicit manner and challenges the critical response to his works that currently exists. From this position, the thesis presented here argues that Kachyňa is an important filmmaker of the twentieth century whose works require greater attention in scholarship.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank, first and foremost, my supervisors Dr Mirna Šolić, Dr Jan Čulík and Dr Elwira Grossman for their extraordinary efforts and assistance during my research for this thesis. Without Mirna's drive and unstinting ability to push me in the right direction, I would have been lost. Elwira, too, has offered what we have described as an outsider's perspective, enrichening the revision of the entire work, and it has been a pleasure and privilege to have the support of such dedicated academics who go above and beyond continuously to support their students.

My first introduction to Czech literature was reading Bohumil Hrabal's *I Served the King of England* as a University of Glasgow undergraduate, which set me on the path to this thesis. Reading Hrabal, I came across an autobiographical work, *Letters to Dubenka*, in which he describes a visit to the University of Glasgow where he was chaperoned by Jan Čulík. I quickly enrolled in all of Dr Čulík's Honours courses surrounding Czech culture, where my introduction to Czech cinema was made. Jan was instrumental in arranging my study in the Czech Republic at Brno's Masaryk University, where I was able to enhance my Czech language skills during a three-month period.

My supervisors were also instrumental in supporting my application for sponsorship by the Madeleine Albright Scholarship, to whom I am very thankful for their financial support throughout my research for this thesis.

Finally, in the same month as I started my postgraduate research, my wife Louise and I welcomed our first child, Henry, into the world. At just five months old, he joined us in Brno for those three months at Masaryk University. Over the years, Henry has welcomed two younger sisters, Delilah and Nettie, and the dedication of my family, in particular my wife Louise, has got me through every rise and fall during this time. I would also like to thank my parents, Ellen and Frank, and my mother and father-in-law, Linda and Jim Hendry, for all of their support and patience during this time.

INTRODUCTION

Karel Kachyňa (1929-2004) was a prolific Czech filmmaker who worked from 1950 until his death in 2004. During this period Kachyňa made over forty feature films, the vast majority of which were produced during the communist regime in Czechoslovakia (1948-1989).[1] In this thesis, I will explore Kachyňa's works during the four decades of the communist regime, from his earliest socialist-realist student films to those pertaining to the Czechoslovak New Wave movement of the 1960s and beyond.[2] This approach will open up many research questions about Kachyňa as a filmmaker that I will examine in this thesis. Was his earlier body of work, predating the New Wave movement, considered supportive enough of the regime that he could reconcile his post-1968 works with them? Was Kachyňa merely providing propagandist material in his early socialist-realist works? Are there instances of subversive material in his earliest works that have been overlooked in criticism and scholarship? How did Kachyňa's work influence the New Wave? Can he really be considered a New Wave filmmaker, given that he had worked throughout the previous decade? What does the censorship of two of his films following the 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion suggest about his position towards the regime?[3] How was he able to continue

[1] Reference to the regime in this thesis is directed at the totalitarian communist regime in Czechoslovakia from 1948-1989; this is not intended as a monolithic term, with the various periods of the regime explored in detail throughout. There are many examples of this approach reflected elsewhere in scholarship, e.g. in Zdeněk Kříštůfek, *The Soviet Regime in Czechoslovakia* (Boulder: East European Monographs; New York: Columbia University Press, 1982); Miloš Jůzl, 'Music and the Totalitarian Regime in Czechoslovakia' in *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (June, 1996), pp. 31-51. [Online] available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/3108370; Alexander Bobrakov-Timoshkin, *(Self)kidnapping in Central Europe. Formation and Legacy of the Communist Regime in Czechoslovakia: Postcolonial Perspective* (Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie-New Literary Observer, 2020); Irma Ratiani discusses the 'Communist regime in Czechoslovakia' in *Totalitarianism and Literary Discourse: 20th Century Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010, p.425).

[2] The Czechoslovak New Wave was a filmmaking movement in the 1960s that grew in tandem with the political atmosphere in the decade, which saw a relaxing of the Stalinist model for the communist regime in Czechoslovakia and culminated in the Prague Spring of 1968. See Peter Hames, *The Czechoslovak New Wave* (London: Wallflower Press, 2005); Jonathan L. Owen, *Avant-Garde to New Wave: Czechslovak Film, Surrealism and the Sixties* (New York, NY; Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2011).

[3] For an overview of the liberalisation of Czechoslovak culture from the death of Stalin in 1953 to the Prague Spring of 1968, see Pavel Kolář, 'Post-Stalinist Reformism and the Prague Spring' in *The Cambridge History of Communism*, Volume 2: The Socialist Camp and World Power 1941–1960s (Cambridge University Press, September 2017). [Online] Available at: https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-history-of-

to work after this? Were concessions made on his part to the authorities in his films after the 1968 invasion? Does criticism of his child narratives during the normalisation period overlook a subversive strand in Kachyňa's work? Is the theme of critics overlooking this subversive material reflected in his works?

As these questions suggest, there is uncertainty surrounding the critical reception of Kachyňa's works across the various stages in the Czechoslovak filmmaking environment during the communist regime. His earliest works of the 1950s have been ascribed the status of socialist-realist by some critics and scholars (Viceníková in *Kinoeye*, 2003); his early 1960s works 'humanist' and dismissed as 'officially approved criticism' (Hames, 2009: 79); his films during the Czechoslovak New Wave (circa 1963-1968) 'increasingly daring' (Hames, 2009: 79). Kachyňa is considered as belonging to an older generation who both influenced and contributed to the New Wave movement (Hames, 2009: 80-91; 'Generation 57', Viceníková in *Kinoeye*, 2003; Košuličová in *Kinoeye*, 2003). By examining Kachyňa's film poetics over four decades of his career, I will present an artist who used his experience of living under totalitarianism to negotiate the fluctuating political and cultural spheres to continue to work in his field.

Nine years old when the Nazis invaded Czechoslovakia on March 15, 1939, Kachyňa lived under Nazi rule over the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia for six years until, aged 16, Czechoslovakia was liberated by Soviet forces on May 5, 1945.[4] Before his nineteenth birthday, the Czechoslovak Communist Party (*Komunistická strana Československa*, KSČ) orchestrated a successful *coup d'état* to overthrow the democratic

communism/poststalinist-reformism-and-the-prague-spring/9EDF2827ACD1721D1A56ADAD8E779468/core-reader.

[4] Mary Heimann provides a history of the Czechoslovak state from its founding in 1918 to partition at the close of 1992 in her book *Czechoslovakia: The State That Failed* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press: 2011).

government of President Edvard Beneš in late February 1948.[5] Kachyňa would spend the vast majority of his adult life under communist rule until the final months of 1989, when, aged 60, he witnessed the fall of the communist regime in Czechoslovakia. At the close of 1989, Kachyňa released a Czechoslovak/British/French collaborative film *The Last Butterfly* (*Poslední motýl*, 1990, prem. 1991) which marked a departure from the insular filmmaking culture of the previous two decades (Fisher, 1990). I intend to explore the roots of this departure as belonging firmly in the 1980s and the communist regime, however, to begin make the argument that this was less of a clean break and more of an extension of Kachyňa's film poetics throughout his career.

After the Regime

On January 27, 1990, William Fisher published a 'production report' in the British film magazine *Screen International* on the upcoming film by Czech director Karel Kachyňa, *The Last Butterfly*. Fisher reported producer, Steve North, of the Czechoslovak/British/French co-production as saying 'it's [Czechoslovakia's] first real co-production with the West since Carlo Ponti [Italy] produced Miloš Forman's *Loves of a Blonde* [*Lásky jedné plavovlásky*, 1965] and *Firemen's Ball* [*Hoří, má panenko*, 1967] in the early [sic.] '60s' (Fisher, 1990). Given that the communist regime, which had been in place in Czechoslovakia since 1948, had only been toppled during the Velvet Revolution of November-December 1989, just weeks prior to the article's publication, the groundbreaking nature of this production is pronounced. This becomes even more apparent when Fisher reports that the project underwent a decade of development, having wrapped just as the country's pro-democracy movement overthrew the incumbent regime (Fisher, 1990). Indeed, in the article, director Kachyňa expresses his prevailing anxieties

[5] See Jan Behrends, 'Exporting the Leader: The Stalin Cult in Poland and East Germany (1944/45–1956)', pp. 161–178 in Balázs Apor et.al. (eds.), *The leader Cult In Communist Dictatorships: Stalin and the Eastern Bloc* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

surrounding the film's prospective reception by the authorities in his homeland. Kachyňa said:

> You'd think that the Czechs would have better things to think about these days than movies. They do. With all the changes that are going on here at the moment, our studio heads and industry decision-makers just don't have time to scrutinise projects the way they used to. And that's OK by me' (*Ibid*).

It is natural that Kachyňa, born in 1929 and having experienced both the Nazi occupation (1939-1945) and communist regime in Czechoslovakia during the century, would be sceptical of the extent of his freedom to produce a film without an overbearing state presence. Indeed, his understated words act as a plea to those studio heads and industry decision-makers *not* to scrutinise the work. Furthermore, the attempts in this statement to minimise the significance of the work are a feature of Kachyňa's poetics throughout his career, as I will assess in detail throughout this thesis. Kachyňa, in promoting a film based on true, historical events concerning the Holocaust, seeks to reduce the apparent sincerity of 'movies' in relation to the current historical moment in Czechoslovakia (Fisher, 1990). Yet this downplaying of the significance of his work is a distancing technique that I will demonstrate he adopts in several directions throughout his career under the regime.

One example of how he manages this during the regime is through his depiction of historical narratives, like World War II, to distance his films from contemporary concerns, thus placating the studio heads and decision-makers in the industry. Preeminent Czech filmmaker Otakar Vávra (1911-2011), who was the first professor at FAMU (*Filmová a televizní fakulta Akademie múzických umění v Praze*, the film school founded in Prague in 1946), described his own use of historical narratives under the Nazi occupation and later the communist regime as a means of creating 'the art of the impossible' (in Pawlikowski, 1990: 00:36.20). This is reflected in *The Last Butterfly*, which is set during historical narrative of the Nazi occupation of France. What becomes clear, however, is that *The Last Butterfly* is not simply a post-communist-era film; in fact, the project is very much rooted in the previous regime, and the director still feels burdened by the potential reaction from

industry leaders at this incredibly early stage of the new democratic era. This makes Fisher's synopsis of the film even more insightful at this moment in Kachyňa's career. Fisher writes:

> Based on real events, *The Last Butterfly* tells the story of a French mime artist who is blackmailed into performing at the Nazi concentration camp Terezin [Terezín] (in Czechoslovakia) in order to mislead a visiting team of Red Cross fact-finders (Fisher, 1990).

Reading this summary as allegory provides an insight into the method of subversion Kachyňa deployed throughout his career. The story is of an artist who cannot use his voice, whose art is in gestures, but whose remit on behalfProch of the oppressive ruling forces is to use his artistry to help to create an illusion of contentment and compliance on behalf of the oppressed. As a metaphor for Kachyňa working for a state-run film industry under the communist regime, this co-production project with the West provides a sophisticatedly subversive message outwardly to Western audiences that behind the heavily censored façade of Czechoslovak film culture lies an unedifying reality that has been glossed over and accepted elsewhere.

In doing so, Kachyňa provokes several responses: first, the sympathetic narrative produces a visceral loathing of the Nazis' Final Solution; however, this motif of setting up figures of good and evil in binary form, as I will demonstrate throughout this thesis, is not Kachyňa's method. The narrative does not support, for instance, the notion that Western interference will have the desired protective effect, with the Red Cross delegates accepting the false narrative proffered by the Nazis at the internment camp. Instead, several of its constructional features nuance the film: the leading roles are the French artist Moreau, the German occupiers and the oppressed Jews, while the West is represented by the duped Red Cross delegation. Kachyňa, however, resists apportioning blame solely to any other. Moreau is blackmailed and becomes heavily invested in the plight of the condemned, the Red Cross are acting on suspicions over the Third Reich but are being deceived, and even the Nazi soldiers are carrying out orders from above. The real horror is

the abhorrent Aryan project based on fundamentally flawed and inhumane ideology and its ability to pervade society. This again underlines one of the chief aspects of Kachyňa's poetics, where he resists the temptation to blame the individuals who carry out oppressive acts by varying degrees of severity. Instead, Kachyňa is concerned with the arbitrary nature of malignant forces and avoids engaging in partisan attacks on either side.

In terms of *The Last Butterfly* acting as allegory for the communist regime in Czechoslovakia, this positions Kachyňa's poetical stance away from binary concepts of good versus evil, which I will argue in this thesis is evident throughout his previous four decades' work. Rather than blame individuals and perpetuate cycles of binary oppositions that lead to conflict and retribution, Kachyňa focuses on individuals' plights within the trappings of inhumane situations. I will argue that this approach is fundamental to Kachyňa's poetics. By exploring individuals' experiences under varying oppressive conditions, Kachyňa interrogates the effect of authoritarianism in general rather than attack the communist regime itself, and this approach allowed him to get away with significantly more of a subversive style than many of his contemporaries. In this thesis, I will consider Kachyňa's work from an auteur perspective, examining his film poetics in terms of historical, analytical and spectatorial theory, in an effort to argue the case that he is a filmmaker in need of greater attention in film scholarship.

Choosing Kachyňa

In Fisher's article in *Screen International*, Kachyňa alludes to another aspect of his reception as an artist that he feels threatened by, that of his decision to continue to work under the regime following the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact invasion of 1968. Kachyňa said:

> Like Forman, Ivan Passer or Jan Kadar [Ján Kadár], I had certain designs myself on leaving in 1968 […] but for a whole range of reasons I couldn't go. As someone who was active in the movement [New Wave] back then, I'm overjoyed to see it return' (Fisher, 1990).

Here, Kachyňa is presenting a version of a narrative that suits his current circumstances which again is a technique I will argue he adopts at several stages throughout his career. With the regime overthrown, he is inclined to include himself alongside the New Wave film directors, when over the past two decades he had to be seen to be distancing himself following the Warsaw Pact invasion. This narrative has even been adopted by some critics, with Ivana Košuličová describing his work during the Czechoslovak New Wave as his 'most creative period' (in *Kinoeye,* 2003). Košuličová argues that he 'never reached the level of his 1960s work' for twenty years. She writes: 'It wasn't until the beginning of the 1990s when Kachyna made films that finally seemed to continue his work from the 1960s' (2003). Kachyňa's claims to being a proponent of the New Wave are unquestionable. Indeed, in the same year that *The Last Butterfly* was completed and this article appeared, his film *The Ear* (*Ucho*, 1970, prem. 1990) was finally released, having been suppressed on its completion under the regime for its critique of peer-to-peer surveillance, and was premiered in Cannes in February 1990. *The Ear* was nominated for the Palme d'Or in May of the same year and this, coupled with the upcoming release of *The Last Butterfly*, positioned Kachyňa on the side of subversive filmmakers from the Czechoslovak New Wave era. However, questions are raised about his ability to release his next film after the suppression of *The Ear* as early as 1971 and his ability to continue to work seemingly unhindered throughout the next two decades of communism, when so many others could not.

From this perspective, I must state that my motivation for scrutinising Kachyňa's works throughout his career is not in the search for answers about his guilt and/or innocence under the regime. Rather, in starting from the position of the director, this thesis will be engaging with the concept of auteurism. For example, the question of how the director of *The Ear* was able to continue apparently unfettered in the 1970s and 1980s when some of his contemporaries were not implies an inherent suspicion around what he

produced after the invasion. Indeed, Peter Hames argues that directors who continued to produce films in the normalisation years were 'condemned' after the fall of communism as having given credence to the regime (in Mazierska & Kristensen, 2014: 148), but he cedes that many of their films were actually 'critical and avant-garde' (*Ibid*.). My aim in this thesis is to consider the effects produced by Kachyňa in his films in spite (and sometimes *because*) of the filmmaking and socio-political environments surrounding him.

In approaching his works from this position, I will aim to demonstrate how Kachyňa's films remain relevant as emblems of artistic achievement within the communist regime of Czechoslovakia, providing perspectives of the humanity that existed under an oppressive system that set out to limit an individual's ability to express freely. Kachyňa's focus on the individual in his films cuts through questions of innocence and guilt and presents humanity from within a system that overtly sets out to dehumanise individuals deemed not to have followed the rules – however arbitrary or insurmountable these rules may be.

Kachyňa, unlike some of his contemporaries, has not had a great deal written about him in international scholarship nor criticism.[6] As Dora Viceníková argues, Kachyňa's known oeuvre internationally is almost entirely restricted to the 1960s and to a lesser extent the 1990s, yet films from throughout his career are still firmly lodged in the Czech popular psyche (in *Kinoeye,* 2003). Indeed, in 1996 Kachyňa was given an artistic achievement award at the Czech Lions ceremony, and recognition of his work domestically

[6] There are many examples of monographs in English on contemporary European filmmakers to Kachyňa, but not about him. To name but a few, a selection of recent works: Josef Škvorecký, *Jiří Menzel and the History of The Closely Watched Trains* (Boulder: East European Monographs; New York: Distributed by Columbia University Press, c1982); Janina Falkowska, *Andrzej Wajda: History, Politics and Nostalgia in Polish Cinema* (New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2007), John Orr & Elżbieta Ostrowska (eds.), *The Cinema of Andrzej Wajda: The Art of Irony and Defiance* (London: Wallflower Press, 2003); Layla Alexander-Garrett, *Andrei Tarkovsky: The Collector of Dreams* (translated by Maria Amadei Ashot) (London: Glagoslav Publications, c2012), Robert Bird, *Andrei Tarkovsky* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); Peter Bondanella, *The Films of Federico Fellini* [electronic resource] (Cambridge, UK/New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, c2002.); John Orr, *The Demons of Modernity: Ingmar Bergman and the European Cinema* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2016).

and internationally peaked during the 1990s,[7] but today his contribution to Czech and world cinema requires greater attention in scholarship. It is my intention to examine this plethora of material that remains relevant in Czech culture but is overlooked by Western criticism.

Of the work written about Kachyňa, Peter Hames' criticism focuses on Kachyňa's 1960s work, introducing the argument that his early works of that decade 'attempted broad humanist subjects but became progressively more critical' (2009: 79). Hames argues that his treatment of the 'three officially approved subjects' of the liberation of the republic by Soviet forces in 1945, the Czechoslovak partisan effort against the Nazis during World War II, and the collectivisation of agriculture was 'highly unconventional' (2009: 79).[8] Hames acknowledges that Kachyňa, along with screenplay writer Jan Procházka, with whom he worked throughout the 1960s, managed to 'get away with a substantially more critical approach than most' (*Ibid.*).[9] I will argue throughout this thesis that Kachyňa's approach to humanism as a fundamental aspect of his poetics is the cornerstone of his subversively critical approach.

Elsewhere, Mira Liehm and Antonín J. Liehm discuss the 'successes and failures' of Kachyňa (1977: 291). They describe Procházka's position as a 'favourite of the political

---

[7] Pilsen Film Festival: winner of Golden Kingfisher award 1990 for *The Ear* (*Ucho*), winner of Golden Kingfisher award 1994 for *The Cow* (*Kráva*), winner of audience award 1996 for most popular film, *Fany*; Karlovy Vary: winner of special prize for outstanding contribution to world cinema gold award 1999; Czech Lions: nominated for critics' award and Czech Lion award 1999 for *Hanele*; Chicago International Film Festival: nominated for Gold Hugo award 1994 for best feature for *The Cow*; WorldFest Houston: winner of Gold Award 1994 for *The Last Butterfly*.

[8] Collectivisation was a means of extending state control of agriculture as well as the basis for developing large-scale industrial and military power. Irwin T. Sanders edited a group of papers by specialists on Eastern Europe and American rural social scientists, which collectively serve as an analysis of efforts to regiment the East European peasant, in Sanders (ed.), *Collectivization of Agriculture in Eastern Europe* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1958). [Online] Available from: ProQuest Ebook Central. [9 June 2021]. In Czechoslovakia, the KSČ worked along the Stalinist model of the 'collective farm', where private ownership was transferred into kolkhozi (*Ibid*.).

[9] Jan Procházka was a member of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and friend of President Antonín Novotný. Peter Hames discusses Procházka's rise to cultural prominence at the start of the 1960s with his 'socialist-realist novel' *Green Horizons* (*Zelené obzory*, 1960) as part of an attempt to 'extend the range' of the genre (Hames, 2009: 79). This revisionist approach to socialist realism is an effect I will argue Kachyňa had been producing during the 1950s, and as a collaboration, he and Procházka were at the avant-garde of progressive socialism in film culture ahead of the New Wave.

leadership for a number of years' as affording them 'almost unlimited influence in Czechoslovak film' during the 1960s (1977: 291). Before Procházka became a candidate for the Central Committee of the KSC in 1962, his first work in collaboration with Kachyňa, *Fetters* (*Pouta*, 1961) was nominated for the Grand Prix award at the Moscow International Film Festival, demonstrating the extent to which their collaboration was approved in the wider Soviet context. Liehm and Liehm agree with Hames about the sense of 'getting away with it' in that 'Kachyňa became the sole director of Procházka's scripts, touching with increasing daring on painful and taboo subjects of the past 25 years' (1977: 291). Liehm and Liehm treat the child's perspective in Kachyňa's New-Wave-era film *Long Live the Republic* (*Ať žije republika!*, 1965) as 'merciless' and 'politically unbiased' (1977: 291), which reflects Hames' assessment that it is presented as 'the subjective experience of a twelve-year-old boy and, as such, it is free of any interpretative historical framework' (2009: 80). Both arguments apparently overlook the fact that, as a distancing device, this allowed Kachyňa and Procházka to touch daringly on those subjects, as Hames describes it, and to get away with it. Assessing how they achieved this will form the basis of my second chapter covering their early 1960s work.

Indeed, without fully grasping this correlation, Liehm and Liehm go on to say that 'Procházka's position [as a 'favourite' of the Party] inspired and made possible other controversial Kachyňa films, including *Coach to Vienna* (*Kočár do Vídně* (1966))' (1977: 291). While Procházka's position certainly aided their ability to push the boundaries, both *Long Live the Republic* and *Coach to Vienna* deal with what Hames describes as 'officially approved subjects' and, as such, Kachyňa's cunning as a filmmaker allowed them to deal with issues pertaining to the regime allegorically (2009: 79). This is a feature I will explore in chapters dealing with the 1960s works Kachyňa and Procházka collaborated on and as a feature of Kachyňa's entire filmmaking career during the regime. I will argue that Kachyňa had been producing this effect before his association with Procházka in his 1950s works,

and adapted the effect for the entire normalisation period, in an attempt to challenge the apportioning of the status of regime-endorsing socialist realism to his earliest works.

Like Hames, Liehm and Liehm argue that Kachyňa's films of the 1960s grew in their level of subversion and that their unconventional approach to recent history was an integral part of this daring (1977: 291). I will explain in my chapters dealing with his 1960s works how the depiction of historical narratives in this subversive manner is one of the means for criticising contemporary concerns but (as I will outline as a fundamental aspect of Kachyňa's poetics) without stepping over into anti-regime attacks. Along with suspicions surrounding Procházka's connections to the establishment, this refusal to wholeheartedly condemn the regime is another position I will argue distanced Kachyňa from many of his more aggressive New Wave contemporaries, and as such goes some way to explaining his relative exclusion from scholarship and criticism of that period and beyond. It is also, as I will argue, one of the reasons Kachyňa managed to continue to work into the 1970s and 1980s as an important subversive voice in Czechoslovak culture during the normalisation period.

According to Liehm and Liehm, however, Kachyňa and Procházka pushed the boundaries too far with *Holy Night* (*Noc nevěsty*, 1967), upon whose release 'initiated the open conflict between Procházka and the establishment' (1977: 291).While the film gained international attention (nominated for the Golden Lion award at the Venice Film Festival in 1967) and touched on the accepted subject of the collectivisation of agriculture, its depiction of this in an 'unflattering light' went too far and the last two films officially made by this collaboration, *Funny Old Man* (*Směšný pán*, 1969) and *The Ear*, were banned (Liehm and Liehm, 1977: 291). While, as I will demonstrate in this thesis, some critics have tended to discount Kachyňa's pre-1960s works and his later works of the normalisation period as safe, propagandist even, I will show a subversive strand emanating

from his earliest works and continuing into his films of the 1970s and 1980s in my analysis of his poetics throughout his career.

During the normalisation period, Antonín Liehm was an outspoken critic of the state of Czechoslovak filmmaking following the invasion. In an essay titled 'Triumph of the Untalented' (1976), Liehm laments the post-Soviet-invasion film culture that had taken the vitality of the New Wave and replaced it with artistic mediocrity (1976: 59). Referring specifically to Kachyňa, Liehm asserts that he is 'making films for children' in the context that some of his contemporaries have been side-lined from the industry altogether (1976: 59-60). This pessimistic assessment of Kachyňa's output at the early stages of normalisation is reflected in more recent criticism. Viceníková, for example, argues that 'Kachyňa had to choose uncontroversial motifs when the post-1968 period of normalisation truly kicked in, primarily making films for children' (in *Kinoeye,* 2003), although she later makes the distinction that these are 'about children, not for them' (*Ibid.*). This distinction ironically marks this subversive strand in Kachyňa's work that reflects his minimising rhetoric surrounding *The Last Butterfly* in the context of the political upheaval of the time: his children's narratives post-1968 act as a deflection technique against scrutiny from the state-appointed studio heads. Again, as a device, the distancing effect of this narrative technique allowed Kachyňa to push the boundaries in terms of what was acceptable.

As Liehm and Liehm suggest, by the end of the 1960s both Procházka and Kachyňa's good grace with senior members of the Party had begun to wane significantly. The former was banished from the Party following the Warsaw Pact invasion of August 1968 and the latter was relieved of his position as a tutor at FAMU (Liehm and Liehm, 1977: 293). Despite critics tending to accept narratives presented in Kachyňa's films at face value, such as the child's perspective in *Long Live the Republic*, as presenting political objectivity and naivety (Liehm 1976: 69; Hames, 2009: 79; Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003),

I will argue that Kachyňa presents seemingly powerless characters having to deal with the constricting effect of their own surroundings in a highly subversive manner. As a theme, I will also demonstrate how this reflects Kachyňa's own experiences of working under the state-run film industry during the communist regime and provides an insight into how an individual manages to navigate these conditions whilst retaining their own artistic integrity.

METHODOLOGY

In order to examine the works of Karel Kachyňa throughout his career, I will propose a methodological framework that allows for a deconstructive approach to analysing his films that will incorporate the three main approaches to poetics formulated by David Bordwell in this century: historical poetics, analytical poetics, and spectatorial theory (2005: 142). I have outlined my intention to approach this thesis from an auteur perspective, analysing films with a focus on the artist, whose influence and vision can be identified in their work (Kuhn and Westwell, 2012: 25). Annette Kuhn and Guy Westwell outline three phases of auteur theory since the 1950s: auteur theory, auteur-structuralism, and auteur post-structuralism (2012: 25-27). Here, I will demonstrate how these three phases link respectively to the three phases of poetics outlined above.

Historical Poetics

For Kuhn and Westwell, the original auteur theory focuses on the director as the custodian of the work (2012: 25). In his 1960 essay, 'The Ontology of the Photographic Image', André Bazin argues that after Leonardo Da Vinci's discovery of the camera obscura in the fifteenth century, painting 'was torn' between two ambitions towards realism and expression (1960: 6). While Bazin's argument that cinema achieves the former – 'the cinema is objectivity in time' (1960: 8); 'once and for all' photography and cinema 'satisfy' our 'obsession with realism' (1960:7) – has been contested by scholars ever since (Bordwell, 2008: 14), his argument that 'the great artists' are those who can negotiate the tension between realism and expressionism in their works opens the field of analysis of

films in various directions (Bazin, 1960: 6). My dealings with this apparent dichotomy between realism and expressionism, therefore, are concerned with ideas of the photographic image reproducing reality versus the inherent figuration of images as a part of artistic compositions, and the term 'expressionism' is not to be confused with any specific artistic movement.

Indeed, Bordwell acknowledges that Bazin's arguments suggest an awareness of the blurring of the lines between realism and expressionism in cinema while invoking a study of historical poetics. Bordwell argues that Bazin's essay 'The Evolution of Cinema' demonstrates a development in film history (from silent to sound cinema), where 'two tendencies [realism and expressionism], present at the start, collide and blend' (Bordwell, 2008: 14). For Gary Bettinson, the historical approach to poetics is concerned with tracing patterns of artistic continuity and change over time (2016: 1). For Bordwell, historical poetics offers a questioning of 'how, over time, do form and style exhibit patterns of continuity and change, and how might we best explain these patterns?' (Bordwell, 2005: 142). Thus, studies of historical poetics acknowledge changes over time both in the production of films and in their scholarly and critical reception, while also attempting to figure out new ways to approach the field, which is a feature of this thesis as a whole.

An example of this in practice can be found in Stephen Heath's *Questions of Cinema* (1981), where he sets out to 'debunk' the 'classic, naïve thesis' of the photographic image as objective, what he labels the 'reproduction thesis', set out by Bazin (1981: 4). Heath insists that 'one has the right to demand to know where the image comes from and what it is doing in the film' (1981: 1). This is the basis of the historical approach to poetics in its questioning of the causal explanations – seeking to explain how those qualities come about (Bordwell, 2016:16) – for images in films. In my thesis, both the socio-political context and the filmmaking environment pertaining to Kachyňa's works will have a significant bearing on my analyses. Thus, at the beginning of each chapter, I

will provide some historical background to the films I will be discussing, including the developments in the film industry at the time. Given that my thesis will provide an analysis of Kachyňa's work in five different decades, historical poetics will be an important aspect to my work in terms of understanding the relationship between reality and artifice when considering works of art in the context of a historical narrative.

Analytical Poetics

The prerequisite underpinning historical poetics posed by Bordwell, of insisting to know where the image comes from (Heath, 1981: 1), overlaps with and is simultaneously the basis of analytical poetics. Bordwell attests that analytical poetics examines film's visual and aural style, narrative construction, and thematic expression (Bettinson, 2016: 1). Thus, no approach to poetics is mutually exclusive from any other, and the differing terminology is intended as a guide to where focus lies in certain areas of this thesis. As Bordwell argues, poetics is different from other literary disciplines in that it does not represent any one critical school and is therefore detached from any formally defined methods of interpretation (Bordwell, 2008: 12). This is also reflective of how this thesis will not conform to any specific discipline or field such as film studies or history.

Bordwell, however, has gone some way to delivering some defined methods for an approach to film poetics in his work, which I will follow in this thesis. A study of film poetics is therefore the most fitting field to apply this thesis to. Having outlined his 'four broad questions' relating to film poetics (2005: 142), Bordwell elsewhere posits as the 'key question' of poetics: 'According to what principles are works made?' (2016: 15), which he also calls 'the poetics of overarching form' (2005: 142). Herein lies the requirement to provide the filmmaking context at the beginning of chapters in my thesis: the principles of Czechoslovak filmmaking under the communist regime are not homogenous to any notion of socialist realism from 1948 to 1989 under the regime. Indeed, the conflict between realism and expressionism inherent in Kachyňa's first film, *The Clouds Will Roll Away*

(*Není stále zamračeno*, 1950) (which I will return to in my first chapter), demonstrates that he was engaging in a subversive poetics from the outset that would become an important aspect of the New Wave: that of questioning the presentation of reality in films. This becomes particularly relevant when those films are the product of a state-run film industry.

Spectatorial Theorising

One thing generally missing from the historical/auteur-theory-led approach and the analytical/auteur-structuralism-led approach tends to be the viewer – or, in post-structuralist terms, The Reader (Barthes, 1967). Thus, to continue this thread, films must be considered in terms of their author/auteur, their compositional features/auteur-structuralism, and how they interact with the very linguistic, social and institutional environs from which they originate – an approach I will call auteur-post-structuralism. If the New Wave was defined by its questioning of the deficiencies of socialist realism in film (Hames, 2009: 57), then the example of a precedent for this questioning in Kachyňa's socialist-realist film *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (1950) weaves the movement into the fabric of Czechoslovak film history. The effect this creates is a blurring of the lines between these apparently conflicting periods of filmmaking that, through their intertextuality, are linked. This makes the auteur-led approach to Kachyňa's work more amenable to a comparative analysis of varying eras of Czechoslovak filmmaking, both during the communist regime and after, wherein a study of historical poetics develops a post-structuralist analysis of his work.

Kachyňa's works before the New Wave influenced the New Wave directors, the Readers of his works, and his contributions to the New Wave movement augment this connection. Therefore, as I will seek to illuminate throughout this thesis, a study of Kachyňa's historical poetics will offer a chance to reconcile Kachyňa's post-1968 normalisation-era films with his wider canon.

Bettinson defines spectatorial theorising as offering an account of the interface between compositional features and viewers' activity (2016: 1), while Bordwell argues that it questions how the form and style of films shape the uptake of spectators (2005: 142). In this thesis, my analyses of Kachyňa's works will examine how they are a product of the environment in which he was operating, as well as their role in helping to shape the filmmaking environment, its institutions, and indeed the wider social milieu of his time. In terms of the significance of Kachyňa's post-1968 and pre-1960s works, which I have outlined have been largely overlooked by scholarship, this consideration of the dynamic between the works and the filmmaking environment will offer a unique perspective and will aim to support my thesis that Kachyňa's works require greater attention in film scholarship.

Underpinning this connection is the question over the representation of reality in film and the scrutiny of Bazin's ontology of the photographic image. Kachyňa's dealing with reality in the docudrama format, a feature I will examine in greater detail in my first chapter, points to a debunking of Bazin's original thesis of the ontology of the photographic image. In so doing, this challenges the reception of Kachyňa's works outside the New Wave context as being safe and even propagandist for the regime (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003).

THEORETICAL APPROACH

Ideology

The factor that connects the vast majority of Kachyňa's films in their respective eras is the prevailing ideology of socialism in Czechoslovakia. One of the research questions outlined above is to do with the level of subversion available to filmmakers working for the state under a nationalised film industry. As a superstructure within communist society, the nationalised institution of cinema was a producer of ideology in Marxist terms (Marx, 1964: 36-37), and thus the importance of the socialist-realist doctrine in art takes

precedence. By propagating the virtues of socialism in film, the communist authorities were able to recycle the dominant socialist ideologies in a positivist fashion to the masses. However, through the tension between realism and expressionism in film, filmmakers can begin to challenge the veracity of the images they create through subversive means. This is a method that I will argue Kachyňa engaged in from the outset of his career, where the docudrama, a format I will discuss in more detail, provides a platform to question the reality of the images that ostensibly are presented as real.

In terms of questioning the reality of images in films, the relationship between ideology and reality illuminates this area. In *The Sublime Objects of Ideology* (1989), Slavoj Žižek argues that ideology cannot be perceived as a false reality any more than reality itself must be perceived ideologically. Peter Hames explores this phenomenon in the Czechoslovak New Wave context when he describes 'praxis' as man's way of negotiating the tension between being both object and subject under an ideological system (2014: 151). Hames argues that Marxism attacks the role of art in this, challenging the notion that art-reflects-life-reflects-art as a 'reified and fetishized praxis', which he links to the 'frozen reality' of bureaucratic socialism (2014: 151-152), such as the Czechoslovak communist regime. The very nature of film presupposes the tension inherent in this praxis: that of man as both object and subject when real people play characters in films. The life-imitates-art-imitates-life praxis is self-evident in such staging and, given the tension between socialist realism and this praxis, this is a feature I will explore in Kachyňa's socialist-realist works. Indeed, for Elisabetta Girelli, Czechoslovak civil existence during the regime was defined by 'a combination of oppression and absurdity' (Girelli, 2011: 7). Girelli writes: 'communist totalitarianism on one hand fostered a sense of distance and alienation in Czechoslovak citizens; a separation between "us" and "them" characterized perceptions of social identifications, and inserted a sense of dispossession in the relationship between ordinary people and their environment' (*Ibid.*). While Girelli is referencing totalitarianism here, this

effect of creating an ‘us’ and ‘them’ can be registered in any political circumstance. By exploring extreme examples of this in, for example, *The Ear* (*Ucho*, 1970), Kachyňa was able to connect to a global audience, which explains the universal appeal of *The Ear* following its release from the vaults in 1990.

Former Czech president and prominent dissident and activist during the communist regime, Václav Havel, described the experience of communist totalitarianism in Czechoslovakia in terms of individuals having to hinge this praxis. Havel wrote: ‘they must live within a lie. They need not accept the lie. It is enough for them to have accepted their life with it and in it. For this very fact, individuals confirm the system, fulfill the system, make the system, are the system’ (Havel, 1987: 44–45). Again, individuals as subjects are subjected to the realities presented to them by the overarching political authorities at the same time as helping to forge that reality: it is people who make the system. The Czechoslovak New Wave filmmakers, from their position as employees of the very state they supposedly oppose, may work against the ideological forces that govern their work, but in their efforts to present this opposition they are inherently part of the system to which they oppose. I will argue the effect produced by this paradox is one weaponised by Kachyňa in his relationship with screenplay writer Jan Procházka: by producing critical works from the position of a central agency in the regime, the ability to alter the regime from within becomes a reality.

Karl Marx’s work on the production of ideology via institutions within a superstructure helps to illuminate this process at work. Discussing post-industrial capitalist societies in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (first published in 1932), Marx describes ideology as all the forms of consciousness demonstrated through legal and political theories; philosophy; religion; art; literature; and every kind of cultural production (Marx: 1976). According to Marx, post-industrial capitalist societies consist of a base, or infrastructure, which is the economic base with which humans organise themselves with

conditions producing material life (*Ibid.*). From these base superstructures are erected the political and legal institutions which edify these conditions producing material life. Within these superstructures, ideology is produced in the legal and political theories, philosophies, artworks, religion, and all cultural production of society (*Ibid*.). Rather than seeking to attack and destroy the filmmaking environment and, by proxy, the political establishment, then, the tactic preferred by Kachyňa and Procházka to infiltrate the film industry as an institution within the state generates the potential to precipitate real ideological change for those still working on its behalf.

In this sense, I will argue that Kachyňa's primary goal was to make films he considered valuable; acknowledging that the state apparatuses within the film industry were having the effect of hindering his ability to do this, Kachyňa was able to manoeuvre certain obstacles obstructing this goal for a majority of his career. Nevertheless, there were times where he felt the weight of the restrictions on what was allowed (which I will explore in subsequent chapters), while there were also periods where he benefited from a relaxing of restrictions such as, but not exclusively, during the New Wave movement. For Heath, what is concrete about an individual's reality is shaped by the ideology from which they are produced (Heath, 1981: 5). The real-life ideology that Kachyňa lived and worked in for a vast majority of his career was socialism administered under the auspices of the totalitarian communist regime and his ability to make films was determined by his ability to work within this reality. The ideologically charged poetics of socialist realism were, to varying degrees, a requirement of art under the regime. The term socialist realism, however, itself begins to highlight the insufficiencies of Bazin's reproduction theory that Heath insists demands further interrogation, in that the realism it invokes comes with the caveat of socialist ideology.

Socialist Realism

As Andris Teikmanis points out in his essay 'Towards Models of Socialist Realism' (2013), the term socialist realism is notoriously difficult to pin down. Teikmanis offers four varying definitions followed by a fifth, which in itself has four sub-definitions (2013: 97-98). These definitions span the Soviet era and demonstrate attempts at different times to modernise the concept to suit artistic goals pertaining to different times and locations in the Soviet bloc (2013: 99). In terms of the implications of this on Kachyňa's work, the argument that his 1950s works were simply socialist-realist propaganda films is complicated by the vagaries of that term (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003).

Teikmanis argues that after the fall of communism, scholars have tended to focus on the earliest, most 'orthodox' definitions of socialist realism (2013: 99). In his book *Shostakovich and Stalin* (2004), Solomon Volkov calls this the 'original' definition, 'developed with the participation of [Josef] Stalin, Maxim Gorky, Nikolai Bukharin, and Andrei Zhdanov in 1934' (2004: 19). Quoting from the meeting of the Union of Writers in Moscow in 1934, Volkov writes:

> Socialist Realism, being the most basic method of Soviet literature and literary criticism, demands from the artist a truthful, historically concrete depiction of reality in its revolutionary development. At the same time the truthfulness and concreteness of the artistic depiction of reality must coexist with the goal of ideological change and education of the workers in the spirit of socialism (*Ibid.*).

Here, the demand for 'truth' and a 'concrete depiction of reality' are qualified by the demand for ideology. At its heart, this demonstrates the insufficiency of Bazin's reproduction theory: namely that of cinema as 'objectivity in time' (1960: 8), since socialist realism demands that representations of reality in art must encourage the goals of socialism subjectively. Bazin further argues that 'the aesthetic qualities of photography are to be sought in its power to lay bare the realities' (1960: 7). The frustration between 'reality' and reality according to socialist ideology is apparent in the original definition of socialist realism provided by

Volkov: realism is to be the real through the lens of socialism i.e. a subjective version of a supposedly objective reality that furthers the Soviet project.

As I will explore in my first chapter on Kachyňa's earliest works, he was aware from the outset of his career that he was meeting these issues head on. In an interview with Antonín Liehm in 1967, Kachyňa reflects on how his and Vojtěch Jasný's script accompanying one of their early-1950s documentaries was rejected by the Arts Council (Liehm, 1968: 106-107). The young filmmakers' version of real, lived experience did not coincide with socialist realism, and the outcome is a skewed version of reality under the pretence of a non-fiction film. Indeed, this very frustration regarding the veracity of reality in images is what prompts Heath to reject Bazin's reproduction thesis in its simplest terms (that of the photographic as a true reproduction of reality) and to demand to know where the image comes from (1981: 1).

Bettinson, meanwhile, summarises the analytical poetics approach as an attempt to explain film's visual and aural style, narrative construction, and thematic expression (2016: 1), while Bordwell adds that it is a tool for scrutinizing the ways and means of particular films and groups of films (2016: 16). Clearly, this final point is linked to historical poetics in how it seeks to analyse changes and patterns over time – again demonstrating the fluidity with regards to these varying approaches to poetics. The key difference between the historical approach and the analytical approach is the latter's focus on structure (aural style, narrative construction and thematic expression) which is characteristic of structuralism (Bettinson, 2016: 1). Thus, the link between analytical poetics and auteur structuralism is formed in an appreciation not only of the artist as curator of the work, but the demand set out by Heath to know where their images come from: the linguistic, social and institutional aspects to the filmmaking process. Given the oppressive nature of the communist regime in Czechoslovakia that Kachyňa negotiated for the majority of his career, these concerns

around the social and institutional aspects of the filmmaking process will be pivotal in the analysis of his works.

Space

As I have sought to demonstrate, the historical, analytical and spectatorial approaches to film poetics combine to create space for a post-structuralist analysis. In this thesis, I will be focusing on cinematic space in relation to Kachyňa's poetics, but space as a concept is a far-reaching enterprise (Williams, 2016: 1). Barney Warf and Santa Arias point to the many fields where concepts of space are currently being applied (literary and cultural studies, sociology, political science, anthropology, history and art history) (2009:1). They argue that each field asserts that space is a 'social construction relevant to the understanding of the different histories of human subjects and to the production of cultural phenomena' (*Ibid.*). Space, therefore, has a great bearing on this thesis in relation to the experience of subjects living under a totalitarian regime. Indeed, my methodology of introducing chapters by providing historical and filmmaking contexts invokes this concept of space. The geo-political focus in this thesis is a consequence of the fact that where things happen is fundamental to developing an understanding of how and why they do occur (Warf and Arias, 2009: 1), which goes some way to answering Bordwell's question over where images come from in films.

James S. Williams points to early, seminal works on the concept of space that have been applied to cinema in recent works by the likes of Phil Hubbard and Rob Kitchin in their work *Key Thinkers on Space and Place* (2011), and Marie-Laure Ryan, Kenneth Foote and Maoz Azaryahu in *Narrating Space. Spatializing Narrative: Where Narrative Theory and Geography Meet* (2016), and this is the position from which my analysis of space in Kachyňa's films will begin. For Warf and Arias, recent works in several fields assert that space is a social construction relevant to the understanding of various and

varying accounts of human history (2009: 1). They suggest that from the nineteenth century onwards, in part because of the impact of the industrial revolution, the concept of space was marginalised due to modern notions of the past as progressive, an 'inexorable ascent from savagery to civilisation' (2009: 2). Yet, they argue, 'where things happen is critical to knowing *how* and *why* they happen' (Warf & Arias, 2009: 1). This links their approach to the concept of space to historical poetics, in the search for answers as to how and why images appear as they do. However, some of the seminal texts on space Warf and Arias include in their work *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (Oxon: Routledge, 2009) alter this position. Edward Soja, for instance, asserts that he puts space 'first, before seeing things historically or socially, or as essentially political or economic or cultural, or shaped by class, race, gender, sexual preference; or screened through discourse, linguistics, psychoanalysis, Marxism, feminism, or any other specialised disposition' (Soja in Warf & Arias, 2008: 14). This outlook appears to be at odds with historical poetics: it ignores *where* the image comes from. Rather than seeing this as a barrier to discussing the concept of space in a historical-poetics context in the works of Kachyňa, however, this instead opens up fresh interpretative space for examining his works. For example, Soja later discusses how the ravages of World War II led to a 'revolutionary way to think about space' as cities and towns were being rebuilt across Europe (Soja in Warf & Arias, 2008: 16). In the context of Kachyňa's first film, *The Clouds Will Roll Away*, and its depiction of a farm manager arriving in the Sudetenland to help to implement the collectivisation of agriculture after the communist revolution in Czechoslovakia, Kachyňa invokes this in-between space of rebuilding a nation after the war.

As Soja argues, this spatial advocacy in not opposed to historical interpretation but is an attempt to develop a 'more creative and critically effective balancing of the spatial/geographical and the temporal/historical imaginations' (in Warf & Arias, 2008: 16). The docudrama format (as I will explore in detail in my first chapter), in its invocation of

real, lived experience, provides a spatial immediacy that deals with the space confronted in the film. However, the (re)production of this space on screen comes with a warning: the space displayed in wide, landscape shots may appear expansive, uninhabited and frontier-like, but it is framed within the parameters of the filmic whole. Long shots cut to close-ups, documentary shots are at the same time scenes shot on location. The setting depicted in the film is therefore a finite space with inherent borders: on-screen/off-screen, past/present, real/fictional, historical/imagined and so on.

These overlaps between the film world and the real world are at the heart of the spatial divisions Foucault interrogates in his work 'Of Other Spaces' (1988). Foucault writes: 'there are [spatial] oppositions that we regard as simple givens: for example, between private space and public space, between family space and social space, between cultural space and useful space, between the space of leisure and that of work. All these are still nurtured by the hidden presence of the sacred' (1988: 231). The overlaps inherent between the film world and the real world, highlighted when real people play parts in film, illustrate film's inherent ability to interrogate this subversive space that rejects apparently binary oppositions like fiction and non-fiction. Foucault argues that 'we do not live inside a void, inside of which we could place individuals and things […] we live inside a set of relations' (Foucault 1988: 229–236). Thus, the docudrama format offers a subversive space in which the filmmaker can question presentations of reality that is highly subversive under a totalitarian system.

In my first chapter, 'Kachyňa's 1950s Works', I will examine Kachyňa's earliest films, with specific focus on *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (*Není stále zamračeno,* 1950) and *Smugglers of Death* (*Král Šumavy*, 1959), while also looking at this progress through the decade in *It All Ends Tonight* (*Dnes večer všechno skončí,* 1954, prem. 1955) and *Crooked Mirror* (*Křivé zrcadlo*, 1956). I will demonstrate how the films of this decade present a nuanced position from which the filmmaker approaches the state-run industry under the

Stalinist regime. Dora Viceníková describes Kachyňa's *Smugglers of Death* as 'almost a symbol of Communist propaganda film' (Viceníková in *Kinoeye*, 2003), yet I intend to put this and his earlier 1950s films under scrutiny in relation to this problematic term. By exploring the foundations of the nationalised film industry in Czechoslovakia, which I will demonstrate was influenced by East and West in the Cold War context, I will show how this was not aligned directly with communism. As Petr Szczepanik suggests, the Sovietisation of the film industry occurred 'only gradually, and in several stages' (in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 77). Within this argument, I will outline overlaps present in Czechoslovak culture despite the success of the communist *coup* in 1948. From this position, I will consider how this period in Czechoslovak film history represents a liminal space reflected in Kachyňa's films from the outset of his career.

Throughout this thesis, I will repeatedly refer to the concept of limnal space in reference to anything occupying an in-between status. In *Liminality and the Modern: Living Through the In-Between* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2014), Bjørn Thomassen dedicates an entire book to the concept of liminality, arguing that it is a 'central' concept within the social sciences (2014: 1). Thomassen argues that contemporary discussions of liminality are concerned with a constant overcoming of boundaries and questioning of authorities (2014: 3). Likewise, Agnes Hovarth, Thomassen and Harald Wydra describe liminality as 'a prism through which to understand transformations in the contemporary world' (2015: 1). Thus, while discussing various socio-political periods in Czechoslovakia during the twentieth century, punctuated by definitive moments such as revolutions and occupations, I will attempt to demonstrate how Kachyňa's poetics traverse changes in circumstances at the same time as questioning the authority of the overarching socio-political narrative that helps to deliver these changes.

One of the ways Kachyňa negotiated the tension between realism and expressionism in his earliest works was through the semi-documentary format. In their

final student film, *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (1950), Kachyňa and co-director Vojtěch Jasný produced a work I will describe as a docudrama (a hybrid of documentary and drama formats). While *The Clouds Will Roll Away* dramatises a farm manager's work on a Sudeten farm in a contemporary setting, its depiction of a real setting and non-actors from its village plays with this tension between the real/objective and the subjectivity of the scripted narrative. Likewise, during the 1960s in his contribution to the New Wave, Kachyňa tended to film on location in the Czech countryside. In *Suffering* (*Trápení*, 1961, prem. 1962), Jorga Kotrbová, who played the leading role in the film, stayed at the house in the village of Dolní Nerestce where some of her key scenes were filmed. Locals were cast as extras in some scenes also.[10] This bleeding of reality into the fictional world of the set and ultimately the film itself again plays with this clash between reality and expressionism in film. As such, the overlap between real and fiction blurs the lines between these fixed concepts in a manner that questions Bazin's conception of the ontology of the photographic image (1960: 6). The images produced, these films warn, are not an unquestionable representation of any fixed reality. As such, this highlights how the viewer's own sense of reality is open to scrutiny and develops a metafictional space for a study of Kachyňa's poetics. This overlap between notions of a non-fictional and fictional narrative has a metafictional effect. In presenting an ostensibly socialist-realist narrative about the collectivisation of agriculture in the Czech Sudetenland after the communist revolution, the filmmakers offer a narrative that invokes a sense of a new order overlapping with the old.

The film documents a farm manager's attempts to implement the collectivisation of agriculture programme in an area whose population was altered after the liberation of the republic by Soviet forces in 1945. The geographical setting was in a state of flux following

[10] Marek Prášil , Libuše Kolářová and Luboš Dvořák interviewed [Czech language] locals who experienced the filming of *Suffering* in 1961 [online] available at: https://pisecky.denik.cz/zpravy_region/jorga-kotrbova-prozivala-trapeni-v-nerestcich-20130612.html

the expulsion of the predominantly ethnic German population during the Sudeten Movement after the defeat of the Nazis – where an estimated 2.5 million ethnic Germans were expelled.[11] That this film came at a point in their careers where the filmmakers were transitioning from trainees into professionals under the state-run film industry adds to this burgeoning sense of overlap, generating a deeply liminal space that the film occupies. Thus, rather than offering any positivist assurances from a socialist-realist perspective, the film leaves the viewer with questions in this regard. In my study of the challenges that faced the filmmakers in terms of having their script for the film accepted by the film boards, I will demonstrate that, even at this earliest stage of Kachyňa's career, any notion that he was acting as a mere propagandist are open to challenge.

The next film I will analyse in my first chapter is *It All Ends Tonight* (1954), whose espionage theme reinforces the sense of overlap developed in *The Clouds Will Roll Away*. The character device of the double agent emphasises the theme of duality in the film, and acts as a warning to viewers over taking what they are seeing at face value. In the context of a socialist-realist film, this again questions the legitimacy of the concept of real inherent in that term. What deepens this sense of overlap in the socio-political context is the significance of the deaths of Soviet Union leader Josef Stalin and Klement Gottwald, the leader of the KSČ, in 1953. Both deaths marked a point of departure for the communist regime in Czechoslovakia, moving away from the prevailing Stalinist model from the 1950s (Knapík, 2015: 56); however, as I will explore further in my first chapter, these moves were relatively slow to take effect in Czechoslovakia (Bates, 1977: 37). That

[11] For analysis of the Sudeten Movement, see Yeshayahu A. Jelinek (ed.), 'Violence and Arbitrariness during the Expulsion of Germans from Czechoslovakia: Pages from the Report of the U.S. Liaison Officer' in *Bohemia; München*, Volume 34 (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, etc., Jan 1, 1993), pp. 123-132. Jelinek outlines the 'sensitive and much disputed topic' (123), assessing the means for expulsion (130-131) and providing reports of 'irregularities' (126) while citing opposition towards the programme largely from those already expelled to the US Zone (128-130). Jelinek concludes that the Sudeten Movement could not avoid 'being cruel in many respects' and that 'some people' believe that it was a 'mistake', including 'a few Czechs' (132).

Kachyňa continued to provide a subversive strand of socialist-realist cinema with his spy-theme film *It All Ends Tonight*, whose blurring of the lines is reinforced by the retention of the borderlands setting, demonstrates a progressive strand in his work.

Kachyňa performing his military duties by making the Army Film short *Crooked Mirror* (*Křivé zrcadlo*, 1957) also has significant implications in terms of his subversive strand by this stage. Following the docudrama format of *The Clouds Will Roll Away*, this comedic film that masquerades as an instructional film on how a soldier in the Czechoslovak army should behave, is ironically self-reflexive. By portraying a sloppy soldier, played by a young Vladimír Menšík (who would later appear in many of Kachyňa's works during the normalisation period) in a comedic fashion, Kachyňa provides a layered commentary on his own military service. While at face value he is fulfilling his duties in making the film, his flippant attitude reflects that of Menšík's character and calls the whole performance into question.

Thus, by the time Kachyňa released *Smugglers of Death* in 1959, its historically based narrative, borderland setting, theme of double-agency, and theme of an individual carrying out his military duty while lacking devotion to the cause are reflective of his works throughout the decade. Rather than accept Viceníková's position that the film is a totem of socialist realism, then, I will argue that in fact it is a culmination of the subversive strand in Kachyňa's first decade of work. *Smugglers of Death* may play at being a socialist-realist film – just as Menšík plays at being a soldier in *Crooked Mirror*, a film that plays at being an instructional documentary for soldiers – but I intend to argue that this cannot be taken at face value and that a study of Kachyňa's poetics supports this position.

In my second chapter, 'From the First Wave', I will examine the origins of the New Wave. Robin Bates argues that the three factors generally considered responsible for the movement are the nationalisation of the Czechoslovak film industry, the establishment of a film school in Prague (FAMU), and the de-Stalinisation of culture following the death of

the Soviet leader in 1953 (1977: 37). I will reflect on the intricacies of the nationalisation of the film industry, highlighting how this occurred in 1945, before the communist *coup* in 1948, and how as such it cannot be conflated with a Sovietisation of culture. I will consider Kachyňa's role as one of the earliest graduates from FAMU and the extent of the impact of the de-Stalinisation policies on his work.

As a proponent of the 'first wave' of post-war Czechoslovak filmmakers (Hames, 2009: 80-91), I will assess the ways Kachyňa challenged the rigours of the film industry from the outset of his career in a manner that set a template for the emerging New Wave filmmakers of the 1960s. Frustration with the depiction of reality from the socialist-realist films of the 1950s was one of the fundamental aspects of the New Wave (Forman in Pawlikowski, 1990), and I will argue that Kachyňa's first film, *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (1950), demonstrated a subversive means for tackling this frustration under the scrutiny of the overarching film boards. As a figure belonging to 'Generation 57' (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003; Košuličová in *Kinoeye,* 2003), who 'sowed the seeds for the New Wave' (Viceníková, 2003), I will also scrutinise criticism that suggests an uneasy placement alongside the New Wave filmmakers (Viceníková, 2003; Hames, 1985: 35). While Peter Hames laments Kachyňa's early 1960s works as merely 'attempting broad humanist themes' (1985: 35), I will posit that in the Marxist context of Europe at this time this designation illuminates a further subversive strand in Kachyňa's approach to socialist ideology under the communist regime.

Furthermore, with Viceníková's assessment that the New Wave was defined by overlapping styles and input (in *Kinoeye,* 2003), I will argue that Kachyňa's contribution along with other 'Generation 57' figures is integral to the movement as a whole (*Ibid.*). What sets Kachyňa apart from his contemporaries, according to both Hames and Viceníková, is his stylism (Hames, 1985: 35; Viceníková, 2003). One stylistic point I will focus on in this chapter is the use of the child's narrative in *Suffering* (1961) and *Long Live*

the Republic (1965). Selecting two films that hinge the onset of the New Wave, I will aim to reconsider Kachyňa's historical poetics here in an attempt to challenge Hames' perception that he merely joined the New Wave movement 'when it was already in full swing' (1985: 80). I will argue that Kachyňa's stylistic input added another voice that helped to generate a homogenous variety that, according to Viceníková, underpinned the movement (in *Kinoeye,* 2003).

I will point out Kachyňa's awareness of his perception as an outsider in the New Wave context (Liehm, 1974: 106-110), how his use of the child's narrative offered a subversively humanistic approach in the Marxist context, and how the distancing effect of these factors laid a template for other New Wave filmmakers for getting away with criticisms of the regime. Kachyňa's treatment of the accepted mode of socialist realism and the spy genre were features of his subversive approach in the 1950s, here I will argue that he adapted this approach with the child's narrative as a means to continue to work subversively under the regime, a method I will argue Kachyňa returned to at various stages in his career.

In my third chapter, 'Pushing the Boundaries During the Czechoslovak New Wave', I will consider Kachyňa's contribution to the New Wave film movement of the 1960s. From the first wave, Kachyňa had gone from making subversive socialist-realist films in the 1950s that questioned their own depiction of reality to his early 1960s child's narratives that explored humanist themes. I will argue that Kachyňa's subversive treatment of officially approved subjects demonstrates his significant contribution to the New Wave. From the World War II-themed *Long Live the Republic* (1965) to the interrogation of the role of Czech partisans during the war in *Coach to Vienna* (1966), Kachyňa challenged the depiction of the supposedly good side that were ultimately the winners after the conflict. I will then assess his move into overt criticism of the regime in *The Ear* (1970), which came after the Warsaw Pact invasion of 1968 but was banned by the authorities on its

completion. While much scholarship deals with this film in the New Wave context, I will consider the implications of it both falling outside the generally accepted New Wave timeline of 1963-1968 and its suppression in terms of its potential impact on culture.

Ultimately, I will argue that while *Coach to Vienna* initiated suspicions from the authorities towards Kachyňa and Procházka, their move into *disarmament* following the Warsaw Pact invasion highlights the relative effectiveness of the previous, covert approach[12]. I outlined at the start of this introduction how the timing of the release of *The Ear* in 1990, after the fall of communism in Czechoslovakia, has helped to integrate Kachyňa alongside other New Wave filmmakers; however, this was only made possible after the fall of the regime. Yet between *Coach to Vienna* and *The Ear*, Kachyňa's treatment of taboo subjects like the actions of the partisans at the end of the war and peer-to-peer surveillance respectively augments his poetical stance in relation to the actions of individuals under extreme environments. While scholarship tends to focus on the daring level of subversion in *The Ear* as symbolic of a New Wave, anti-establishment ethos, I will argue that its suppression disarmed Kachyňa in this context, with his real successes during the period found in his earlier works, which critics ironically tend to treat more sceptically.

I will explore the concept of the taboo in Kachyňa's works of this period and how this illuminates an understanding of his attempts to push the boundaries of what was acceptable through his work – and crucially how to get away with it. His successes and failures in this sense helped to shape his career during the subsequent normalisation period in culture, allowing him to retain a subversive strand while avoiding the heightened censorship of that period. This is a feature I will explore in my next chapters dealing with Kachyňa's post-New Wave films.

[12] I will refer to the censoring of works as a *disarmament,* where the filmmakers' ability to demonstrate to their audience their criticisms of the authorities is removed by films being banned.

In chapter four, 'Pedagogy and a Return to Child Narratives During Normalisation', I will begin to interrogate Kachyňa's work during the period of normalisation following the Warsaw Pact invasion of 1968. Taking into consideration the changes in culture as the New Wave movement was suppressed, I will consider the ramifications of Kachyňa continuing to work prolifically into the 1970s despite the suppression of *The Ear* in 1970 and his previous film *Funny Old Man* (1969). During a period Jaromír Blažejovský describes as 'normalisation: consolidation' from 1968-1970, when the restructuring of the film industry and the expulsion of New Wave proponents was ongoing (Blažejovský, 2004: 68), the mood of New Wave subversion was generally retained in culture (*Ibid*.). As early as 1971, however, Kachyňa was able to release *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* (*Už zase skáču přes kaluže*, 1970, prem. 1971), despite a more aggressive approach from the authorities (Blažejovský, 2004: 69). While his follow-up to *The Ear* marked a superficial move away from contemporary political concerns to the far reaches of an adaptation of Australian writer Alan Marshall's autobiographical work about the experiences of a young boy contracting polio, I will assess the allegorical aspect of this in relation to the dismantling of the New Wave movement.

Furthermore, the return to a child's narrative signals a retreat from the pointed criticisms of the regime in *The Ear* but also marks a connection to his previous New Wave works. Considering the child's narrative in the context of the theme of pedagogy in *Train to Heaven Station* (*Vlak do Stanice Nebe*, 1972), I will argue that Kachyňa engages in a humanist poetics that compels his viewers to consider the treatment of individuals under oppressive conditions and to reflect on their actions in this context. Continuing this strand of the pedagogical function of children's narratives, I will then explore Kachyňa's depiction of the Hans Christian Andersen fairy tale *The Little Mermaid* (*Malá mořská víla*, 1976) within the normalisation-on-the-offensive context (Blažejovský, 2004: 68). I will argue that despite the restrictions of this particularly stringent period of censorship during

the normalisation period (Liehm, 1976: 57), many of the themes of the child's narratives, particularly the depiction of the fairy-tale narrative, mirror themes explored in Kachyňa's first post-communism film *The Last Butterfly*, as I outlined earlier in this introduction. From this position, I intend to argue that despite the political and cultural machinations of the time, Kachyňa continued to produce works that compounded his poetical position to do with humanism and the experiences of individuals under oppressive systems, and as such continued to critique the oppressive nature of the regime.

In my fifth chapter, 'Charter 77 and Insurrection: The Artist as Individual', I will consider how Kachyňa continues to interrogate the treatment of individuals in the context of the Charter 77 movement. Following the arrests of individuals associated with the underground rock band The Plastic People of the Universe in 1976, a charter drawn up by political activists including Václav Havel was circulated. The charter insisted that the communist authorities respect the human rights terms of the Helsinki Declaration signed by the government in 1975, which protected individuals' rights to freedom of expression (Bolton, 2012: 177). Upon the inception of the charter, however, the Czechoslovak cultural sphere was essentially split in two, with the authorities doubling down with the production of an 'anti-charter' condemning the insurgency, which Kachyňa signed (*Rudé právo*, January 31, 1977: 3).[13] While this move signifies a siding with the authorities at odds with my assessment of Kachyňa's subversive filmmaking during this period, the state-run *Rudé právo* publication alone demonstrates the arbitrariness of the signatories in its exhaustive, thirteen-page list of artistic figures who have apparently lent their name in support of the regime. That the artists' unions were state controlled, the appropriation of the signatories may present a united front, but should be treated with scepticism. Indeed, as I will continue to argue in this chapter, direct conflict with the authorities was not Kachyňa's preferred

[13] *Rudé právo*, číslo 25 – ročník 57 (Právo lidu ročník 80), pondělí, leden 31, 1977/*Rudé právo*, No.25 – Vol.57 (speaker 80), Monday, January 31, 1977.

method and joining the outspoken ranks of the Charter 77 movement would have marked a significant departure in his approach. Instead, I will demonstrate how during these fluctuations during the normalisation period, Kachyňa retained his poetical stance of humanism and a focus on the individual.

This is reflected in the films I will analyse in this chapter, *Love* (*Láska*, 1973), which preceded the Charter 77 movement, *Death of a Fly* (*Smrt mouchy*, 1976, prem. 1977) which was contemporaneous with the Plastic People of the Universe arrests, and *Good Lighting* (*Dobré světlo*, 1986), which appeared a decade later. The films span thirteen years of the normalisation period, but in each work Kachyňa explores the theme of the photographic artist as an individual. This approach will help to support my analysis of Kachyňa's historical poetics during the various socio-political machinations surrounding this context. In *Love*, Kachyňa presents the experiences of adolescents in a coming-of-age narrative that remains in keeping with his humanist poetics at the same time as introducing this new theme of championing the expression of the photographic artist. Having analysed the depiction of the fairy-tale genre in the previous chapter in *The Little Mermaid* (1976), I will argue that *Death of a Fly* (released the following year) marks a shift in tone in Kachyňa's career right at the outset of the Charter 77 movement, invoking a contemporary urban youth at odds with their restrictive surroundings. I will then analyse *Good Lighting* (*Dobré světlo*, 1986), which reflects on these themes from the vantage point of a middle-aged perspective, considering Kachyňa's assessment of the development of this generation, especially with regards to the very personal theme of the photographic artist's ability to freely express themselves.

In chapter six, 'The Holocaust and the Regime', I will reflect on Kachyňa's rejection of polemics throughout his career in film, a feature I will argue is prominent in his three Holocaust films *Golden Eels* (*Zlatí úhoři*, 1979), *Death of a Beautiful Deer* (*Smrt krásných srnců*, 1986, prem. 1987) and *The Last Butterfly* (1991). From his earliest works,

Kachyňa highlighted the insufficiencies of the socialist-realist doctrine in art, moving towards a humanist poetics with an increasingly subversive style during the 1960s and the Czechoslovak New Wave that challenged the oppressive conditions for individuals living under the regime. Yet throughout his career, Kachyňa rarely set out to promote any ideology over another. With the exception of *The Ear*, his works rarely engage in direct criticism of the communist regime, for instance. One theme that ultimately underlines the generation of otherness produced in his interrogation of the treatment of individuals under oppressive conditions is the recurring Holocaust narrative in these three films spanning more than a decade.

While my other chapters will seek to explicate the ways Kachyňa offers unconventional criticisms via accepted forms of narrative, I will argue that his Holocaust-themed films provide a unique perspective in dealing with taboo subjects. As emblems of his humanist poetics, in their rehabilitation of both an erased narrative in the Holocaust (Sniegon, 2014), as well as the individuals persecuted by an arbitrary system that denigrated them to the status of other, the films demonstrate the perils of accepting dogmatic ideological doctrines. In doing so, I will argue that Kachyňa continued to push the boundaries with regards to what was acceptable throughout the normalisation period and ultimately beyond the fall of the communist regime.

His adaptation of Ota Pavel's autobiographical work *Golden Eels,* for example, broke a decade-long trend of ignoring the Holocaust in Czechoslovak cinema (Sladovníková, 2018: 8), while *Death of a Beautiful Deer* provided a similar narrative that moved from the child's perspective of the former into an adult's experience. Finally, *The Last Butterfly*, as I outlined at the beginning of this introduction, began production during the normalisation period with its completion and release coming after the fall of communism. I will argue that this serves to underline how Kachyňa's works transcend the various political and ideological forces he encountered during his life and career. For

Kachyňa, the artist as individual endures, and this thesis will attempt to make the case for Kachyňa's enduring legacy as a great filmmaker of the twentieth century.

CHAPTER ONE: KACHYŇA'S 1950s WORKS

Dora Viceníková describes Karel Kachyňa's *Smugglers of Death* (*Král Šumavy*, 1959) as 'almost a symbol of Communist propaganda film' (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003). Appearing before the Czechoslovak New Wave of the 1960s, from a young FAMU graduate, following the communist takeover in 1948, and produced by a state-run film industry demanding the adoption of socialist realism, this may come as little surprise. However, by examining the conditions Kachyňa was working under during the decade more closely, I will challenge this perception of his early work. By paying particular attention to *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (*Není stále zamračeno*, 1950) and *It All Ends Tonight* (*Dnes večer všechno skončí*, 1954), while considering the implications of his other contribution to Czechoslovak Army Film (*Československý armádní film*) in *Crooked Mirror* (*Křivé zrcadlo,* 1957), I will provide an analytical-poetics approach to his works of the decade. In order to reach this analysis of Kachyňa's works, I will first outline the historical, political and film environment in which he was operating.

Foundations of a Nationalised Film Industry

At the close of World War II in Europe in 1945, the Czechoslovak government in exile of President Edvard Beneš in London met with KSČ leaders in exile in Moscow in March, 1945 for negotiations over the future of the newly independent nation.[14] An umbrella structure named the National Front was formed in April 1945, which was a left-leaning group (Lovejoy, 2015: 53), and by August 1945, following the war and Czechoslovakia's liberation by Soviet forces on May 8, 1945, the film industry had been nationalised.[15] This move

[14] Czechoslovakia was conquered by the Nazis in 1938-39 and the republic, which had been created at the end of the First World War, was split into the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia and the Slovak state under Nazi control. This arrangement ended after the Nazis' defeat by the Allies in 1945, when the government in exile in London returned to assume control of the Czechoslovak republic once more.

[15] Petr Pithart, lawyer, Prague Spring activist, dissident and first Czech post-communist Prime Minister, has argued that 'everything that we call civic society was subsumed under the National Front' (in interview with Jan Čulík, *Britské listy*, August 7, 2019. [Online] available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eP7b0Jhzlnk. Pithart argues that the National Front was an all-encompassing, undefinable entity, which had no legal justification (*Ibid*.).

reflected the nationalisation of Czechoslovakia's banks and went in tandem with the reorganisation of the military according to the Soviet model (Lovejoy, 2015: 54); however, the first publication of the literary journal *Literární politika* on September 14, 1945 suggests that these moves did not necessarily indicate any formal Sovietisation of Czechoslovak culture at that time. The publication's editor-in-chief – Emil František Burian (1904-1959), a future communist government official who had first joined the KSČ in 1923 – wrote at the time that the magazine would be of best service if it provides information 'from both the West and the East' (Lovejoy, 2015: 53).

For the film industry, as Jiří Knapík argues, its nationalisation was not even a communist idea: the move did not constitute a 'major discontinuity' since the idea had 'originated in the thinking of responsible filmmakers as early as the second half of the 1930s' (in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 41). Indeed, Beneš's government in exile, as early as 1942, approved the first plans for nationalisation (Lovejoy, 2015: 57). As Lovejoy argues, the move to a nationalised film industry marked a shift in focus from generating profits and providing entertainment to providing education and contributing to culture (*Ibid*).[16] As for other Czechoslovak state institutions at the time, the reorganisation of the military in 1945, too, was not as straightforward a siding with the Red Army as could be suggested, given that many Czechoslovak military personnel during World War II had fought in exile with British and Red Army corps respectively (Lovejoy, 2015: 57). This demonstrates the conflicting powers at play in the early stages after Czechoslovakia's liberation.

Both the desire to embrace East and West in culture, as outlined by Burian, and the competing foreign powers within the political sphere at the time are demonstrated in the hosting of three foreign film festivals in 1946. First was a French film festival (Prague, March 22-April 5, 1946), followed by a Soviet film festival (Prague, May 17-31, 1946); Bratislava, June 3-5, 1946), and then a British film festival (Prague, September 27-October

[16] This pedagogical function is an area I will explore in more detail throughout this thesis.

13, 1946; followed by screenings in Bratislava and Brno). The communist mobilisation within the National Front from February 1948 forced Beneš to surrender to KSČ demands to include a majority of KSČ members in his cabinet, although he stopped short of signing the revised constitution which purported the Communist Party as the sole party for a 'people's democracy' and was thus forced to leave office (Behrends, 2013). Even before the February *coup*, however, the KSČ had begun to renege on their National Front commitments (Brenner 2009: 426–427, quoted and translated from the German in Behrends, 2013). Thus, when KSČ leader Klement Gottwald announced a close alliance with the USSR following the February crisis, this was both a radical shift and one marking a progression along the communist end of the National Front's parameters.

Peter Hames argues that the perceived betrayal of the Munich Agreement of 1938 by the Allies, where the strategy of appeasement of the Nazis allowed for the occupation of Czechoslovakia to go ahead without challenge, helped to foster a strong communist tradition in Czechoslovakia (1985: 24). Hames outlines KSČ membership in Czechoslovakia from its inception in 1921, where membership numbered 350,000, to 1925 where the party gained 13.2% of the general vote to become the nation's second largest party (1985: 24). By 1931 membership was down to 40,000 before rising to 100,000 in 1938 around the Munich Betrayal (*Ibid*.). Hames, however, reinforces how the Czechoslovak communists' approach to socialism was varied, with Gottwald stressing that Czechoslovak socialism would not follow the Soviet model (Hames, 1985: 24). These competing approaches, however, were the reason Stalinism was 'meted out so heavy handedly in Czechoslovakia', according to Hames (1985: 25). Amidst this political milieu, the pronouncements of a 'concrete totality' from contemporary Marxist philosopher Karel Kosík, where reality is 'at the same time a totality of nature and a totality of history' (in Kusin, 1971: 136), suggest that ideas of a fixed sense of reality and history are to be presented via the subjectivity of a socialist perspective. Rather than foster a version of socialism appropriate for the Czechoslovak context, however,

such pronouncements merely augmented the doctrinally charged version of socialism along Soviet lines. Kosík, however, according to Hames, saw culture, 'particularly cinema', as 'attacking the exisiting bureaucratic regime at its core' (Hames, 1985: 29). Thus, while socialist realism prevailed in cinema, the films of the early communist era were still capable of this level of subversion.

As such, however, these details generate more of a sense of overlap politically, which reflects the hesitancy over siding unilaterally with East over West in culture as outlined earlier. As Petr Szczepanik suggests, the Sovietisation of the film industry occurred 'only gradually, and in several stages' (in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 77). The KSČ, during its first three years in power from 1948, 'established the foundations for the new social order, whereby the party… was able to take advantage of the trends that had started in 1945 or even earlier' (Knapík in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 46). Additionally, the 'efforts to rigorously plan and politically control film production in the years 1948-51 led to the creation of a bureaucratically demanding process of approval' (Knapík in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 46). Essentially, this was approved so long as the artists subscribed to the politically accepted artistic doctrine of socialist realism; however, as I shall aim to demonstrate in the works of Kachyňa during this period, and as Szczepanik suggests, this was not straightforward.

The term socialist realism, for instance, is notoriously difficult to pin down (Teikmanis, 2013: 97-98). After the fall of communism in 1989, scholars have tended to focus on the earliest, most orthodox definitions of the concept (Teikmanis, 2013: 99). As I discussed in my introduction, the conflict between reality and reality according to socialist ideology is apparent in the term socialist realism, where realism is the real through the lens of socialist ideology (Introduction: 26). I also explored how Marx sets out the concept of the superstructure (Introduction: 24): it is clear that the creative institutions, including the film industry, were to play a big part in helping to produce and propagate the ideology of

socialism in communist cultures. This accumulation of cultural production is based on the understanding that these products are conditioned by the 'mode of production' that constitutes that society's economic base (Marx, 1976: 36-37). This is an important point in the study of films produced under a nationalised film industry in a communist setting, as a vast majority of the works by Kachyňa were, since the mode of production is very different to that of, for instance, the profit-driven studio mode of the Hollywood film industry in its capitalist setting.

During the authoritarian reign (1929-1953) of Stalin, most of the communist parties of Europe followed the Soviet leader's dogmatic approach to Marxism. A closed concept named dialectical materialism – where all events in history are the result of class struggle – was the basis for socialist realism in art; however, the publication of Marx's *1844 Manuscripts* in 1932 and subsequent translations led to an uptake in the humanist element of Marxist thinking across Europe (Ferretter, 2006: 30). Indeed, Mark Poster argues that these publications 'almost unanimously' led to the humanist aspect of Marxism being accepted as a serious position by contemporary and future philosophers, arguing that the theme of alienation in the *1844 Manuscripts* was the 'fulcrum of all Marx's thought' (Poster, 1975: 69). Christian Fuchs defines humanism as a 'particular philosophical tradition and worldview that focuses on the human being as a central moment of society', while Marxist humanism also takes the human being as a 'starting point for the theoretical and practical analysis and critique on human practices and class struggles', with an emphasis on 'democratic socialism' as enabling the best living conditions for human beings to thrive (Fuchs, 2021).

Following Stalin's death in 1953, Marxist humanism exploded after the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in 1956, when First Secretary Nikita Khrushchev exposed and denounced the crimes of the Stalinist era and his reign of terror, initiating the de-Stalinisation of the culture of the Soviet Union (Ferretter, 2016: 29).

After the publication of Marx's *1844 Manuscripts*, there were competing approaches to the concept of Marxism in the USSR and beyond, despite Stalin's dogmatic approach. This only increases the sense of political overlap in Czechoslovakia outlined in this chapter. If, as Poster and Ferretter suggest, postwar Marxism was to a high degree related to the concept of humanism, where men and women determine their own lives, then this would have been felt by socialist-leaning Czechoslovaks even before the February *coup* of 1948. Czechoslovakia, however, had adopted communism after the Second World War, before the death of Stalin had allowed Marxist humanism to pervade across Europe, and had inherited the strictures of the Stalinist era. Czechoslovak communist connections to the USSR before, during and after World War II created an overlap where the emergence of communism as the dominant political force in Czechoslovakia after 1948 had more to do with leaning towards Stalinism than it did an embracing of Marxist humanism. Socialist realism in art was therefore a critical tool in the Czechoslovak context for reinforcing this dogmatic approach in the face of competing approaches to socialism.

However, Jan Mervart argues that all states in the Eastern bloc had to redefine social changes post-Stalin, either to improve efficiency or to find a new legitimisation in the wake of the revelations of Stalin's crimes (2017). As such, Mervant argues that these conditions had reform implications within the communist states, which was especially pronounced during the 1960s in Czechoslovakia leading to the Prague Spring of 1968 (*Ibid*.). Thus, while Czechoslovakia's embracing of Marxist humanism was inevitable after the death of Stalin in 1953, as Mervant suggests, its relatively late adoption into the 1960s suggests another period of flux that Kachyňa occupied when he started out in his career in filmmaking at the beginning of the 1950s (*Ibid*.). Thus, I will argue that Kachyňa's humanist approach before and immediately after the death of Stalin demonstrates a high level of subversion in even his earliest works. While some of the critical responses to his 1950s films consider his earliest works as emblems of socialist realism (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003), I will demonstrate

how those works in fact challenge socialist realism at its heart in the manner Kosík suggests (in Hames, 1985: 29).

The reality for filmmakers operating under a state-run film industry is that the ideology they help to produce is the real, lived experience in the system under which they operate. Indeed, realism as artistic expression acts both as a theory of knowledge and as an ontology (an account of what exists and is real in the world) (Lovell, 1980: 10). However, Louis Althusser argues that 'the peculiarity of art is to "make us see", "make us perceive", "make us feel", something which alludes to reality' (1971: 204). Thus, socialist-realist cinema compels its viewer to consider how its version of reality carries with it this ideological function. In the Marxist context, the social world is not, however, the product of socialist-realist art or the officials censoring its application (Lovell, 1980: 9). This effect provides Kachyňa with a tool to question the implementation of socialist realism in his films. The metafictional possibilities within socialist-realist art are not available without the work of theory construction outside of this framework – i.e. an awareness of the ideological forces behind socialist realism – and an appreciation that this process constitutes part of the real, lived experience of the filmmakers and the viewers in the real world (Lovell, 1980: 9).

Thus, this nuanced position in terms of an approach to socialist realism opens many subversive possibilities for filmmakers working at this time. These instances of ideological, political, historical, and regional overlaps in terms of the unique case of communism in Czechoslovakia provide the platform for a revisionist approach to socialist realism that I will argue Kachyňa produced from the outset of his career. Furthermore, Knapík describes a cultural 'thaw' in Czechoslovakia, which occurred following the deaths of Stalin and Gottwald in March 1953 (Knapík, 2015: 51). These deaths provided 'important stimuli' for a change in direction in Czechoslovak cinema (*Ibid*.). With the de-centralising process in Czechoslovak film in 1956, including the dissolution of Czechoslovak State Film

(*Československý státní film*, ČSF) by 1957, this move away from a centrally defined culture within film gained pace.

These developments occurred in tandem with the 1956 Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in which the critique of the 'personality cult' in the wake of Stalin's death began to expose the criminality of the system (Knapík in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 56).[17] Yet, as Knapík points out, the moves towards realising the decentralising goals 'cannot be automatically associated with an ideological liberalization of the cultural sphere' (in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 59). Instead, a campaign against 'revisionism' via administrative interventions slowed down this liberalisation, an effect I will demonstrate affected Kachyňa's early career, while the banning of Ján Kadár and Elmar Klos in 1959 following the release of their subversive comedy *Three Wishes* (*Tři přání*) demonstrated how transgressions would be dealt with by the authorities.[18] Thus, in my analyses of Kachyňa's works during the 1950s, I will consider ways in which he challenged the norms of socialist realism to an extent that was acceptable under the conditions he was working, especially as a novice filmmaker trying to establish himself. I will examine his earliest work, *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (1950), coming during the Stalin era. I will then assess his Czechoslovak Army Film works appearing during this de-centralising period after the deaths of Stalin and Gottwald, *It All Ends Tonight* (1954) and *Crooked Mirror* (1957). Finally, I will then consider his apparently emblematically socialist-realist work, *Smugglers of Death* (1959) (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003), which came at the same time as Kadár and Klos's

[17] Robin Bates describes this meeting, along with the twelfth Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in December 1962, as helping to usher in the 'de-Stalinization' period in Czechoslovakia (Bates, 1977: 37).

[18] Kadár and Klos were banned from the studios until 1963 for their critical approach to the failures of the implementation of socialism in Czechoslovakia in *Three Wishes* (1959). See Pater Hames, 'View of Ján Kadár' in *KINEMA* (Spring 2013) [Online] Available at: https://openjournals.uwaterloo.ca/index.php/kinema/article/view/1289/1668.

work was banned. In each case, I intend to demonstrate ways in which Kachyňa managed to challenge the dogma of socialist realism in film.

Challenging Socialist Realism

The 2003 autumn edition of the film journal *Kinoeye: New Perspectives on European Film* was devoted to Czech filmmaker Karel Kachyňa (Volume 3, Issue 9, 15 Sept 2003). In it, Dora Viceníková touches on Kachyňa's earliest works in her essay 'Generation 57 and Beyond: A Portrait of Karel Kachyňa'. Viceníková states that Kachyňa started out making documentary films at the start of the 1950s with *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (1950) which, while true, is an aspect of his early filmmaking I will explore with greater scrutiny in this chapter. She then asserts that, 'like many of his contemporaries', Kachyňa made 'a number of optimistic and slightly propagandist films', one of which is *Smugglers of Death* (1959). Her use of 'slightly' to describe the level of propaganda in this film, however, is telling, and begins to chip away at the notion that the film is emblematic of socialist realism. I will argue that throughout the decade, via the medium of the documentary format and other ambiguous techniques such as borderland settings and historical narratives, Kachyňa was never committed to socialist realism and instead sought to challenge the heavily bureaucratic and dogmatic industry structures in place.

***The Clouds Will Roll Away* (1950)**

Set in the rural settlement of Moldava in the Ore Mountains borderland in the north of Czechoslovakia in 1948, *The Clouds Will Roll Away* documents the experience of a farm manager who arrives in the area to oversee the collectivisation of agriculture programme. As I previously outlined, Edward Soja argues that an approach to space comes first before an interrogation of the historical (in Arias & Warf, 2008: 14); however, Soja also argues that the space produced by the ravages of World War II opened up a 'revolutionary way to think about space' (in Arias & Warf, 2008: 16). Thus, the historical aspect to the Sudeten setting in *The Clouds Will Roll Away* has a profound effect on its invocation of space. In the film,

the region is affected by the eviction of non-Czechoslovaks following the liberation of the Republic and the farm manager's objective is to help to implement the collectivisation of agriculture programme on the authorities' behalf. This nationalisation of a previously privatised industry reflects the filmmaking culture Kachyňa and Jasný were operating in and the depiction of resistance to the new system from the locals reflects Kachyňa's account of his own professional introduction to the nationalised film industry. In an interview conducted by Antonín J. Liehm in 1968, Kachyňa expresses his and Jasný's frustrations with the film-industry structures of the early 1950s when he was starting out in his career. The transcript reads:

> In [the early 1950s], we were supposed to do a documentary about the collectivization of farms. They gave us a few tips; they listed a few collective farms; and on the basis of what we saw and heard there, we wrote the script. We presented it to the Arts Council – which consisted of a disproportionate number of politicians compared with film people – and from then on we didn't stop blushing; they started to make complete idiots of us. What we had written, they said, wasn't the truth at all, because it wasn't in keeping with the agricultural policy of the Party, but simply with what we had heard at the farm. We left like beaten dogs, desperately looking for a way to get the whole thing in some sort of shape. The judges, of course, were people with authority. We were only young beginners in documentary film, and so we did as we were told. The result was a fantastic bastard of a film.
>
> From then on, all of us kept getting into greater or lesser conflicts with institutions that were supposed to guide Czechoslovak [107] culture, and we kept knuckling under. It was impossible to escape the pressure, sometimes more, sometimes less; but whatever we did always bore the stamp of the Arts Council, something no creative work can stand (Kachyňa in Liehm, 1968: 106-107).

The period referred to here was when Kachyňa and Jasný were making *The Clouds Will Roll Away*, and this bearing on their script reflects the conditions for some of the characters in the film. One of the main frustrations felt by Kachyňa at this time was the domination of 'political people' in the decision-making processes of the film industry (Kachyňa in Liehm, 1968: 106). The conflict over the script, for a documentary film, points to a conflation of real and fiction in this project, manipulated through this political lens. Kachyňa and Jasný had written their original script based on accounts from people who had lived through this historical moment, yet the Arts Council rejected this (Liehm, 1968: 106-107). This is a

telling indictment of the manipulation of real in socialist realism, yet Kachyňa admits that as beginners they were willing to accept what they were told and carried out their instructions, adding that the result was a 'fantastic bastard of a film' (in Liehm, 1968: 106). Thus, Kachyňa reflects that, despite the restrictive conditions of the industry structures, he was able to make films of worth, although he admits that having to bear the stamp of the Arts Council from that early project onwards was a tedious effort, one which 'no creative effort can stand' (in Liehm, 1968: 107).

This overbearing approach from state representatives on film production was a conscious effort from the authorities. In one sense, in terms of the nationalised film industry from 1945, the reduction in the need for commercial success brought great freedom to filmmakers. On the other hand, the apparatuses within this industry acted as constraints to certain filmmakers, a feature reflected in Kachyňa's depiction of the conflict between the apparently wide-open setting of the countryside versus the trappings of life for his characters in *The Clouds Will Roll Away*. While Viceníková describes the film as a documentary, I will explain in this chapter how the term docudrama is more appropriate.

The film opens with some overt signalling that it is not a conventional, expository-mode documentary. Emblazoned on the title credits are writers František Daniel, Kachyňa and Jasný, then members of the cast are credited as 'the actors from the Ore Mountains Theatre in Teplice' (0:00.41). Thus, from the outset this documentary film appears to follow the conventions of a fictional film, where actors are employed to convey a scripted narrative. The shot then cuts to a map of the Czech lands, zooming in on the Ore Mountains region as the voiceover delivers a concise account of the recent history since the end of World War II. This exposition acts as a reinforcement of the status of the region as belonging to the Czechoslovak state. Robert Burgoyne makes a comparison between films and maps in that both are forms of 'locational machinery' that serve to reorient us (2010: 123). The conflict between the reality of the images in this docudrama versus the subjectivity of the scripted

narrative, coupled with the need to retain the socialist-realist agenda, all combines to generate a self-reflexive commentary of the filmmaking environment. Despite the appearances of a naturalised space, Kachyňa presents a complex network of contrived spaces that point to the subjectivity of his narrative and by proxy of the communist metanarrative.

This process is reflected in Barney Warf's essay 'From Surfaces to Networks' (2009), where he charts the modern history of approaches to the concept of space. Warf argues that the prevalence of the early-modern omniscient narrator in art and literature arose in tandem with the birth of modern science (in Warf & Arias, 2009: 61). Within these scientific fields, Warf argues, the rise of cartography marked a shift from local topologies to a 'fine, spatially referenced, spherical earth' (*Ibid*.). Warf argues that the printing of maps helped to make Europeans accustomed to conceiving of geographical space as representing territorial order, helping to establish abstract space as the 'dominant model' (in Warf & Arias, 2009: 63), an effect reflected in the expository scenes in *The Clouds Will Roll Away* with the voiceover delivered by the farm manager. Thus, in producing the citizen of the nation state, complete with identifying documentation, within a reified territorial space, the nation-state also constructed moral geographies of similarity and difference, inclusion and exclusion, which sharply distinguished 'us' from 'them' (Warf in Warf & Arias, 2009: 64). The framing of the real, lived experience of the Sudetenland after World War II in *The Clouds Will Roll Away*, therefore, offers a depiction of socialism in action within this transitional space that points to the role film is playing in this process of super-state control. This product of the state is informing its citizens, its viewers or Readers, about its territory and the 'us' and 'them' who are allowed and disallowed to inhabit it (Warf in Warf & Arias, 2009: 64).

The opening shot of Moldava portrays the remote township in the foothills of the mountains, covered in a blurring mist. The wide shot of the town pans left into blackness, offering a bleak overview. Then the shot cuts to the farm manager (played by actor Kamil

Olšovský) who appears from a dense wood dressed in a trenchcoat, wearing a hat and carrying a briefcase. There is the disparate appearance of a city businessman arriving in an uncultivated land, which is reinforced when the shot cuts to him traversing towards buildings with abandoned farm machinery sitting in the foreground. The shot then cuts to a low close-up of the farm manager, whose presence on screen is enhanced. Mimicking his view, the shot pans across the abandoned-looking street and focuses on a sign with 'STÁTNÍ STATEK' ('State Farm') printed on it (0:02.54). A young man appears on a horse and notifies the farm manager about a problem with cattle at a nearby farm. Demonstrating his dexterity in the agrarian setting, the farm manager mounts the horse and rushes to the farm to find livestock destroyed in a barn. Here, the issue of resistance to the collectivisation of agriculture is first confronted, with accounts of the early collectivisation programme in Czechoslovakia reaching a general consensus of failure, where material benefits of collective farming for peasants were far below that of private farming (Sanders, 1958: 119). These conditions, augmented by a food crisis brought on by two years of drought on top of the diminished population as a consequence of the Sudeten Movement (Jelinek, 1993: 123), led to collectivisation activists being boycotted by the locals in a 'majority' of cases, 'some even ending with peasants' mutinies' (Iuoras, 2016: 32). Thus, straight away Kachyňa and Jasný are confronting opposition to the authorities' programme for agriculture.

The shot then cuts to the local administrative commission where a well-groomed man in suit and tie appears from the doorway to greet the farm manager. The administrator provides an account of the recent decline in the area since the onset of the Sudeten Movement, cutting to shots of abandoned farm equipment on disused farmland. Here, the didactical dimension to the film commences, with the farm manager picking up a pitchfork in a barn and getting to work. Suddenly, he is accompanied by other young men who work enthusiastically alongside him. The shots are low, offering the workers an esteemed status,

with the cloudless sky in the background in contrast to the bleak opening scenes and offering a nod to the film's title. The message is that by getting to work as a collective everything will improve quickly. In a few shots, the workers have successfully cultivated the abandoned land, the equipment has been mended and put to use, and livestock is being tended to. The farm manager even shows a young woman how to milk her cow. Following this montage of transformative action, a bright, spring scene showing new houses, fresh flowers and a spraying fountain precedes visions of comfortable living within. The farm manager surveys plans for building which are cut on screen with the plans brought to life in the area.

Accompanying the successful integration into the collectivisation programme, however, is the retention of the local administrative commission. In stark contrast to the industry shown on the sun-drenched farms by the workers, the administrators are depicted as lazy bourgeoisie holed up in their office gambling, drinking and smoking. Accompanying these corrupt officials, there are antagonists in the form of capitalists trying to buy out the accomplishments from under the collective. The farm manager refuses to engage with them but the figures remain in their midst, sneering from close by. This foreboding escalates to the farm manager being attacked off-screen and horses being stolen. While he is injured, the workers double down, working day and night on the farms while employing new technologies like floodlighting and combine harvesters to increase productivity. Thus, despite interference from would-be saboteurs, the collective shows resilience and is able to thrive, and the farm manager realises his work is done.

On a sun-drenched landscape, then, he rides off on horseback to the literal fanfare of the locals (a man playing a woodwind instrument and children on horns) to return to his family in the city in the knowledge that his mission has been completed, with Moldava thriving with industry and life. The deeply subjective framing of the successes of the collectivisation project in this small town offers viewers a scepticism with which to

approach their claims to documenting real, lived experience. This wariness towards the narrative construct is a product of the application of the documentary format in this highly subjective manner.

Docudrama

Two of the films I will focus most closely on in this chapter, *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (1950) and *It All Ends Tonight* (1954) both carry heavy traits of socialist realism. One notable difference is in the former being a hybrid of fiction film and documentary, which I will call docudrama (Grodal, 2018), while the other is a fictional feature film. Bill Nichols outlines the fundamental difference between these two types of films: 'fiction films operate within a fictional world; documentary films refer directly to the historical world' (2017: 6). However, as Nichols points out, there are several modes of documentary film that cloud any fixed definition of the form (2017: 4), and the reflexive mode in particular draws attention to its construction in a manner which casts doubt on the form's apparent historical objectivity.

In his revised 2017 edition of *Introduction to Documentary Film*, Nichols seeks to define the term 'documentary film', while warning that an overarching definition can obscure any understanding of what it is (2017: 5). Nichols points to an early definition of documentary film by John Grierson in the 1930s, that it entails a 'creative treatment of actuality', as an example of the conflict inherent in the genre between real and fiction (Nichols, 2017: 5). Nichols lists five documentary modes: the poetic mode, which is closely linked to avant-garde filmmaking in its expressive style; the expository mode, what most people associate with the genre, whose emphasis on voice-over commentary, a problem/solution structure, argumentative logic and evidentiary editing generate a sense of authority over events in history; the observational mode, where the filmmaker does not interact with subjects directly; the participatory mode, which emphasises interaction between filmmakers and their subjects; and the reflexive mode, which draws attention to the

documentary form itself (2017: 22). Of these categories, the docudrama belongs chiefly to the reflexive mode. However, as I have outlined, there are strong expository-mode elements (voice-over, problem/solution structure), which emphasise the reflexive mode in drawing attention to the status of the film as documentary at the same time as a dramatisation of events.

The docudrama, in its adoption of some of the tools of fiction films (script, actors, lighting, setting) (Grodal, 2018: 75), draws attention to how even the expository mode of documentary film employs some of these elements (its voiceover, for instance, will have been scripted and rehearsed). Indeed, as Grodal argues, 'neither docudramas nor documentaries are categories with strictly necessary and sufficient conditions' (2018: 76). Thus, in these varying forms and modes of documentary film and how they interact with fictional films, a sense of the blurring of the lines between different film genres and modes is apparent, which self-reflexively highlights the blurring of the lines between reality and fiction. As outlined in my introduction, in his call for historical poetics Stephen Heath insists that the image is not enough, but that we must know where the image comes from (Heath, 1981: 1). When considering a film's ontology, most people think of a series of images taken close together which when played back give the illusion of motion (Boardman, 2019). This understanding fails, however, to take into consideration other aspects of cinematography other than the camera (the script, costumes, lighting, setting, actors and so on). Nor does this ontological description of film consider the impact of the film industry, finance, technological developments nor the social and cultural mores of the film industry of a given geo-historical setting, nor those of the audience at any given time (Boardman, 2019).

Frank Boardman discusses these issues in relation to film in his essay 'Film Ontology: Extension, Criteria and Candidates' (2019) and argues that there remains no real consensus on what constitutes the term 'film'. Ultimately, for Boardman, there is a difference between a recording, such as that of CCTV footage or a home video, and a film,

which is an artwork (2019). He points to how some films use a security-camera shot for effect, for example, of how this type of footage can overlap and be used as part of a filmic whole; however, Boardman overlooks the intention behind security cameras in the first place (2019). If a security camera is installed at an important building, for instance, this serves the purpose as both a deterrent for would-be invaders, and as a means to record images of anyone attempting to commit a breach of security. The prosecutor of a crime, meanwhile, would find the appropriate section of footage and apply it to a narrative they have constructed to prosecute would-be criminals who have breached security. This apportioning footage to fit a narrative is part of an effect of documentary film Carl Plantiga describes as characterisation (2018: 115). Prosecutors will lean on the authoritative narrative effect of the expository mode of documentary filmmaking to convince their audience that their narrative applies to the historical world, burnishing their theories with subjective characterisation (2018: 115): these pictures show that this person is guilty. This reflects how socialist realism operates in this docudrama format: it provides a depiction of an objective real through the subjective lens of an individual/group directing these images with the desired effect of a supposedly objective, convincing representation of reality.

When making the docudrama *The Clouds Will Roll Away* as their final student film in 1950, the power of this effect was felt keenly by Kachyňa and co-director Jasný. The young filmmakers had to attend meetings with the Arts Council to ensure that the contents of their projects met the requirements of the socialist-realist doctrine of the time (Kachyňa in Liehm, 1968). Ultimately, a tension develops between ideas of the real and the real filtered through a lens of ideology, which the reflexive mode of the documentary in the docudrama format highlights as applicable to the real-life setting for the audience.

While socialist realism was unavoidable as a reality for Kachyňa and Jasný in the 1950s – through the version of socialism doctrinally administered by the authorities – what must also be considered is that, however doctrinally charged, their experience was the real,

lived experience of individuals working under the communist regime. Given that *The Clouds Will Roll Away* involved actors playing out a version of the history of the setting, the film deepens this web of reflexivity and illuminates the ideological forces attached to the film in a metafictional manner. In her work *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Concious Fiction* (London: Routledge, 2013), Patricia Waugh reflects on the overlap between the real, lived world and the constructed world of literary fiction. Waugh writes: 'If our knowledge of this world is now seen to be mediated through language, then literary fiction (worlds constructed entirely of language) becomes a useful model for learning about the construction of "reality" itself' (3). This effect is emphasised in film, where the fictional reality played out by real people is based on the language of a script/screenplay. In film, the real world can be depicted in shots of real settings, characters in films are played by real people, even for films produced entirely in studio settings, that studio remains part of the real world: a place where real people can visit and real people work. The docudrama, then, provides a deepening of the metafictional possibilities surrounding these conditions, where the scripted, rehearsed and acted scenes are supposed to denote real life. Kachyňa has revealed how the version of events reproduced in the film differs from the reality of the stories presented to him and Jasný of the lived experience of residents of this town. This can provide, as Waugh argues, the potential for constructive social criticism (2013: 12), and has the effect of encouraging the demand to know where these images come from, as Heath urges, as part of a historical-poetics approach (1981: 1).

This approach to *The Clouds Will Roll Away* has already been commenced in this chapter: considering the historical and political context, the cultural context, the film-industry context, the directors' background, and the format of the film itself. Another aspect pertinent to an analysis of where the images come from is the setting for this docudrama. In exploring issues surrounding the liminal status of the Sudeten borderland setting, within a narrative exploring a crossing-over into a new political landscape, within the docudrama

hinging the real and fiction, I will also consider an analytical-poetics approach to do with issues regarding space. The self-reflexivity produced in these aspects of *The Clouds Will Roll Away* demonstrate Kachyňa and Jasný's willingness to explore how their own filmmaking environment mirrors the concerns of the characters depicted in their film and, in turn, individuals' experiences in these early years of the communist regime.

Borders

The Sudeten borderlands setting in *The Clouds Will Roll Away* has a blurring effect in terms of the contextual post-war, post-Nazi occupation, post-republic, post-communist *coup* environment. In filmmaking terms, Kachyňa and Jasný are operating as individuals coming from the previous of all of these and operating in their present under the communist regime. The space they occupy as filmmakers and as individuals in this sense is a liminal one. *The Clouds Will Roll Away* does not signify a clean break into communist-era, socialist-realist film, regardless of its adoption of socialist realism and the treatment of the Arts Council in shaping it to meet the needs of the regime.

For Kachyňa and Jasný, the rupturing of the new communist era is an example of an old being replaced by a new order reflective of the plot of *The Clouds Will Roll Away*; however, as I have sought to reinforce throughout this chapter, the new communist era did not symbolise a clean break from what had gone before. This space is what Michel Foucault calls a heterotopia: 'situated on the borders of society, in a liminal position, [heterotopias] reveal the limit of the symbolic' (Foucault, 1998: 178). Kachyňa and Jasný, as both individuals entering the adult, professional age as filmmakers, and as citizens coming from competing, ideologically charged regimes, occupy this heterotopic space in 1950 when making *The Clouds Will Roll Away*. Thus, the apportioning of the Sudeten borderlands for a metafictional docudrama at this early stage of the communist regime provides a platform for a highly sophisticated level of subversion in their film, where apparently fixed borders and parameters meet with a heightened sense of suspicion.

In generating this uncertain, heterotopic space, Kachyňa and Jasný point to the limits not only of socialist-realist cinema as the symbolic of communism, but in doing so self-reflexively question the very ideological foundations behind this doctrine, and to its claims of legitimacy. Indeed, mirroring Kachyňa's lament about the administrators of the Film Artistic Board during the making of *The Clouds Will Roll Away* in his interview with Liehm in 1968, the film depicts inept administrators in the borderland town. These characters represent the previous time, symbols of decadent bourgeois interest, whose vices and self-interest get in the way of progress. While on one level this conforms to a rejection of bourgeois ideals and a promotion of socialist values, the overlap between the historical moment the filmmakers are coming from (1950) and the film's historical setting (1948) generates a sense of uncertainty concerning where this critique is aimed.

Given that the film, made by two agents of the state, was passed by the censors and worked on some level as propaganda, the work offers an important distinction in dealing with Kachyňa. While the work ultimately subscribed to the socialist-realist doctrine in its depiction of the collectivisation of agriculture, he demonstrates at this early stage of his career that he is willing to bend the rules to comply with his own individual style. As the interview with Liehm in 1968 indicates, Kachyňa and Jasný were frustrated with the approval process for the film's script. That this was an ongoing process suggests that compromise was met in reaching the final cut of the film. Through this dynamic of negotiation, they were helping to shape a subversive poetics against the artistic doctrine from within the establishment: this is how Marx argues changes to ideology occur (1964: 36-37), demonstrating the depth of subversion Kachyňa and Jasný were engaged in from this earliest stage of their respective careers. This template for subversion is a theme I will return to later in dealing with Kachyňa's 1960s works in relation to other Czechoslovak filmmakers of that time. His works from the outset resist binary definitions such as pro- or anti-regime and, as such, contribute a great deal to the discursiveness of Czechoslovak film produced under the

communist regime. This analytical-poetics approach to Kachyňa's work also offers one answer to the question of how he was able to make films throughout the regime that were never fully submissive to socialist-realist propaganda.

Army Film and Czechoslovak Film Culture

As Alice Lovejoy argues, it is important to view the foundations of the nationalised Czechoslovak film industry as lying outside the Cold War framework; this was a film culture wrapped up in deep-rooted and complex political and geographical foundations which made it 'never fully united in purpose and practice, but rather defined by competition, contradictions, and negotiation' (2015: 54). An understanding of Czechoslovakia as a nation in flux, negotiating these competing and contradictory ideologies from East and West, is borne out in the formative months of the nationalised film industry. Army Film, in its intrinsic connection to the reorganised military, was no exception.

The implications of Kachyňa's contribution to Army Film in *Crooked Mirror* (1957) emphasise this and, despite the frustrations with the machinations of the industry in his earliest works, as Petr Szczepanik suggests, the Sovietisation of the film industry occurred gradually (in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 77). Shortly after Kachyňa had graduated from FAMU, in the years 1953-1956, Jiří Knapík describes a cultural 'thaw' in Czechoslovakia that occurred after the deaths of Stalin and KSČ leader Klement Gottwald, both in March 1953. These deaths provided 'important stimuli' for a change in direction in Czechoslovak cinema (Knapík, 2015: 51). With the de-centralising process in Czechoslovak film from 1956, including the dissolution of Czechoslovak State Film (*Československý státní film*, ČSF) by 1957, this move away from a centrally defined culture within film gained pace. These developments occurred in tandem with the 1956 Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in which the critique of the 'personality cult' in the wake of

Stalin's death began to expose the criminality of the system (Knapik, 2015: 56).[19] Yet, as Knapík points out, the moves towards realising the decentralising goals 'cannot be automatically associated with an ideological liberalization of the cultural sphere' (2015: 59). As outlined previously, administrative measures remained in place to slow down any revisionist approach to filmmaking in Czechoslovakia following the deaths of Stalin and Gottwald (Knapik in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 59).

The espionage theme of Kachyňa's *It All Ends Tonight* (1954), therefore, is extremely potent, especially given the sympathetic angle towards even a guilty party in the film, which I will explore in more detail in my next chapter. While the collective prevails in the end, the subtlety of Kachyňa's critique demonstrates a precedent for getting away with a degree of subversion in contrast to the plight of Kadár and Klos. The apparent retention of socialist realism in Kachyňa's *It All Ends Tonight* allowed him to continue to push the boundaries with regards to what was acceptable, without following some of his artistic contemporaries into a complete *disarmament*.

***It All Ends Tonight* (1954) and *Crooked Mirror* (1957)**

Kachyňa and Jasný co-directed their first fully scripted, fictional feature film *It All Ends Tonight* in 1954 for the Czechoslovak Army Film studio, not long after the deaths of Stalin and Gottwald had commenced a loosening of the grip of the socialist-realist doctrine in Czechoslovak culture. A soldier, Milan (Josef Vinklář), falls in love with a woman, Helena (Eva Kubešová), discovers she is a spy by the name of Irena Vágnerová and, rather than allow his feelings for her to cloud his judgement, the soldier helps to uncover her plot with the elusive spy Krejza (Vlastimil Brodský). In socialist-realist terms, the plot line supports the goal of protecting the revolutionary aims of socialism at all costs. However, as Jasný points out, the deeper focus in the film on Milan's psychological journey produces a sense

[19] Robin Bates describes this meeting, along with the twelfth Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in December 1962, as helping to usher in the 'de-Stalinization' period in Czechoslovakia (Bates, 1977: 37).

of dubiety, with his apparent hesitancy to carry out his duty (in Willoughby, 2008). Jasný described the film as not being a detective film 'in the true sense of the word', rather that it is a 'psychologically deepened story with a spy base' (in Willoughby, 2008). That psychology deepens the story, for Jasný, points to the focus on the individual in the film, with the spy base providing the drama in the plot. Thus, rather than being a socialist-realist work promoting the success of the collective against the malignant subterfuge of a splinter cell (reflective of the plot of *The Clouds Will Roll Away*), the film explores the individuals ensconced within a narrative along these set lines of good versus evil. Milan, through his relationship with Irena Vágnerová and vice versa, offers a complex account of an individual's actions within this polarised culture that rejects the binarisms upheld by socialist realism.

In the opening scenes of the film, while the couple's romance blooms, Milan is at odds with his military duties: he is often on the receiving end of tirades from his commanding officer, Sergeant Karel Haluza (Otto Lackovič), and is more interested in singing in the group choir and seeking out girls than his role in the army. While the socialist-realist goals are met in that Milan satisfies the needs of his officers in uncovering the spy plot, his means of achieving this are met through a web of dishonesty. Firstly, Milan goes against the rules by leaving the barracks at night to go after Helena. After kissing her, he returns to the barracks in upbeat spirits, before lying to his comrades about being ill in order to get out of choir rehearsals. Milan returns to Helena's apartment, where she lies to him about her accomplice Krejza (who in the scene is hiding out in her room), whom she claims is blackmailing her to get a photograph of Milan's corps. Milan leaves in far meaner spirits after discovering that she is engaged in an espionage plot, and after much deliberation decides to tell his comrades. When Sergeant Haluza is informed, he springs into action and assembles a search party to apprehend the spies.

At this stage, it is unsure whether Milan believes Helena's cover story but, regardless, he follows his commanding officer's orders and aids the search for the fugitives. They catch and kill Krejza and they apprehend Helena, at which point the close-up of Milan's face projects a sense of doubt, which casts Milan as a failure as a double agent in this scenario. Allan Hepburn discusses the reading of sex and romance in spy narratives as a demonstration of the male spy's inoculation to sentiment (Hepburn, 2005: 14-15). Love, Hepburn argues, is a weakness for the male spy; sex, a betrayal (*Ibid*.) Thus, Milan's commitment to the objective of his military duty is compromised by his romantic involvement with the enemy. As Jasný argued, this was not meant as a simple spy film, but as a psychological exploration: did Irena, alias Helena, get her comeuppance? Does Milan still see something eminently human in his love interest, despite the dehumanising effect of her fate being sealed by her assailants? Did Milan do the right thing by his comrades? Was his heart really in halting the spy plot? And what means led to his discovery of the plot? Was he not breaking the rules in the first place to put himself in the position to discover it? Socialist realism's answer to these questions, as reinforced by the censors' approval of the film, is that so long as the spies are apprehended, the commanding officers will look favourably on Milan for his role in the operation and ignore any of these questions.

In a deepening of this reflexive web, the viewer can make of this underlying doubt a sense that not everything is straightforward in this good-overcomes-evil plot. What this suggests about the filmmakers is a denial of a full endorsement of socialist realism. Kachyňa and Jasný mirror Milan in their arbitrary carrying-out of their duty, and offer an ironically self-reflexive suggestion that they doubt the sincerity of their own actions as socialist-realist filmmakers. The film is propagandist in nature but the lack of assuredness blurs the lines for the viewer. On reflection, a summary of the plot could be: a soldier at odds with his military duties who, through a pathway of deceit, accidently uncovers an espionage plot and helps his comrades to apprehend the spies. The irony of this outcome stops short of producing a

comic effect in the tragedy of Irena Vágnerová's fate, yet the potential for comic satire is explored in Kachyňa's short film *Crooked Mirror* (1957).

The ironic military plot is reflected in Kachyňa's real-life military service and is reinforced in his other contribution to Czechoslovak Army Film, *Crooked Mirror*, a satirical short about the expectations of how a Czechoslovak soldier should conduct himself in public. Kachyňa performed the serious duty of military service by making films to serve the pedagogical and propagandist goals of the socialist system. Making a film in this context, with an actor (a young Vladimír Menšík) also carrying out his military service in the role of playing at being a soldier, is another ironically self-reflexive nod to the process at play. Kachyňa is playing with the expectations of the audience of Army Film (almost exclusively real soldiers) in terms of their anticipation surrounding an instructive film on how they should behave.

The uncanniness of films critical of the state produced by figures working for the state is reflected in the role of the Army Film studios in Czechoslovakia, which operated from 1928 until 1968. As Alice Lovejoy argues, the 1940s-1950s Czechoslovak films pertaining to the early communist years are often perceived in opposition to the modernist poetics of the 1930s and the 1960s and the New Wave (2015: 54). Their poetics, however, do not necessarily align with a rigid adoption of socialist realism in line with the Sovietisation of culture. The comic nature of *Crooked Mirror* generates a metafictional effect: if the intention is to instruct soldiers on how to behave and Kachyňa does so using a comic, satirical method, then the effect on the viewer is to diminish the seriousness of their role in the military. This example demonstrates Kachyňa acting as double agent in the role of filmmaker himself. Having infiltrated the institution of the armed forces through the medium of film, he projects a subversive message that has the effect of disrupting the ideological process at play and demonstrates his own graduation from student filmmaker to, literally, teacher.

During the early 1950s, Kachyňa represented the student under the state-controlled film industry whose job was to reflect and recycle into culture the goals of socialist realism. The concept of heterotopias, however, highlights how this mirroring produces a false conception of real objects in space. The real in the sense of socialist-realist art is projected out (literally via the film projector), but the image is skewed in some way (as it appears on the screen). Thus, despite the adoption of socialist realism, Kachyňa's metafictionality makes his films a kind of crooked mirror in this sense, where the image of socialist realism appears distorted: an effect that lays the foundations for subversion within this genre. Wrapped up in this, however, is Kachyňa's own defence against the censors, which doubles as the basis for critics dismissing these earlier works. In Marxist criticism, good art 'challenges' the ideological assumptions of its time (Eagleton, 1976: 17), whereas naïve art merely reproduces ideologies without questioning them (Hepburn, 2005: 21). For Hepburn, 'the critical tendency to read texts for subversion prevents critics from seeing encoded messages of repression and conservatism' (Hepburn, 2005: 21). Viceníková's dismissal of Kachyňa's 1950s works for their adoption of socialist realism, then, reflects the attitude of the film boards who passed them as acceptable for this very reason. Thus, what appears to be the unquestioning projection of socialist realism in Kachyňa's 1950s works is actually the basis for the subversion which sets them apart. Furthermore, the temptation to dismiss the documentary as propagandist or spy genre as formulaic and relatively unserious is another way of ignoring its ideological material, an effect that was not lost on Kachyňa. The adoption of acceptable genres would be a technique Kachyňa would return to throughout his career as a means for distancing his work from the attentions of censorship, particularly in the following decade and during the New Wave, as I will explore in this thesis. Ultimately, however, as will be discussed in relation to *The Last Butterfly* (*Poslední motýl*, 1990) in my final chapter, the danger in this approach is that the subversive message is lost behind the façade of appeasing the authorities.

This example demonstrates how notions of individuals accepting the regime by playing their part within it do not necessarily equate to their adoption of the mores of socialist realism. As the above examples of criticism show, this works both ways: while there is a common perception of the New Wave filmmakers as subversive, there is a suspicion of Kachyňa's 1950s works and post-1968 works as safe and even as emblems of propagandist material. However, what *It All Ends Tonight* and *Crooked Mirror* reinforce is that simply by participating in Army Film in order to carry out his military service, Kachyňa was not necessarily acting as a mere mouthpiece for the regime. Conversely, the comical nature of the material has the effect of calling into question the seriousness of his subject matter: that of how a soldier should behave. The soldiers watching this instructional film are compelled to call into question the seriousness of the role they are performing in another superstructure producing ideology under the regime.

Perhaps *It All Ends Tonight* offers a less humorous version of that edict. What is clear, however, is that the individual can find themselves at odds with their environment and yet still be pragmatic enough to negotiate that environment. This generates nuance with regards to how Kachyňa's filmmaking of the 1950s and post-1968 can be regarded. Rather than dwell on suspicions to do with complicity with the regime, it will be more useful to consider how Kachyňa managed to balance pragmatism towards the strictures of the regime against his own artistic goals. In *It All Ends Tonight*, the filmmakers attempt to strike a balance between toeing the party line and offering a level of critique towards what they are witnessing around them, and in so doing lay a template from within the institution of the film industry for how to achieve this. While the collective prevails in the end according to socialist-realist convention, the subtlety of Kachyňa and Jasný's critique demonstrates a precedent for getting away with a degree of subversion in contrast to the plight of Kadár and Klos into a complete *disarmament*, a condition Kachyňa would later experience in his career towards the end of the 1960s.

***Smugglers of Death* (1959)**

Kadár and Klos's expulsions from the film industry lasted from 1959, the same year Kachyňa released *Smugglers of Death*, until 1963, the generally accepted starting-point for the New Wave. Radomír Kokeš provides an in-depth analysis of *Smugglers of Death* (1959) in 'Poetical Dissonance: Smugglers of Death' ('*Poetika disonance: Král Šumavy*', 2015). The film narrative follows the infamous border guards during the Sudeten Movement expulsions in Bohemia after World War II (Jelinek, 1993: 123). The plight of the guards, dubbed the kings of the Šumava Forest on account of their control over people-smuggling from East to West (Kokeš, 2015), subscribes to socialist realism in its promotion of the protection of socialist territories from the contagion of the West. Kokeš concludes that, while the film marks a continuation of Kachyňa's image style, it is 'fundamentally different' to his previous works in how it connects 'narrative, stylistic and thematic means of the whole' (Kokeš, 2015). The central factor that marks this distinction for Kokeš is the effect of cognitive dissonance, produced when an individual is forced to do something that goes against their beliefs (Festinger, 1962). However, this is precisely the effect I have argued is produced in the self-reflexivity of even his earliest works with Jasný.

Furthermore, rather than being a new effect in *Smugglers of Death*, the cognitive dissonance produced in the narrative comes from several familiar sources, as Kokeš identifies. Kokeš points to the overlapping of the production of socialist realism through the telling of a historical narrative (reflected in *It All Ends Tonight* and *The Clouds Will Roll Away*) and the context of the borderlands and how the everyday is woven into the fabric of classical storytelling (the effect produced by docudrama (Grodal, 2018: 75)). This demonstrates, for Kokeš, the development of 'self-conscious stylistic practices' (2015); however, this is exactly the effect I have argued Kachyňa had been producing from the outset of his career. Thus, both Viceníková and Kokeš overlook the self-reflexivity of

Kachyňa's work throughout the 1950s and its potential for having helped to set a template for challenging socialist realism in film.[20]

Kachyňa accepts that he and Jasný ultimately assented to the recommendations of the Arts Council over the scripting of their early docudrama *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (in Liehm, 1968: 106), but Kachyňa insists that the experience was chastening and therefore represents an example of cognitive dissonance very early in his career (*Ibid*.). There was clearly more to the film than just a full acceptance of the socialist-realist doctrine. The role of the protagonist, the farm manager who is brought in to the Sudeten village to implement the collectivisation of farmlands, reflects that of the filmmakers themselves, whose job is to implement the doctrine of socialist realism through the persuasive format of the documentary. The borderland setting, and the historical setting which invokes unprecedented flux, reflects the socio-political and cultural fluctuation surrounding the filmmakers, who themselves had experienced liberation from the Nazi occupation, the nationalisation of the film industry, the communist revolution and were now taking their first steps in their filmmaking careers at that time. While the docudrama delivers the socialist-realist message in a positive manner, instances of reflexivity, in particular in relation to the inept administrators of the town, aligned with the uncertainty over borders, generate a sense of hesitancy and doubt in its delivery.

In this chapter, I have set out the film-industry conditions surrounding Karel Kachyňa on his entry into professional filmmaking. By exploring the foundations of the nationalised film industry following the Nazi occupation in 1945, I have sought to demonstrate how ideas of this status should not be conflated with the onset of the communist regime from 1948, three years later. Instead, this overlap is reflective of other

[20] Elsewhere, in his essay 'Subjectivism, Uncertainty and Individuality: Munk's *Człowiek na torze*/*Man on the Tracks* (1956) and its Influence On the Czechoslovak New Wave' (2011), César Ballester argues that Andrzej Munk was a 'forerunner in challenging the aesthetics of socialist realism' in the Czechoslovak context (61), with no mention anywhere in his essay of Karel Kachyňa having contributed to this.

overlaps in Czechoslovak culture that help to generate a liminal space that Kachyňa, who lived through the interwar republic years, the Nazi occupation, liberation of the republic after World War II and into the communist era, occupied at the outset of his career. Rather than accept the prevailing critical reception to his earliest works as propagandist in their adoption of the state-sanctioned artistic doctrine of socialist realism (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003), I have sought to emphasise how Kachyňa managed to challenge socialist realism in his 1950s works. The period of flux Kachyňa was experiencing at the outset of his career is reflected in his earliest films. From the hesitant depiction of the implementation of the collectivisation of agriculture in *The Clouds Will Roll Away* to the equally metafictional approach to his Army Film short *Crooked Mirror*, Kachyňa was able to manipulate his depiction of socialist realism in a subversive manner. Likewise, the use of the docudrama format and of borderland settings helped to invoke the upheaval of the time, from the series of political and regime-changes to the ethnic and nationalistic issues surrounding the Sudeten Movement following the Nazis' defeat.

In assessing this first decade of Kachyňa's career, I have implemented a historical-poetics approach that provides a formidable challenge to the reception of his 1959 film *Smugglers of Death*, described by Dora Viceníková as symbolic of socialist realism (in *Kinoeye,* 2003). Taking into account the use of the borderlands setting, the army theme and the apathy of individuals within that institution, the hesitancy generated in the double-agent genre, and the focus on the individual acting under extreme circumstances, I have posited that there is a deeply subversive strand to this work that I will argue is reflective of Kachyňa's later career.

In the next chapter, I will explore the ideological foundations of the Czechoslovak New Wave of the 1960s. While Kachyňa's 1950s works have tended to be treated as propagandist films for the regime, I hope to have highlighted instances of reflexivity in his works of that demonstrate how he helped to set a template for the New Wave. I will explore

another key emergence in his treatment of genre in developing the theme of cognitive dissonance in the face of working under the regime.

CHAPTER TWO: FROM THE FIRST WAVE

In my introduction, I quoted Karel Kachyňa from 1990 where he downplays the seriousness of his films in the context of periods of major socio-political upheaval in people's lives in a litotic, disarming fashion (Fisher, 1990, No. 741). This was an attitude towards films that I will argue filmmakers exploited during the 1960s in Czechoslovakia in their challenge to the stasis of socialist realism in cinema. Miloš Forman, whose *Black Peter* (*Černý Petr*, 1963) is considered to have been one of the New Wave forerunners (Hames, 1985: 92), has argued that in making ironic comedies during that decade, for instance, he was largely ignored by the censors. Reflecting on how the authorities reacted to his satirical *The Firemen's Ball* (*Hoří, má panenko*, 1967), Forman says: 'I was lucky because they would go: "It's a comedy, nothing serious"' (in Pawlikowski, 1990, 00:17.57). Forman acknowledges that this misconception of his subversive work was fortunate in that he was able to get away with pointed criticism of the regime behind the veil of comedy.

Šárka Sladovníková argues that some of the films engaging with the Holocaust of the Czechoslovak New Wave (a period she marks as 1959-1969) engage with the theme in the form of 'dark comedy' (2018: 58). Peter Hames, meanwhile, devotes an entire chapter to the theme of 'comedy' in his book *Czech and Slovak Cinema: Theme and Tradition* (2009: pp 32-54), where he describes the genre as 'prominent' in the Czechoslovak context (2009: 32). František Daniel, in his essay 'The Czech Difference', argues that irony and satire as the chief weapons in the Czech literary arsenal became 'ingrained in the Czech psychology and artistic imagination' (in Paul, 1983: 53). By deploying a genre considered safe by the authorities, then, filmmakers were able to achieve a greater level of subversion through covert means via a cultural trend that aligned with Czech cultural identity.

In the previous chapter, I demonstrated how Kachyňa had set the template for a subversive approach through the application of the accepted mode of socialist realism in

his films of the 1950s. This was achieved through an ironically self-reflexive approach to the pedagogical nature of his early docudrama *The Clouds Will Roll Away* (1950), his ironic contributions to Army Film in *It All Ends Tonight* (1954) and *Crooked Mirror* (1957), and his subversive application of another genre taken less seriously, the spy genre, in both *It All Ends Tonight* and *Smugglers of Death* (1959). In the latter case, I have demonstrated how the spy genre is not merely naïve art that reproduces ideology without question (Hepburn, 2005: 21), but in its intrinsically dichotomised, double-agent nature offers space for subversion through its application. Thus, even *Smugglers of Death*, considered a totem of socialist realism (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003), has the ability to produce deeply subversive effects.

The blurring effect produced in these examples stems from the ambiguity of the docudrama *The Clouds Will Roll Away* and its challenging of the structures of the institution of film under the regime, offering a template for subversion within an oppressively state-sanctioned industry. The effect I have argued produced by these films is the invocation of a marginal space that reflected the socio-political and cultural upheaval of the post-war, post-communist *coup* era for filmmakers in Czechoslovakia in the early 1950s. Moving into the 1960s, then, a decade that would produce the 'Czechoslovak Film Miracle' (Owen, 2011: 2), Kachyňa continued to direct as a sole director. From 1961 onwards, however, he began a decade-long collaboration with screenplay writer Jan Procházka that would help to define his work of that decade in their anticipation of and contribution to the Czechoslovak New Wave.

The Foundations of the Czechoslovak New Wave

Critics tend to single out three factors responsible for the inception of the Czechoslovak New Wave: the nationalisation of the film industry (which, occurring in 1945, I have outlined was not necessarily a communist idea), the establishment of the film school at Charles University in Prague (FAMU), and the de-Stalinisation policies in Czechoslovakia

in the 1960s (Bates, 1977: 37). On the first point, while there were many challenges surrounding the bureaucratic element to the nationalised film industry Kachyňa began working in during the 1950s, the freedom with regards to a reduction in the necessity for commercial success was keenly felt by filmmakers, especially during the 1960s.[21] For Jiří Menzel, whose *Closely Observed Trains* (*Ostře sledované vlaky*, 1966) won the Academy Award for best foreign film, the 1960s was his preferred period (in Buchar, 2004: 38). In an interview published in Robert Buchar's *Czech New Wave Filmmakers in Interviews* (2004), Menzel describes the 1960s as an ideal time and atmosphere to make films, despite the pressure from the authorities (38). Elsewhere, Peter Hames quotes Jan Švankmajer as stating that the 1960s was a 'time when art had a tangible effect on social and political development' (in Mazierska and Kristensen, 2014: 147). This combination of filmmakers enjoying the freedoms of the nationalised film industry at the same time as finding ways to challenge the political structures hampering their creativity may have been emphasised during the 1960s, but is also a reflection of the process Kachyňa had been performing since the 1950s.

This overlap of New Wave themes of the 1960s and what Kachyňa had been doing in the previous decade is indicative of a slight generational difference between Kachyňa and the New Wave filmmakers who emerged and came to the fore in the 1960s; this is also an element relating to the second point from Bates concerning the film school, FAMU. Of the graduates from the film school in Prague, the filmmakers to emerge during the 1960s remain the foremost in Czech culture; however, Forman describes what prompted a wave

[21] Antonie Doležalová and Hana Moravcová explore the move from private enterprise to a state-run institution in Czechoslovak film from 1918-1945 in their work 'Czechoslovak Film Industry on the Way from Private Business to Public Good (1918-1945)' (April 26, 2020) in *Business History* [Online] Available at: https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/10.1080/00076791.2020.1751822. Reflecting on the template for a state-run industry during the Nazi occupation, their study examines the narrative surrounding the state involvement in the film business and the structure and effects of the government subsidies to the film production. The study shows the growing awareness of the ability for film to influence a national consciousness through propaganda, while the increasing level of state intervention led to the rapid completion of the monopolisation of the industry by the state.

of films that questioned the regime during the decade. In Pawel Pawlikowski's BBC documentary *The Kids From FAMU* (1990), Forman says: 'We were reacting to the bad films [of the 1950s]. Our provocation wasn't to follow but to destroy the lies, the empty film of Czechoslovakia in that era. I didn't care about the story or plot in my early films, I just wanted to bring real faces, real human behaviour to the screen' (00:09.45). Clearly, Forman was frustrated with the depiction of reality through the lens of socialist realism, a frustration I have argued Kachyňa shared during the previous decade.

Ivan Passer, another filmmaker who came to prominence during the New Wave, echoes Forman's frustrations. Passer says: 'We are actually posing questions: "What is reality?", "What does it mean to fall in love?" or, "What does it mean to have some dream?" It was a search for very simple things because they were all deformed' (in Pawlikowski, 1990: 00:12.02). This is reflective of the themes of Kachyňa's 1950s works: the crooked mirror where reflections of reality appear skewed. These are frustrations about the depiction of the real in socialist realism I have argued Kachyňa grappled with in the 1950s, with Passer describing this depiction of reality as 'deformed' (*Ibid*.).

While the likes of Forman, Věra Chytilová, Passer, Menzel, Jaromil Jireš, Jan Němec, Evald Schorm, Pavel Juráček and Jan Schmidt were emerging filmmakers propelling the New Wave in the 1960s (Hames, 1985), the older generation, which included Kachyňa, also took part: František Vláčil, Štefan Uher, Vojtěch Jasný, as well as Jan Kadár and Elmar Klos, all contributed significantly (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003). These filmmakers are described by Dora Viceníková as belonging to 'Generation 1957': 'The First Generation of FAMU' (2003), whose 'new aesthetic' challenged the stasis of socialist realism (*Ibid*.). Viceníková argues that while most of the proponents of 'Generation 57' emerged in the latter half of the 1950s, their 'best creative period' came during the 1960s, and that these artists 'sowed the seeds' for the New Wave (2003).

Furthermore, the crossover of different generational voices, for Viceníková, generated a 'marvellously homogenous stream' in a variety of styles and aims during the 1960s (2003).

Peter Hames acknowledges that Kachyňa, along with other FAMU alumni from the 1950s, helped 'pave the way' for the New Wave as part of what he terms a 'first wave' (Hames, 1985: 35). However, Hames describes Kachyňa's relationship with the development of the New Wave as 'somewhat ambiguous' *(Ibid*.). Hames argues that Kachyňa's 'preoccupation' with 'surface stylistics' was a factor in allowing him to work before, during and after the New Wave relatively unhindered as opposed to other filmmakers of the movement, merely joining in with the New Wave 'when it was in full swing' (Hames, 1985: 80). Hames argues that his apparent preoccupation with stylistics was a consequence of having started out in the photography department at FAMU (1985: 80-81), a point echoed by Viceníková who states that this background influenced his 'feeling for composition', which permeates through his entire career (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003). However, according to Viceníková's position that overlapping ages, experiences and styles generated a homogenous stream in a variety of directions during the New Wave, this emphasis on stylistics should be regarded as a layer enriching the New Wave with another approach (*Ibid*.). For Viceníková, the New Wave was a 'multi-generational phenomenon that saw both new and established directors making pioneering films in a variety of styles with a variety of aims' (2003). Furthermore, Hames also acknowledges that Kachyňa was a prolific filmmaker (1985: 81). This commitment to making films ironically demonstrates what his real preoccupation was. The question over any ambiguity surrounding Kachyňa's style in relation to the New Wave serves to represent the space he occupied within the filmmaking culture of the 1960s: a liminal space, which I have argued is reflected and emphasised in Kachyňa's work.

On Bates' final point, concerning the de-Stalinisation of culture (Bates, 1977: 37; Ferretter, 2016: 29), again there is a blurring of the lines in the treatment of humanism in

Marxist thinking which I explored in the previous chapter (Ferretter, 2016: 29). While the deaths of Stalin and Gottwald precipitated a de-centralising, de-Stalinisation of culture in Czechoslovakia, this did not occur pervasively nor quickly (Szczepanik in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 77). Also, the rise of Marxist humanism across western Europe following the publication Marx's *1844 Manuscripts* in 1932 was not reflected in Czechoslovak culture after the communist *coup* of 1948, where an alignment with the Stalinist model meant humanism was a revisionist approach opposed by the authorities (Szczepanik in Karl & Skopal, 2015: 77). Peter Hames' criticism of Kachyňa focuses almost exclusively on his 1960s work, introducing the argument that his early works of that decade 'attempted broad humanist subjects but became progressively more critical' (2009: 79). Given the implications of the term 'humanist' explored in the previous chapter to do with Marxism, and its rejection as revisionism under Stalinism, this criticism overlooks how this demonstrates an alignment with the de-Stalinisation of culture in the early 1960s, which is one of the underpinning factors Bates outlines led to the New Wave movement.

In this chapter, I will explore Kachyňa's humanist approach through the plight of children in coming-of-age narratives in *Suffering* (*Trápení*, 1961) and *Long Live the Republic* (*Ať žije republika*, 1965) as metaphors for those considered to be on the fringes of society as a means to deflect from direct criticism of the regime. In its similarity to how Forman deployed the ironic comedic mode to deflect from censorship, this both reflects the means Kachyňa developed for generating subversion in the 1950s and helps to set the template for the New Wave and its approach to subversion. This is also the reason I have selected two films which hinge the onset of the New Wave in 1963, to demonstrate how Kachyňa's early 1960s works connect with his works belonging to the New Wave period with less of a departure than can be suggested in the criticism I have mentioned.

The New Wave did not appear from nowhere, as Bates' exploration of its ideological foundations supports. Kachyňa was a key contributor to the foundational

aspects of this movement in terms of his early entry into the nationalised industry, his attending FAMU and his experiences of the ideological pressures from the Arts Council that influenced his studentship. In this chapter, I will analyse how his new collaboration with Jan Procházka from the beginning of the 1960s marked a significant change in direction in his filmmaking. From generating subversion through a deployment of socialist realism that focuses on individuals' experiences under the trappings of totalitarian structures, as opposed to a simple promotion of the value of the collective, Kachyňa takes this humanist approach into his 1960s works with Procházka in a trajectory towards the more liberal mores of the New Wave. Indeed, this focus on the individual within a humanist poetics is the fulcrum of Kachyňa's career and his work with Procházka during the 1960s set the tone for the rest of his career during the regime. The child's perspective, for example, in *Suffering* and *Long Live the Republic* reflects the distancing technique of the application of socialist realism in the 1950s, but the latter film's treatment of the historical narrative provides another layer of subversion through this covert methodology.

Kachyňa's place as both a great influence and as a key proponent of the movement is not fully assured, however; critics point to his 1950s works as propagandist and to his early 1960s works as generally unserious (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003; Hames, 1985: 80), and the result is a suspicion surrounding Kachyňa's credentials in terms of the 1960s movement. In other criticism of Kachyňa's works of that decade, Mira Liehm and Antonín J. Liehm point to Procházka's position within the Party as allowing them to get away with more than most (1977: 291).[22] Peter Hames describes Procházka as a kind of 'poet laureate' of the decade with a 'self-appointed task of enlightening the establishment' (1985: 81), and Hames acknowledges that this association with leadership in the Party led to a somewhat dismissive attitude towards Kachyňa and Procházka (Hames, 1985: 81).

[22] Jan Procházka was a member of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and friend of President Antonín Novotný

However, as I have sought to demonstrate through engagement with Marx on the development of ideology, this insider status allowed Kachyňa and Procházka to directly affect ideological change within the superstructure of the state through the institution of film.

Kachyňa certainly was aware of his in-between status in relation to his contemporaries, which suggests an awareness on his part of this ability to precipitate real change from within. In his interview in the summer of 1968 with Antonín J. Liehm, Kachyňa reflects on this, but also evinces on the difficulty for his peers to accept this proximity to leadership. The transcript reads:

> KACHYŇA: Another difficult circumstance was the attitude of film critics toward me, toward the two of us [Procházka]; they categorized us in advance, isolated us from the larger, main group. I can't help feeling that this attitude wasn't based on our films as such, on an evaluation of our work, but on broader political and artistic considerations. Or at least that these things played a role in their attitude.
> LIEHM: You must admit that you are an unusual figure among the leading Czechoslovak directors of recent years, and among your own generation. You never went against the wave that broke here in the sixties, but then you never were a part of [106] it either. You just went your way, which was a little different from that of all the rest…[110] I have tried to imply that the distance between you and the majority was not just the circumstances that you mention, but also a difference in poetics.
> KACHYŇA: When I think about all our lives in film over the past twenty years, I get the impression that the path we took was unnecessarily tortuous and complicated. That was probably because it led through a maze in which we not only had the problem of disorientation, but also of constantly emerging obstacles; we kept running into walls which we literally had to break down in order to move forward (Liehm, 1974).

In this exchange, Liehm argues that Kachyňa was separated from his New Wave contemporaries because of his poetical approach. This was the case, but only in reference to what Kachyňa says in response. Rather than meet obstacles head-on at every step during the period, Kachyňa manouevered his work via the distancing techniques that I have set out, and through his esteemed position in relation to the authorities through his association with Central Committee member Procházka. Liehm takes this as having had a diminishing effect on Kachyňa's work; I will argue that the opposite was the case. By avoiding direct

conflict with the authorities, Kachyňa was able to contribute more to culture for a sustained period during the New Wave and beyond.

Kachyňa, however, describes the issues surrounding his association with Procházka – on the one hand, his access provided certain privileges with the authorities, but he acknowledges the knock-on effect of exclusion from his peers and a suspicion from critics (in Liehm, 1974: 106). When considering Marx's definition of base structures and superstructures in the generation of ideology (Marx: 1976), however, this places Kachyňa and Procházka in an influential position with regards to the production of ideology through the institution of film. Indeed, in order to produce any meaningful change, Marx's theory suggests that change must be instigated from within institutions rather than through attacks upon them from the outside (*Ibid*.). Given the stringent levels of censorship even during the more liberal 1960s, it is clear that in order to present subversion in a meaningful way (i.e. where audiences have the chance to view the work), a level of compromise was required on the part of subversive filmmakers. This is a skill I will argue Kachyňa and Procházka applied but which they pushed too far as the decade wore on. Liehm, too, recognises that Kachyňa neither went against nor was fully part of the New Wave movement, to which Kachyňa points to problems facing filmmakers with regards to ideological barriers, a direction he admits was 'unnecessarily tortuous and complicated' (in Liehm, 1974). Thus, while Procházka afforded Kachyňa a level of leniency with the authorities through his position on the Central Committee, it was the bureaucratic barriers he so opposed in the 1950s that still hindered his artistic freedom in the 1960s, and indeed caused his exclusion from his peers.

The outcome, in his earlier 1960s works, was films which involved a level of compromise but were nonetheless of artistic value. Kachyňa states:

> A person tries to find his modus vivendi in art, a space in which he can work, and do what he would like to do. Initially, the area that offered itself was one of fairly general subject matter in which you wouldn't run up against too many obstacles.

> This includes some of the films that Jan Procházka and I did together, including *The Stress of Youth* [*Suffering*] and *The High Wall* – general humanistic ideas with a strongly lyrical note. A person at least had the satisfaction of having created an artistic picture, on a small scale. But even this ran up against opposition: *The Stress of Youth* was labelled 'formalistic' by the Central Committee of the Party; and when scripts were being approved in the spring of 1961, it was classified as a 'film suitable for recruiting young people into agriculture' (in Liehm, 1974).

Kachyňa echoes Hames' criticism regarding the adoption of humanist themes in these early 1960s works, but Kachyňa was attempting to negotiate the complex structures precluding his ability to 'do what he would like to do' (in Liehm, 1974). While the idea of concessionary treatment is regarded with suspicion, in a separate interview with Antonín Liehm in 1968 Kachyňa admits that, while Procházka had a mutual respect for then President Antonín Novotný, he did not always hold the national leader in the same esteem (Liehm, 1974: 107-108). Ironically, in terms of his treatment from his peers as an insider with the political elite, Kachyňa shows how he also felt like an outsider in this political context. In an almost self-fulfilling manner, this only serves to highlight how Kachyňa reflects the Czechoslovak New Wave: a movement resisting the strictures of the regime whose proponents were employees for the very state apparatuses in question.

The overlap between the cultural and the political is interminable in this approach to Kachyňa's work during the 1960s. His connection to the political establishment excludes his work from a full embracement from the New Wave fraternity, while his subversive works and attitude to political leaders excludes him from the political elite. Ironically, it was the use of the child's perspective, and the apparent political naivety afforded by that genre (Liehm & Liehm, 1977: 291), that allowed Kachyňa to provide this covertly subversive approach from the beginning of the 1960s, before the New Wave's inception. While his adoption of this narrative technique meant that his works would be sidelined to some extent by contemporaries and critics (Liehm, 1974, 1978; Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003; Hames, 1985), it also demonstrates a technique for getting away with a

more subversive approach. By exploring how the child's narrative functions in his works, in particular how it is used to confront adult themes and its pedagogical function towards adults, an appreciation of the subversive quality of Kachyňa's early 1960s works can be found.

The Child's Narrative

Adriana Benzaquen argues that, in literature, 'children have been on the receiving end of a project of knowledge production in which the positions of subject and object (adult and child) are painstakingly and hierarchically fixed' (2001: 34). Benzaquen discusses the 'risks' involved when adults 'seize' the place of subject in discourse about the child (2001: 35). This language of appropriation lends itself to a feminist/postcolonial discourse reflective of the Sovietisation of Czechoslovak culture that had been developing during the 1950s and reinforced through socialist realism. Benzaquen argues that, in modern societies, 'the child' is a 'double figure: an object known by various disciplines and made to participate in social and cultural institutions', but also a pervasive image in the adult imagination (2001: 35). The subject/object dynamic between adult and child is reflective of the pedagogical function of socialist-realist art, a feature that was exploited by the several communist authorities in the Soviet Bloc as the original definition imposed by Stalin and his acolytes demonstrates (Volkov, 2004: 19). Filmmakers working for the state are subjects of socialist knowledge whose works impart that knowledge onto an audience in a self-perpetuating manner.

The figure of the child in this context, then, becomes a self-reflexive device. The child actor is also performing the role of delivering socialist-realist knowledge to their audience from the position of the filmmaking institution. Following Benzaquen's argument, this is an example of the child participating in social and cultural institutions, but also as an image (through their character) of the adult (filmmaker's) imagination (2001: 35). Thus, the shift from the character device of the double agent in *Smugglers of*

Death to the child in *Suffering* is not as stark as it may appear; as Benzaquen suggests, the child is a 'double figure' (2001: 35), both participating in the production of ideology via the state-run institution of film and as the subject of the adult imagination through film.

For Debbie Olsen and Andrew Scahill, children in literature generate a fiction that is always engendered or lost, as childhood is so often 'haunted by the specter of its own failure or incompletion' (2012: 6). Olsen and Scahill argue that this otherness in children exists in literature within an identity that is 'constructed for them via adults, and when such children strain against adult constructions, they become marginalised' (2012: 7). The use of the child's narrative by Kachyňa, then, as a self-reflexive device mirroring the role of the filmmaker in the Czechoslovak context, highlights how individuals under this system who 'strain against' its constructions become marginalised (Olsen & Scahill, 2012: 7).

Liehm and Liehm, however, treat the child's perspective in *Long Live the Republic* as 'politically unbiased' (1977: 291), which reflects Hames' assessment that it is presented as 'the subjective experience of a twelve-year-old boy and, as such, it is free of any interpretative historical framework' (2009: 80). Both arguments overlook the fact that, as a device, this interpretation of the child's narrative allowed Kachyňa and Procházka to get away with a more subversive approach than their peers (Liehm & Liehm 1977: 291). Thus, while Kachyňa's films about children have been treated by contemporaries, critics and scholars alike as relatively unserious, I will argue that Kachyňa presents characters having to deal with the constricting effect of their own surroundings in a manner which reflects his own career, and indeed the careers of his contemporaries.

Using narratives insulated from censorship had been a tactic deployed by Kachyňa in the 1950s, and I will argue the child's narrative was a successful extension of this which he would return to throughout his career at different stages of the regime. Philippe Ariès has explored the very idea of childhood as being separate from adulthood as a relatively new phenomenon that developed after the medieval period (1962: 1). Child characters in

films produced by adults offer a space of becoming which can feign as the naïve perspective of the child, as Hames and Liehm and Liehm suggest; however, this is complicated by the narratives being written and scripted by adults.

In her 2008 book *Children and Cinema,* Vicky Lebeau explores the history of children in film, arguing that children are 'everywhere on our screens', a potentially overwhelming resource for reflecting on the cultural histories of childhood through the twentieth century (5). Indeed, children's coming-of-age narratives, far from being aberrations in the Czechoslovak New Wave, are abundant. Forman's *Black Peter*, *Talent Contest* (*Konkurs,* 1963), *Loves of a Blonde* (*Lásky jedné plavovlásky,* 1965), *The Firemen's Ball*; Menzel's *Closely Observed Trains*; Juraj Herz's *The Cremator* (*Spalovač mrtvol*, 1969); and Jaromil Jireš's *Valerie and Her Week of Wonders* (*Valerie a týden divů*, 1970) all deal with issues relating to young characters coming of age. Rites of passage, developing romantic and sexual relationships, aspirations for themselves and the expectations of the older generations, dealing with family structures, entering employment, dealing with death, loss or even arbitrary political conditions such as occupations and war are circumstances affecting the youths in these films. In *The Firemen's Ball*, the female adolescents in attendance are subjected to a beauty contest overseen by the aging firemen's committee, while the youths' actions are monitored closely by the older generation. In *The Cremator,* the anti-hero Karel Kopfrkingl's children are subjected to arbitrary anti-Semitic oppression at the hands of the invading Nazis, where their own father seeks to destroy them to aid his self-promotion under the oppressive system. Thus, youths are a prevalent feature of the New Wave, albeit the children referred to in Kachyňa's early 1960s works are generally pre-pubescent. Does this make their narratives less serious than, for instance, a teenager dealing with premature ejaculation as in Menzel's Oscar-winning *Closely Observed Trains*? This question is connected to Lebeau's interrogation of 'what is the

child *for* cinema? What does cinema *want* of the child?' (Lebeau, 2008: 5), which opens the child's narrative to an analytical-poetics analysis.

For Camelia Diana Luncan, one answer to these questions in reference to her own selection of war-themed films is to challenge adults into introspection and help to instigate change (Luncan, 2018). Children in this context, Luncan argues, 'help adults become aware of their responsibilities and can teach them to love' (Luncan, 2018). This is one aspect of *Long Live the Republic* that challenges the naïve reading of the child's perspective. The film's apparently naïve approach to historical events provides the viewer with another version of the World War II narrative – another history, which I will explore in more detail in this chapter – that is unavailable under the strictures of socialist realism. The deftness of this approach is in its delivery through the subjective experience of a twelve-year-old boy. In adopting this approach to child roles in film, the apparent conflict between childhood and adulthood is called into question in relation to the film medium.

Ian Wojcik-Andrews argues that recent criticism surrounding films containing child narratives has shifted the focus away from the notion of children as recipients of adult culture to adults as producers of children's culture (Wojcik-Andrews, 2000: 46). Wojcik-Andrews argues that the focus instead is on how cultural studies, feminism, Marxist, and/or new historicist ideas 'question the dominant media giants and cinematic institutions' (Wojcik-Andrews, 2000: 46). For Kachyňa, the prevailing media giant and cinematic institutions of the early 1960s were part of the regime. Thus, only in adopting this turn towards considering adults as producers of children's culture can the subversive quality of films like *Suffering* and *Long Live the Republic* be grasped.

As Lebeau argues, the role of the child reflects the depiction of real on screen: both are at once a moment in the emergence of psychic life and a state of being that never goes away (Lebeau, 2008: 8). For cinema, I have explored how its overt artifice is also an object of material existence in the context of socialist realism (it is the real, lived experience of

those who watch/create it). For the child's role in cinema, this relates to the character's production by adults in the filmmaking process. The scriptwriter or director is not inherently opposed to these child characters; as adults, they were once children themselves (a state of being that never goes away). This phenomenon, which overlaps the child on screen with the adults off-screen, reflects the ontology of film, where the object and subject coexist in the image: it is both the character in the film and the actor in the real world. For Lebeau, the concept of *infans* ('without language') is vital to the exploitation of the concept of childhood in film (Leabeau, 2008: 8). While the image of the child subject as *infans* reflects the interpretation of naivety in these characters in Kachyňa's films, they are the object of the film auteur. Through the misapprehension of the naivety of children in his films, Kachyňa was able to exploit a critical approach that continued to challenge socialist realism at its heart through an accepted medium, as the plethora of child narratives in the New Wave demonstrates.

With Procházka as screenplay writer, Kachyňa presents characters who are outsiders in their own environments, and whose relationships to the wider socio-political narrative is essentially arbitrary. Having explored the tension between the real and fiction in the docudrama in the previous decade, as well as the conflicting nature of borderlands settings, and double-agency in the spy genre, Kachyňa provided another platform for a critique of socialist realism in the child's narrative. In my analyses of *Suffering* and *Long Live the Republic* in this chapter, I will argue that Kachyňa goes further with his use of child narratives in a manner which generates questions to do with how the authorities deal with individuals who fall just outside the margins of society, with the authoritative roles in the films occupied by adults. The effect is not only that the films have some artistic value, as Kachyňa concedes was his consolation (in Liehm, 1974), but that this technique helped to lay the template for how the New Wave would approach subversion as the proliferation of child narratives emanating from Forman's *Talent Contest* (1963) onwards demonstrates.

***Suffering* (1961)**

Kachyňa's works present individuals who can find themselves at odds with their environment and yet still be pragmatic enough to negotiate that environment, a condition that reflects his own dealings with the film-industry structures he was working in. Rather than dwell on suspicions to do with complicity with the regime, it will be more useful to consider how Kachyňa manages to balance pragmatism with regards to the strictures of the regime against his own artistic goals.

In the previous chapter concerning Kachyňa's 1950s works, I demonstrated how the filmmakers managed to balance the requirement for socialist realism with an ability to criticise what they did not approve of in the machinations of the film industry. This theme is also explored in *Suffering*, where the symbol of walking a tightrope is reinforced at two points in the central character, Lenka (Jorga Kotrbová), a young girl who appears at odds with her environment in the South Bohemian village of Nesovice. This unease is introduced in the opening sequence, where the syncopated stringed accompaniment on the soundtrack seems at odds with the tranquil shots of the Bohemian countryside. Each cut during the opening sequence reflects this uneasiness: close-ups of barley blowing in the breeze pan out to looming electricity pylons over the landscape, but the shot cuts to close-ups of gothic statues on the small bridge. Shots pan from a field behind a bridge to heavy machinery at work in a quarry, then to a close-up of the pylons from above, panning down to show several in sequence off into the distance. The natural setting is never allowed to sit quietly, with the juxtapositions of machinery and human endeavour coupled with the unsettling soundtrack creating a feeling of menace. The contrast also suggests an uneasy transition from old to new, which reflects the generational problem of the child's narrative but also reflects the wider socio-political situation in its move from the old into a new era.

These conflicts act as a critique of the filmmaking culture Kachyňa was operating in and the clash between adopting socialist realism and producing subversive material. The

mise-en-scène is a peaceful, almost utopian perspective of country living which is affected by human endeavour. Behind the veneer of tranquillity is another, unseen force which also makes up a significant part of the filmic whole in the soundtrack. With these conflicting effects of the visual and sound aspects of the opening sequence, Kachyňa generates a tension which helps to create a marginal space both on- and off-screen, with neither allowed to sit comfortably. In the previous chapter, I explored the narrative effect of apportioning voiceover to documentary footage, which deepens the reflexivity of this apparently objective format. Similarly, the soundtrack here is self-reflexive in how it highlights how appearances can be deceiving, which is also a commentary on the ontology of film itself at the same time as a metaphor for the role of socialist-realist cinema under the regime.

The viewpoint in these opening shots is restricted, low, implying the perspective of a child. Then Lenka is introduced on screen, walking barefooted across stones to greet a group of young boys. Suddenly, at this peaceful lake, the drama is unleashed, and the unlikely character to whom the real suffering in the film belongs appears. A black horse bolts across a sun-drenched pathway with a cart in tow and a coachman, whip in hand, in pursuit on foot. Lenka and the boys follow the chase, but while the boys follow on foot like the coachman, Lenka finds an abandoned bicycle, which gives her an advantage in the chase. The theme of man-made objects such as the pylons and quarry equipment sitting uneasily against their natural backdrops is reinforced when the shot cuts to the horse, Prima, crossing an old bridge adorned with gothic idols, and this moment literally knocks Lenka off her stride as she falls off the bike and her pursuit ends. At this point, Prima has made it up to a modern, road bridge, where car horns and vehicles greet him, before the scene cuts to Prima's cart tumbling off the bridge after crashing into one of the oncoming vehicles. The contrast between the country setting and symbols of modernity in the heavy machinery and pylons in the opening sequence set the tone for a conflict between old and

new. The crossing of the old, gothic bridge being followed by this crash on the modern, road bridge reinforces this theme of old versus new, which is brought into a literal collision here with the old cart crashing into this symbol for modernity in the automobile.

Prima, penned in by vehicles on either side, is not allowed to cross over. Given the theme of liminality explored in the previous chapter, his confinement in this in-between space, before his master finally catches up with him and provides a severe beating in front of the onlookers on the bridge, highlights the position Kachyňa finds himself in at this point in his career. Occupying this space, Kachyňa is trapped and open to retribution for any perceived wrongdoing by his masters in the film industry. The viewer is invited to share Lenka's gaze, with the low shot cutting to a close-up of her in tears signifying a sympathetic point of view towards suffering and oppression. Within this framing, the argument that the child's narrative is less serious is diminished. Within the atmosphere of this period in Czechoslovak filmmaking, where just two years previously Ján Kadár and Elmar Klos had been banned from making films for their controversial *Three Wishes* (1959), this scene reflects concerns pertaining to the filmmaking culture. One horse is unwilling to follow the rules set by a hard taskmaster and is reprimanded harshly. Looking on are groups of ordinary individuals who follow the horse's plight but are seemingly in unison with the horse's master.

In the scene, five adult males stand beside Lenka and allow this brutal act to happen as the shots cut to close-ups of her tears. Fully ten seconds later one onlooker disrupts the beating by sounding his car horn, before others join in. This has the welcome effect of ceasing the attack; however, this was no act of mercy, nor was the chorus of car horns an act of solidarity. Instead, this was the impatience of the drivers who just wanted to continue their journey, as they weave past the scene and go on their way. The message at this early stage of the film is ominous: this untamed, outcast horse who fled from its master is beaten into surrender. Any hopes of the collective who witness this brutality speaking up

are in vain. When considering the filmmaking culture Kachyňa was operating in, this scene is a daring critique of the filmmaking environment, which is masked by the treatment of the child's perspective as unserious.

Lenka is a character at odds with her social environment. The other girls her age are presented at one stage by the river with their mothers, performing domestic cleaning duties while playing games together with dolls and toy prams. This scene presents normative behaviour in an idyllic setting, with the girls and their mothers playing up to their roles in society, which is reflective of the goals of socialist-realist art. One girl tries to include Lenka in the games, showing her the play she is putting on with her toys. Lenka decides to play a prank on the girl and places a newt on her table that generates chaos amongst the group. The girls as a collective turn on Lenka for this disruptive act, calling after her derogatively. Lenka returns to playing with the group of boys, where she is not fully accepted either, and where she must prove herself with dares such as crossing the lake on a tightrope. In her relationships with her peers, Lenka is reflective of Kachyňa as a filmmaker: never sitting comfortably with any group. Indeed, the little play Lenka disrupts with her prank is a metaphor for Kachyňa's approach to socialist realism, where rigid parameters are broken by subversive means.

For Lenka, like Kachyňa, however, the problem throughout the film is her inability to be understood. After trespassing on her neighbour's stables to visit Prima, she is caught by a farm hand who asks her: '*Co děláš? Neumiš mluvit?*' ('What are you doing? Can you not speak?') (00:35.50), to which her response is to run away. Later, having been dressed up in her finest clothing by her mother, Lenka runs off to the riverside to play with her male peers. When her mother discovers her, she again angrily confronts Lenka with: '*Co děláš?*' ('What are you doing?') (00:49.54), before slapping her across the face. This action links Lenka to the suffering of Prima in the opening scene at the hands of the stablemaster. When their actions are not understood, or perceived to go against the rules,

violence is applied to normalise their behaviour. The second part of the question from the stable hand towards Lenka in the first scene is also an integral question of Kachyňa's poetics: Can you not speak? The inability to speak, to say what you mean, is a fundamental aspect of Kachyňa's poetics and underpins the necessity to negotiate censorship. Kachyňa must not say what he means, but instead deals in an art of gestures: this is a theme that becomes increasingly relevant throughout his career during the regime, culminating in the character Moreau in *The Last Butterfly*, a mime whose art is in gestures.

The self-reflexivity produced here, however, forces the viewer to question their own environment, and consider their response to such scenes in real life: would such recriminations merely serve as unwelcome distraction to their own pursuits? Or do they have a responsibility, like Lenka, to at least engage sympathetically? Furthermore, is there anything they can do to stand up to such oppression and resist? This is not simply an artist attempting humanist themes, as Hames suggests (2009: 79), in terms of children reacting to cruelty to animals, this acts as a critique of the filmmaking environment and, in turn, the communist regime which Kachyňa was operating under. Youth, in this sense, is an incredibly powerful motif. As one of the Generation 57 filmmakers, senior to the latest FAMU graduates, Kachyňa is offering a call to arms to the younger generation of filmmaker. If they are to achieve progress, to cross over from the old to the new, they will have to form a solidarity of purpose. Rather than having isolated cases of individuals like Lenka responding sympathetically to oppressive acts, Kachyňa is showing the need for a humanist alternative for the new filmmakers if they are to usher in the new. Ahead of the New Wave, Kachyňa is first signalling the oppressive conditions of the filmmaking environment, while simultaneously demonstrating that criticisms of these conditions are possible from within the film industry. What is also notable about the film is its reception internationally. *Suffering* was nominated for best film in the international competition at the 1962 Mar del Plata Film Festival in the antipodal setting of Argentina and won a

special jury award at the same festival. What later materialised from 1963 in Czechoslovakia was the onset of the New Wave, which would have a remarkable international impact. Kachyňa's work would continue to reach an international audience during this period, with *Hope* (*Naděje*, 1964) also nominated for best film in the international category at the 1964 Mar del Plata, with Kachyňa winning the award for best director. At the 1966 edition of the awards, *Long Live the Repbulic* (*Ať žije republika*, 1965) won the FIPRESCI Prize for best film, as well as best film in the international competition.

***Long Live the Republic* (1965)**

Like *Suffering*, the narrative in Kachyňa's *Long Live the Republic* is presented from the perspective of a child, with the camera often positioned low so that shots are taken with an upwards angle. One major difference between them is that *Long Live the Republic* was produced after the onset of the New Wave. Despite this crossing-over from an ostensible old into the new of the New Wave, this retention of the fundamental theme of the child's perspective illustrates how Kachyňa's work overlaps these different periods. The film opens with its protagonist, Oldřich (Zdeněk Lstibůrek) measuring his height against a wall; indeed, his diminutive stature is a key feature of the film. Oldřich is small and apparently insignificant; he is rejected by his peers and is harshly bullied; he is beaten by his father, is vulnerable and impressionable, yet he is curious and distracted at the same time, and this is reflected in the narrative structure. While the film is set in a small Moravian village occupied by the Nazis that witnesses the arrival of the Red Army liberators at the close of World War II, these distinctions are barely visible. Yet for Hames, a divergence from treatment of one of the 'officially approved subjects' of World War II in a 'highly unconventional manner' is what makes the film a 'far cry from the ideological simplifications normally associated' with the liberation of the republic genre (Hames, 2009: 79). What becomes pertinently clear in this film is that history will be told

differently, with the linear narrative interjected with flashbacks and flights of fancy interrupting the retelling of the historical events surrounding the central character. Indeed, terms like Nazi and liberator do not really apply to Oldřich, who perceives those around him chiefly as friends or foes based on how they interact with him. This is a device used by Kachyňa to allegorise the possibility to blur the ideological framework of the historical narrative in terms of binaries like good and evil, right and wrong. For Oldřich, brutality and chaos are everywhere and perpetrated by all sides; equally, moments of humanity and relief come from all sides, too.

Ideology is presented as many sides to the same coin: religious ceremonies are mirrored with the pageantry of the village's fire brigade show and the youths' reaction to either is to mock. In church they play pranks, at the brigade's show they urinate on the flames that the firemen are trying to extinguish; at their own performance Oldřich brings a goat into his recital which is met with laughter from the crowd. Thus, while the conflicting ideologies of Nazism and communism come into contact in this setting, they are presented almost homogenously. This is a deeply subversive position for Kachyňa to take, given the allegorical potential in denouncing the Nazi occupation. The blurring of the lines between these competing ideologies is reflected in the depiction of war, which provides the backdrop to the film. In the opening scene, Oldřich and his father gaze up to the sky when they hear aircraft overhead, but as the camera pans upwards – exaggeratedly demonstrating the perspective's connection with the child – the viewer can only see clouds. As in *Suffering* and the films of the 1950s, off-screen space is to play an important role in the film: the characters are aware of potentially malignant forces but which side the menacing aircraft belong to is irrelevant. Aircraft and artillery are represented through sound and off-screen space as a malignant force throughout when they come into view they attack and destroy edifices in the town. However, this overlaps when the Russian tanks roll in after the Nazis are defeated and are welcomed gleefully by the townspeople. Kachyňa is

demonstrating how people have the ability to welcome in the very forces that oppress them.

Here, while off-screen is the war, Oldřich's own concerns remain those of a child. To him, cruelty and brutality exist independent of the wider conflict, regardless of how close he comes to the physical conflict in the war narrative as the film progresses. As with the ideologies of Nazism and communism, to Oldřich these conflicts are arbitrary: both are responsible for the oppressive conditions surrounding him. This apparently naïve perspective of a child invites the viewer to consider the similarities in either ideology's claims for legitimacy. Thus, from this perspective, if socialist realism allows for depictions of socialism prevailing over Nazi oppression, the effect is that socialist in its current guise under the communist regime similarly requires attention.

One explanation for one side's victory over the other offered by Kachyňa is in the recurring motif of the mob. In *Suffering*, Prima is chased before receiving a beating for disobeying his master; in *Long Live the Republic*, Oldřich likewise suffers the cruelty of his peers. Early in the film, he encounters a group of boys his own age. Having played a prank on the group, he is chased on his bike until eventually he falls off to a chorus of laughter from his assailants. In both examples, the mob is portrayed negatively while the viewer shares a sympathetic gaze with the outsider as individual. How Kachyňa reacts to this in *Long Live the Republic*, however, is to introduce a surrealist element to the film. Oldřich confronts the boys, punching one much bigger than him, lifting another and hanging him by the coat on a nail on a tree, before pushing the other one into a pond; however, these acts of vengeance are mere flights of fancy. Following a stern reproach from his father, Oldřich jumps several feet in the air over a puddle; later he imagines he causes one of the bullies to fall from the bell tower after they climb a ladder to trespass at the church and the boy lands head first into the ground with his feet comically squirming above. Oldřich imagines himself as the hero in his reverie: a champion motor racing driver,

a renowned horse trainer, always greeted with great cheers from the people of his village for his achievements. Concepts such as real and fiction overlap on screen and the metafictional effect is that the narrative is brought into question. The events are not real, despite what the viewer witnesses, and this is a demonstration of the process the viewer must engage with in order to question the veracity of any narrative they are presented with, however convincing it may appear to be.

Ironically, Oldřich's accidental involvement in the narrative of the liberation of this Moravian village involves great bravery and resolve; yet these acts are to go unnoticed by any of his peers. Immediately after the scene where the boys urinate on the fire brigade's ceremony, the shot cuts to Oldřich bathing in a river in the woods. Here, he witnesses a rendezvous between a soldier and a nurse, with the motif of the sound of aircraft remaining on the soundtrack reminding the viewer that the war is ongoing off-screen. Following this scene, the first visible sign of the aircraft appears and, while presented as distant, this suggests this narrative is moving closer to the setting. The gaze which meets this scene, however, is significant. While this is the gaze of Oldřich, a 12-year-old boy who is small, insignificant, vulnerable, immature, impressionable and distracted, the subject of his voyeurism reflects all of this. The soldier and nurse are busy distracting themselves while the war narrative is closing in around them. While their actions are adult in nature, their behaviour and reaction to the seriousness surrounding them reflects the childishness of Oldřich and the desire to look away. Again, the viewer is forced to confront the issue of only seeing what they want to see and ignoring the suffering that exists around them.

Given that the viewer has been invited to share Oldřich's gaze, the viewer's very own need for distraction from the seriousness surrounding them is reflected here and again the ontology of film, in terms of its entertainment purposes, is reflected. For Oldřich, his flights of fancy represent the space for distraction from the seriousness surrounding him from the point of view of a child. While this may appear harmless, this narrative technique

contains a warning to the viewer over what they are seeing around them and their own naivety towards acts of oppression from the ruling mob. The analeptic narrative structure makes it difficult to follow the events in the film with any real cohesion, and this is largely down to Oldřich's dreaming. His understanding of the events surrounding him is in turn impaired; what Kachyňa is demonstrating to the viewer is that the versions of events presented to them can often be given with similar bias, and the result is this confusion over the real events taking place. This provides a warning about the unreliability of the retelling of any history.

For Oldřich, his accidental involvement in the narrative of the liberation of the republic does lead to his becoming the unlikely hero in the film, but how he responds to being accosted in the woods by Russian soldiers and having his horse stolen is reflective of how he has dealt with bullies throughout. He responds in kind by removing the wheels of his cart and receives further beatings, but he keeps getting up and facing his aggressors. Like Lenka in *Suffering*, Oldřich ostracises himself at times, and as outsiders they are cast aside because they go against the grain of their collective peer groups. That Oldřich pits himself against the Red Army soldiers is self-reflexive of Kachyňa's position in terms of socialist realism in this film. Rather than portray them as heroic liberators, they appear to Oldřich to be just another group of militant bullies he has to contend with.

That this is played out in the film in a society of children may appear to lessen the degree of political critique; however, the effect is in fact intensified. The actions of the Russian liberators reflecting the bullies demonstrates how there is no victory for good over evil in this plot, merely another form of oppressive authority has usurped the previous force. This is a powerful allegory for the communist regime in that the cruelty of the children reduces the pathos of the message: Kachyňa is honing his critique on the treatment of individuals at all levels of society from their collective peers. This targets the heart of the socialist ideal of the collective, a supposed virtue upheld by socialist realism. For

Kachyňa, the collective is a mob, willing to turn on anyone so long as they are protected by their status as belonging to the crowd. This is expressed at numerous points in the film: the group of bullies, the clergy at mass, the teachers at school, the groups of soldiers.

Yet the film ends on a pointedly negative note. Despite coming through the ordeal of the war narrative, Oldřich returns to his village and remains an outsider; it is as if nothing has happened. Bruised and bloodied already, the bullies finally catch up to him and render him a sound beating. On returning home, his parents have packed and are ready to flee without him. Despite the liberation, Oldřich has never been more fenced in. As the bullies flee, Oldřich turns to his slingshot to fire a final salvo; however, with the boys all escaping he turns and aims one at the doves on the roof, brutally picking one off as the rest run away. Having stood up to acts of cruelty throughout, this mindless act is that of an individual pushed to his limits. Oldřich becomes his oppressors when his retaliations and flights of fancy have run dry. Kachyňa's own parting shot is one which warns about how easy it can be for an individual to turn against their own ideals amidst arbitrary conflicts in which they become victimised through no fault of their own.

In both *Suffering* and *Long Live the Republic*, Kachyňa uses the child's narrative to convey concerns that are universal to the audience, such as dealing with being on the outside of the dominant group. I have outlined in this chapter how this narrative technique was an extension of Kachyňa's 1950s works in how he treated socialist realism subversively through the documentary mode, borderland settings, the use of the double agent, and depiction of historical narratives with analogous concerns for the current time. These factors all helped to generate a level of subversion that was able to pass censorship in a covert manner. By drawing on criticism of child narratives that demonstrate how this narrative technique can offer viewers a discursive platform to consider their own environment, I have sought to challenge the view that Kachyňa's child narratives are insignificant in the context of the 1960s Czechoslovak film culture and ensuing New Wave

(Hames, 2009: 79). Furthermore, I have argued that Kachyňa challenges his contemporary filmmakers to confront the oppressive nature of their own industry and follow his lead in making films that challenge these conditions but that can pass censorship and reach an audience. This is an approach I have argued underpinned the New Wave movement, with Forman's *Talent Contest* (1963) and *Black Peter* (1963) considered to have commenced the movement (Hames, 1985: 92). Forman has expressed how he adopted comedic modes as a means for appeasing the censors, who did not take the genre seriously (in Pawlikowski, 1990, 00:17.57).

In *Suffering* and *Long Live the Republic*, two films that hinge the onset of the new Wave movement, Kachyňa presents the motif of individuals who flee oppressive peer groups, in the form of a mistreated horse, a young girl and a 12-year-old boy, in narratives where the viewer is invited to respond sympathetically to the outsiders. The characters' status as children may have placated the authorities, but this naïve position also helps to strip away the fundamentals of ideological forces in the films such Nazism and communism. As the criticism surrounding child narratives I have discussed in this chapter demonstrates, there is a didactic function for adults viewing child narratives in how the children compel adults to react sympathetically (Luncan, 2018). Thus, when Oldřich's only concern in *Long Live the Republic* is to avoid oppressive behaviours from soldiers on both the Nazi and Red Army sides, as well as those of his peer group, all sides merge into one. This invites the viewer to consider the analogous potential of a narrative surrounding the liberation of the republic from the Nazi occupation in terms of how this reflects the regime in place in 1960s Czechoslovakia. This proved to be an effective means for providing a subversive approach to issues surrounding Czechoslovak culture during the 1960s and the proliferation of child and adolescent narratives in the New Wave demonstrates how this approach was followed during the movement. This serves to highlight the significance of Kachyňa's early 1960s works in terms of how they provided a continuation of his humanist

poetics from the previous decade at the same time as offering a platform for emerging filmmakers to continue to challenge the oppressive conditions of Czechoslovak culture throughout the 1960s.

CHAPTER THREE: PUSHING THE BOUNDARIES DURING THE CZECHOSLOVAK NEW WAVE

In the previous chapter, I discussed the difficulties Karel Kachyňa's films of the early 1960s faced in terms of their reaction from peers, critics, and scholars – in part due to the elevated position within the KSČ of screenplay writer Jan Procházka (II: 79). Indeed, Peter Hames argues that the twelve films they made in collaboration during the decade were 'frequently dismissed as officially approved criticism' (2009: 79). However, Hames also argues that Kachyňa's work of the previous decade helped to set a template for the Czechoslovak New Wave of the 1960s, an unofficial film movement characterised by a subversive and politically pointed style and content in spite of the communist regime in place at the time (2009: 80-91). This is a point I have sought to emphasise in my previous chapter.

For Hames, Kachyňa was an integral part of the 'First Wave' that commenced during the 1950s, as the earliest graduates of the Prague Film School, FAMU, emerged (Hames, 2009: 80-91). I have demonstrated in my first chapter how Kachyňa's treatment of the documentary format offered a subversive template for dealing with concepts of reality in film at odds with the prescribed socialist realism (I: 56-60). I have explained how the criticism of Kachyňa's early 1960s works as dealing with humanist themes overlooks how this signified a move towards more progressive Marxist thinking in the communist context (Ferretter, 2016: 29). Furthermore, Hames argues that from these humanist themes, Kachyňa's work of the 1960s 'progressively became more critical' (Hames, 2009: 79); however, Hames fails to pinpoint what exactly they became more critical of. As I have previously outlined, Kachyňa's works of the 1950s projected frustrations with the bureaucratic nature of the film industry that could be taken as representing certain bureaucratic structures of the regime at large. By the same token, it is again important to separate Kachyňa from ideas of pro- and anti-regime; by producing subversive material critical of the structures of the film industry, Kachyňa was not necessarily against the regime

per se. His primary motivation was always to make the films that he wanted to make (Kachyňa in Liehm interview, 1974).

What Kachyňa's works eventually began to interrogate from the mid-1960s was the treatment of what Hames describes as 'three officially approved subjects' in *Long Live the Republic (Ať žije republika*, 1965), *Coach to Vienna* (*Kočár do Vídně*, 1966) and *Holy Night* (*Noc nevěsty*, 1967) of the liberation of the republic by Soviet forces, the domestic partisans' resistance against the Nazis, and the collectivisation of agriculture respectively (Hames, 2009: 79). I discussed the subversive treatment of history from the child's perspective in *Long Live the Republic* in the previous chapter in an attempt to show how Kachyňa's themes overlap in films coming before and after the generally accepted start of the Czechoslovak New Wave in 1963. This was also an attempt to revise the thesis that his child narratives were less serious than his later New Wave works. The 'highly unconventional manner' of Kachyňa's treatment of these officially approved subjects reflects his treatment of socialist realism from the beginning of his career (Hames, 2009: 79); however, as I have sought to outline, this is a theme which overlaps in Kachyňa's 1950s, early 1960s and later New Wave films, and as I will argue in coming chapters this continues throughout his career.

In the previous chapter, I discussed how Kachyňa's rejection of the absolutism of socialist realism from the 1950s carried on into his early 1960s work. While *Suffering* and *Long Live the Republic* depict child characters at odds with their environments, neither film can be considered anti-establishment. However, the move from a narrative surrounding the experiences of a youth in a small village to that of a child witnessing the liberation of the republic in 1945 demonstrates a shift from humanism towards a critique of how history was treated under the regime using the same parameters. The two films straddle the onset of the New Wave and this shift in the cultural landscape of the filmmaking environment is reflected in Kachyňa's style, with the aforementioned move from a narrative surrounding the experiences of a young girl to the politically charged commemorative narrative of the

liberation of the republic twenty years on in 1965. Producing characters whose actions refuse to be categorised into terms like pro- and anti-regime, Kachyňa offered a scepticism around narratives at odds with the political environment of the 1950s and early 1960s, but one which matched the character of the rising New Wave.

Yet, despite this, scholarship and criticism of Kachyňa's 1960s works tend to focus on the leniency from the authorities on account of Procházka's position on the Central Committee as a factor which somehow diminished their potency as subversive works (Hames, 2009: 79). My argument is that the opposite is the case; that it was more daring to question the workings of the film industry and the regime from this position as insiders, something I will argue is demonstrated in *The Ear* (*Ucho,* 1970) in this chapter. The approach, particularly from Procházka's perspective, also reflects one of the fundamental characteristics of the New Wave: predominantly it involved artists criticising the very regime they worked for under a state-run film industry, which reflects the sense of overlap between oppressor and oppressed inherent in *The Ear*.

One other area of criticism which will inform this chapter in relation to Kachyňa's New Wave-era films is the argument that they became increasingly more provocative (Hames, 2009: 79). Given that *Holy Night, Funny Old Man* (*Směšný pán,* 1969) and *The Ear* were all banned by the authorities, this would appear accurate; however, a look at the difficulties *Coach to Vienna* faced during the post-production stage suggests that suspicion from the authorities about Kachyňa's works had been aroused earlier in the decade. As well as suggesting that his films became 'increasingly daring' during the decade, Hames argues that they touched on 'taboo' subjects (Hames, 2009: 79). This is something that I will argue, through an explication of the term taboo, is a fundamental aspect of Kachyňa's poetics in a historical sense. From his treatment of the war and enemy forces in his 1950s works, to the treatment of death, Kachyňa frequently touched on taboo subjects in a manner that did not set out to promote socialist-realist values. Yet one of the criticisms of Kachyňa's earlier

works was that they depicted historically accepted narratives – albeit in an 'unconventional manner' (Hames, 2009: 79). Given the censure of his later films of the 1960s, I will argue that the success of Kachyňa's subversive works lay in his ability to push the boundaries in terms of what was accepted, rather than the films that went too far with the authorities and were banned. After all, how effective as subversive works could they be if no one was able to watch them? In order to examine this effect, it is necessary to interrogate the term taboo further.

Taboo Subjects

Keith Allan and Kate Burridge describe a taboo as referring to a proscription of behaviour for a specific community, at a specifiable time in a specifiable context (2006: 11). Peter Hames describes Kachyňa's work of the 1960s as touching upon painful and taboo subjects (1977: 291). The specific community referred to here is the Czechoslovak filmmaking community, the historical period is the communist regime in Czechoslovakia and the context is the 1960s where a more liberal approach was being pursued in response to the regime.

James Grotstein, meanwhile, discusses the origins of taboos in response to Sigmund Freud's work on psychoanalysis. Grotstein argues that taboo originated in primitive, pre-religion societies to regulate their living conditions. Principally, taboos had been developed to combat incest, but also to work against contact with tribe leaders, slain enemies, and dead relatives (in Willock, Curtis & Bohm, 2009: 31). Therefore, according to Grotstein, taboo has always played a corrective role for societies, as well as an insulation function for their leaders, and as insulation against the horrors of conflict and the permanence of death. Taboo is therefore intrinsically linked to issues such as hierarchies and subordination and dualism like life and death. Metaphysics projects hierarchies and subordination in the dualisms it encounters (Derrida, 1982: 195), thus the taboo occupies a crossing-over space, one that implies trespassing from one territory into another. This is a theme reflected in Kachyňa's earliest works dealing with the new communist era in the aftermath of World War II, where

national borders had been shifted as reflected in the borderland setting, the Sudeten Movement, and double agency, and the economic system had completely changed which is explored in the collectivisation of agriculture theme.

The negative connotations of taboo are echoed by Keith Allan, who argues that to engage in taboo is to cause offence (2018: 2). He also makes the connection between taboo and censorship (*Ibid*.), proposing that censorship is the suppression of speech or writing that is condemned as subversive of the common good (2018: 16). Taboo is therefore a buffer which, when crossed, causes injury and harm to the structures of society. Given the ancient, underlying aspects of taboo to do with leaders, war and death, and the contemporary censorship concerns for Kachyňa in the context of the 1960s Czechoslovak New Wave, touching upon taboo subjects, as Hames describes it, was an act of subversion in the context (1977: 291). The pressure to conform with the authorities' strictures, then, and not to transgress taboos, was profound; rooted in ancient, ritualistic practices. For Kachyňa, this pressure was most keenly felt during the making of *Coach to Vienna* in 1966. Kachyňa describes how the film was banned before it even got beyond the script stage, but that President Novotný 'personally' allowed it to be shot (Liehm, 1974: 108-109). Ironically, this intervention from the national leader also opened Kachyňa up to another breaking of taboo: that of contact with leaders (Grotstein in Willock, Curtis & Bohm, 2009: 31). Indeed, Kachyňa describes how this involvement led to his works being described as 'officially approved' – which is echoed by Hames in his criticism much later – which hurt Kachyňa, given everything he had had to go through to complete the films (Liehm, 1974: 109). Mira Liehm and Antonín J. Liehm go on to say that 'Procházka's position [as a 'favourite' of the Party] inspired and made possible other controversial Kachyňa films, including *Coach to Vienna*' (1977: 291). Again, Kachyňa responded to this kind of criticism of his and especially Procházka's proximity to the central powers in his interview with Liehm. Kachyňa says:

> It wasn't really too simple with President Novotný from the outset, either... [On Procházka's position of influence:] and here we run into some of the external and auxiliary factors that caused a certain isolation on my part. I worked very closely with Procházka, who was scriptwriter and head of the production group. He was active in the Party Central Committee. That apparently cast a certain light on him and me, whether we liked it or not. Everyone knew about it, and different people drew different conclusions from it. Many of them didn't know me or Procházka very well at all. Personally, I have an [108] aversion to highly placed people, no matter who they are. Novotný always appeared to me to be a person whose personal attributes were far below the level needed for the responsible jobs that were entrusted to him. But at the time, Procházka hoped that he would be able to have a salutary effect on the opportunities given to cinematography, which was seriously threatened. In several cases he was successful. The paradox of it all is that Procházka's opinions were not in agreement with those of Novotný. (Liehm, 1974: 108-109)

While Kachyňa is acknowledging how Procházka's (and by proxy his own) proximity to the central powers afforded them some leniency, he is careful to distance himself from the president at a highly important time. While Novotný adopted certain reforms due to public pressure in the 1960s, he was forced to resign as party leader in January 1968 and was replaced by the reformer Alexander Dubček. In March 1968, he was ousted as president and in May he resigned from the Central Committee. Given that this interview by Liehm was provided just a couple of months later in the summer of 1968, Kachyňa's harsh criticism of Novotný was in step with the political landscape of the time. Indeed, there is an element of Kachyňa aligning himself with the negative public perception of Novotný at that time in an attempt to distance himself from the ousted president whose grace he admits had favoured his career. He then goes on to explain his and Procházka's relationship with the ousted leadership. Kachyňa says:

> [Procházka] explained [the content of their films] at several public talks, and the response was generally good; but this response was precisely what made Novotný want Procházka on the Central Committee. And that is where the impression arose that perhaps Novotný was better than the rest. Later on, my personal experience showed me that it was simply impossible to establish any kind of real contact with the man. But he did stand up for the film *Long Live the Republic* again, against the majority. There wasn't any logic in it, neither ideological or political; it was just a matter of mood, tactics, and finally despotism. And it was in such situations that

> some people got the feeling that it might be possible to talk to him after all, to reach some agreement, and to maintain a certain latitude for film work on the basis of certain dispensations (Liehm, 1974: 108).

Novotný's leniency is therefore attributed to attempting to boost popularity and perception with the public rather than any ideological or reformist ideals. While Kachyňa's appraisal of Novotný could also be deemed to be an attempt to distance himself from the unpopular figure and to align himself with popular public opinion, there were certainly issues in the preceding couple of years which would have caused Kachyňa's disapproval. According to Liehm and Liehm, Kachyňa and Procházka pushed the boundaries too far with *Holy Night* in 1967, upon whose release 'initiated the open conflict between Procházka and the establishment' (1977: 291). While the film touched on the collectivisation of agriculture, which according to Hames was one of the approved subjects (Hames, 2009: 79), its depiction of this in an 'unflattering light' went too far and the final two films made by this collaboration *Funny Old Man* (1969) and *The Ear* were banned (1977: 291). Indeed, Kachyňa, speaking in 1968 following the release of *Holy Night*, reflects on his and Procházka's work during the 1960s. The transcript reads:

> It turned out that this was nothing but an illusion, that the very structure of this kind of power has boundaries that cannot be overstepped. And it culminated in the only way it could have – with Novotný launching a violent attack on our film *Night of the Bride* [*Holy Night*], simply because we had gone beyond the limits of his understanding and his vision, his capacities. Procházka had already discovered that trying to convince this group of conservatives and its leaders of the need for some artistic freedom was a futile endeavour (Liehm, 1974: 108).

The level to which he and Procházka were willing to push these boundaries was demonstrated to the extreme in the production of *Coach to Vienna*, which was also banned during filming, but Procházka managed to convince Novotný to allow for the completion of the film on that occasion. While this instance clearly demonstrates how Procházka's connections aided an otherwise doomed enterprise, I will aim to take a more nuanced approach to how Kachyňa dealt with censorship.

As Liehm and Liehm suggest, by the end of the decade both Procházka and Kachyňa's good grace with senior members of the Party had begun to wane significantly, with the former banished from the Party following the Warsaw Pact invasion of August 1968 and the latter being relieved of his position as tutor at FAMU. *The Ear*, which was both filmed and completed after the invasion of 1968 and therefore falls into the era of normalisation (the machinations of which I will examine more closely in the next chapter) was the final film they were credited with in collaboration (Procházka was later forced to remove his name from the writing credits for *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* (*Už zase skáču přes kaluže*, 1970)).

With specific reference to *Coach to Vienna* and *The Ear*, I will explore the difference between two films that pushed the boundaries with the authorities. While Hames responds positively to the suggestion that Kachyňa touched 'with increasing daring' on the taboo subjects of the partisans' role in acts of retribution in World War II (Hames, 2009: 79), the liberation of the republic and the zeal of communists and religious fanatics alike, the ineffectiveness of this increased daring (his final three films produced in the 1960s were all banned) seems to be overlooked. Thus, while one fundamental aspect of taboo is to protect leaders from direct contact with their subjects, Kachyňa's unconventional treatment of taboo subjects marks a transgression with regards to leadership and the authorities.

While Kachyňa's proximity to leadership was something of a taboo for the wider filmmaking fraternity, his criticism of the regime placed him in a delicate position in terms of his ability to work. The product of this tension with regards to taboo is the very balancing act I have argued is a foundational aspect of his historical poetics: being able to criticise leadership at the same time as appearing to toe the party line. What is expressed in Kachyňa's 1950s and early 1960s works is a frustration with the machinations of the regime and how they are manifested in the film industry, with his dealings with the Arts Council causing him particular strife (in Liehm, 1974: 106). Indeed, this sense of disillusionment over how the

hope and optimism following the communist *coup* of 1948 had evaporated is also a feature of the New Wave, where the filmmakers react to the restrictiveness of the previous decade in filmmaking terms with an experimental, avant-garde cinema. As I have argued, and as Hames underlines with regards to what he calls the First Wave of the 1950s and early 1960s (Hames, 2009: 80-91), Kachyňa was an integral figure in laying the foundations for this movement.

The Czechoslovak New Wave

Peter Hames argues that while the Czechoslovak New Wave marked a break with socialist realism (1985: 1), it cannot be considered an anti-communist-propaganda movement (1985: 2). Instead, the New Wave was part of a Czechoslovak reform movement that also included new ideas on approaches to economics, politics, literature and the arts (*Ibid*.). Hames describes the New Wave as a 'revitalisation movement' offering a 'progressive development towards a socialist culture' (1985: 8). However, most Czechoslovak filmmakers of the 1960s would deny the existence of an intentional movement (Hames, 1985: 5). What united them, according to Hames, was their rejection of dogmatic socialist realism (1985: 5). As I have sought to demonstrate in my previous chapters, this is an activity Kachyňa had been engaged in throughout his career, and again demonstrates how as a filmmaker he traverses the pre-New Wave era as part of a first wave as well as contributing to this 1960s period.

Hames points to Forman's *Talent Contest* (*Konkurs*, 1963) and *Black Peter* (*Černý Petr*, 1963) as marking the beginning of the New Wave (Hames, 1985: 92). The crucial stylistic element pertaining to this genesis for Hames is what he describes as the 'realist influence' (1985: 92-118). Hames is careful to point out that 'realism' does not denote any formal literary style, rather a position of realism that opposed socialist realism (*Ibid*.). Indeed, Věra Chytilová used what Hames describes as a 'non-realist' style (*Ibid*.), which produced a similarly questioning tone to the manipulation of the concept of the real in Kachyňa's early docudrama *The Clouds Will Roll Away*. The influence of the older

generation on this development in Czechoslovak culture in 1963 is highlighted by Hames, who points to the re-publication in 1968 of Josef Škvorecký's novel *The Cowards* (*Zbabělci*, 1958) (*Ibid*.). Its unconventional approach to historical events in the socialist-realist context meant the novel was received unfavourably by the Central Committee, who accused Škvorecký of 'defamation of anti-fascist resistance and denigration of the Red Army' (Halamíčková, 2006). This unconventional approach to accepted historical narratives was reflected by Kachyňa in *Long Live the Republic* (1965) in relation to the liberation of the republic from the Nazi occupation by the Red Army, as I explored in the previous chapter. Kachyňa's unconventional treatment of the domestic partisans' efforts against the Nazis during World War II in *Coach to Vienna* (1966) is another example I will explore in detail in this chapter. Thus, the overlaps in Kachyňa's regard come in the form of texts by authors pertaining to his older generation, his own works of the New Wave period, and the influences on the younger generation of filmmakers in this movement. As well as Škvorecký's re-published novel, Hames points to the Beat poets' influence on the younger generation by 1964 (1985: 29): 'abstract art, pop art, the new figurative art, even geometric and kinetic art' were all having an influence at this time (Hames, 1985: 29). Thus, the New Wave signifies a movement deriving influences from many directions and is, as its label suggests, indicative of a crossing-over period in Czechoslovak culture. This crossing-over characteristic links the New Wave to the taboo.

In my introduction, I discussed the concept of realism in its relation to ideology (Introduction: 22-25). The purpose of socialist realism in art was to promote socialist ideology in a favourable light, so an opposition to socialist realism was not just an attempt to realign the perception of the real away from the version of reality preferred by the communist authorities. As Terry Lovell argues in *Pictures of Reality* (1980), 'Marxism is a realism' (1980: 9). Ideology cannot be taken to be opposed to reality in that it is part of the real, lived world. While Kachyňa's socialist-realist works, through their subversive means,

were able to highlight the insufficiencies of the genre metafictionally, this does not remove the reality that socialist realism was the dominant mode of cultural production. Thus, socialist realism, the dominant mode of production in Czechoslovak filmmaking terms, both produces and reproduces real life; it projects and reflects the reality for filmmakers and people living under the socialist system. It should be noted, however, that this includes some of the absurdities of the socialist system, but to oppose socialist realism in its entirety would be to deny the reality of the filmmaking environment. Rather than legitimise these as real, however, Kachyňa's subversive approach to socialist realism highlights how ideas of real are framed in a manner that seeks to reinforce the legitimacy of the communist approach to, for instance, the collectivisation of agriculture or the retelling of national histories. Realism, then, is 'both a theory of knowledge and an ontology (an account of what exists and is real in the world)' (Lovell, 1980: 10). Therefore, to oppose socialist realism, as Hames argues the New Wave did at its core, would be an attempt to deny the reality of the situation the filmmakers found themselves in. Kachyňa's ability to adopt socialist realism at the same time as challenging the version of reality this doctrine projects is what generates subversion in his works during the New Wave. Socialist realism, therefore, offers a depiction of reality that is open to scrutiny, an effect I argue Kachyňa recognised and exploited. By adopting this form, he was playing along with the rules, while demonstrating the reality in his films that this was an illusory depiction of life under communism.

An example of how Kachyňa succeeds in this approach to socialist realism is in his treatment of historical narratives. Depictions of accepted historical narratives in socialist realist works were required to paint the socialist in a positive light. It follows that, if communist partisans were on the side of the good in opposing the evil Nazis, socialism is in the right. This is what Lovell describes as an empirical, or a positivist, position of realism, which is 'logically incoherent' and 'cannot provide an account of the processes of knowledge production on which scientists are actually engaged… nor of the history of science' (Lovell,

1980: 10). Thus, despite the requirement of empirical knowledge to contain facts, an empirical position of realism refuses this requirement, according to Lovell. Following from an empiricist or positivist position, Lovell posits conventionalism as a source of 'devastating critique of positivism and empiricism' (Lovell, 1980: 10), while realism is a belief in the existence of an independent reality (*Ibid*.). While empiricist ontology 'posits a real world which is independent of consciousness and theory, and which is accessible through sense experience', Lovell argues that something in the real world 'must be capable of generating actual or possible experiences' (Lovell, 1980: 11). In this sense, Kachyňa's socialist-realist films are, on Lovell's terms, conventionalist in their critique of the positivism of socialist realism (Lovell, 1980: 10). This is an example of how Kachyňa's proximity to the central powers through his working relationship with Jan Procházka has the capacity to provide highly subversive pieces of work from this position within the institution of film.

This is also where the importance of film's ontology in the success of socialist realism is found. The ontology of film matches Lovell's requirement for a medium capable of generating 'possible experiences' – film is a series of images taken closely together that generate an illusion of motion and real lived experience on screen (Lovell, 1980: 11). Lovell argues that empiricism is 'premised on the existence of a knowing subject [in film, this is the viewer], source of the sense data which validates knowledge. This knowing subject [the viewer] and its experience are taken as given and unproblematic by empiricism, or, where it is problematised, empiricism begins to be undermined' (Lovell, 1980: 11). Thus, a conventionalist approach to the New Wave would see its attack on socialist realism as an attack on the regime from an institution governed by the authorities, providing a devastating critique of the positivism of the regime through this mode of production. However, Hames is right to insist that the New Wave was not an attack on socialism per se. For Lovell, 'the conventionalist interpretation of Marxism leads to the loss of what is most useful and distinctive in it, while the realist interpretation brings out what is most valuable in Marx's

work' (Lovell, 1980: 11). Thus, as Hames alludes to, realism as the underlying position of the New Wave makes the movement revisionist in nature. Indeed, Forman sets out as his primary objective a desire to put 'real' images on screen, and this conventionalist challenge to the positivism of socialist realism sets in motion the New Wave movement (in Pawlikowski, 1990). This is a position I have argued Kachyňa has taken up throughout his career, and his contributions to the New Wave reflect this.

***Coach to Vienna* (1966)**

As alluded to by Hames, *Coach to Vienna* is a film that touches on the domestic Czechoslovak partisan efforts against the Nazis during the 1960s, but in an unusual manner (1985: 85). For Hames, while the film is 'particularly controvervsial' in its 'failure to present the wartime partisans in conventional heroic terms' (*Ibid*.), 'the film adopts a simple humanist theme and non-propagandist approach to war and, although it is primarily a poetic and epic work, *Coach to Vienna* again seeks to undermine the simplifications of propaganda. Not all Germans are "bad", the acts of the partisans were not always "heroic" and, without human understanding and the rejection of simplified political oppositions, genuine progress is impossible' (Hames, 1985: 87). Hames argues that *Coach to Vienna* 'bluntly' confronts 'official mythologies' in a manner that should have been recognised domestically and internationally (in *Kinoeye,* 2003), but points to Procházka's position on the Central Committee as 'suspect in the eyes of audiences' (*Ibid*.), with the film perceived as 'official' criticism (*Ibid*.). However, Hames also outlines Procházka's position, as expressed at the Writers Congress in 1967, when he argued that 'the struggle for free expression would continue "…because the writer will not subordinate himself to doctrines and dogmas"' (Procházka quoted in Golam, 1971: 243, in Hames, 2003).

Thus, Hames expresses a confusion over the reception of the film on the basis of this proximity to leadership, which I have argued is an element of the taboo (Grotstein in Willock, Curtis & Bohm, 2009: 31). Hames' suggestion that *Coach to Vienna* failed to be

recognised domestically and internationally, by which he appears to mean the West, seems to overlook its nomination domestically for the Crystal Globe award for best film at the 1966 Karlovy Vary International Film Festival. Hames also overlooks how the film was received in the Soviet bloc context. Karol Szymański, in his essay 'Psychological Ballet in a Specific Configuration of Power: On the Polish Reception to "*Carriage to Vienna*" by Karel Kachyňa ('*Psychologiczny balecik w konkretnym układzie sił. O polskiej recepcji „*Wozu do Wiednia*" Karela Kachyni*') (2018), argues that the film generated great opposition in Poland (one of the neighbouring Warsaw pact nations that would assist in the Soviet-led invasion following the Prague Spring of 1968) (2018: 275). The major objections to the film were in its depiction of a romantic relationship between a Czech woman and an enemy soldier amidst the unflattering depiction of the partisans accompanied by the sympathetic German. According to Szymański, this discourse towards attempts to portray 'socialism with a human face' was later used in order to legitimise the 1968 invasion in reaction to the Prague Spring (2018: 275-299).

While Hames is right to highlight how the pretext of a World War II narrative where heroic resistance fighters help to bring down the evil occupiers of the Czech lands is subverted, the film is in fact a tour de force of slow-paced, character-based drama rather than a simple humanist film. So acute is the development of character in the film that the interactions between the anti-hero and heroine are conducted across two languages, often through physical gestures, with neither fully understanding the other; indeed, it is more generally a dialogue of gestures where understanding is reached despite no access to one another's language. This barrier between effective communication sets up one of the fundamental themes of the film of the experience of trauma in justifying nationalist and racist hatred in the context of the postwar Sudeten Movement. In order for Krista to overcome this condition, compromises are required reflective of the compromises required when obstacles to effective communication are in place. The only thing that is understood at the beginning

between the two main characters is that one is a Wehrmacht soldier, the enemy of the other, a Czech peasant. Kachyňa, however, presents a narrative that sets up these binaries as obstacles in order to knock them down.

This theme is introduced in the opening sequence, where the rolling script explaining that this is the final day of the War in Europe wherein two Wehrmacht deserters are forcing a Czech peasant woman to drive them by horse and carriage to the Austrian frontier through an enormous forest. Krista is in mourning for her husband who was murdered by Nazis and this sets up a revenge plot on her part in the film. Indeed, Hames outlines the premise of the film as its heroine having 'resolved' to kill two Wehrmacht soldiers in retaliation for the murder of her husband at Nazis' hands (in *Kinoeye*, 2003). In this description, however, there are certain characteristics that diverge from a polemic good-versus-evil revenge plot. One of the soldiers, Hans, is Austrian, not German; they are both deserters, not committed Nazis. While the epic conventions are in place with the voyage and the grand World War II setting, the viewer is explicitly told this is the final day of the war, deepening the liminal quality of the setting within this format. Binaries are being treated differently by Kachyňa and this need to compromise when the barrier of language is introduced begins to focus the idea that what is considered concrete is going to be complicated in this film. That it is acceptable to make a film promoting the virtues and heroism of those who stood up to the Nazis during the war is the vehicle to producing subversive material in this work.

In the opening sequence, Kachyňa sets up the theme of binaries by drawing attention to the shooting in black and white with a chiaroscuro effect, a technique I will return to in this chapter in discussions on *Coach to Vienna*. By 1966, this was very much a stylistic choice – Kachyňa had used colour in his previous film, *Long Live the Republic* – with the columns of black trees set against the white sky underlining this binary opposition. To explore this theme, Kachyňa starts with the concept of time. It is explained in the opening crawl that this is the final day of the war, a point that concentrates a six-year conflict into

the space of 24 hours; the major events for these characters within this grand narrative, meanwhile, will be retold in the film over the course of eighty minutes or so. From the beginning, Kachyňa is sending out a warning to the viewer about the retelling of stories and how even fixed concepts such as time are manipulated by the narrator to meet the needs of their version of events.

The overlap in the treatment of time and space are invoked in terms of the chronotope in film, a phenomenon explored by Mikhail Bakhtin. There have been countless applications of Bakhtin's term 'chronotope' since he first described it in the 1930s (Steinby & Tintii, 2013: 105), but for the purposes of discussing Kachyňa's films, I will focus on how the overlap and connectedness of time and space are presented. Chronotope, literally meaning *time-space*, is, for Bakhtin, the 'intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature' (1981: 84). In terms of how this can be applied to Kachyňa's poetics, I will focus on its application when considering the historical-poetics aspect to analyses of his works. According to Bordwell's framework, historical poetics looks at changes and similarities in a body of work over time (Bordwell, 2005: 142); within films themselves, there are many self-reflexive instances of this effect in action. A historical setting is an artefact that invokes a sense of stasis and movement in one place. For example, Prague Castle represents the edification of the city of Prague as a central point in the Czech lands – even today it is the home of the Czech President – but it also represents the passage of time, which in itself edifies its own importance (with Prague as a historical city).

One of the distinctions Bakhtin makes between the Greek romance novel and what came after is through what he calls alien-space (1981: 101), arguing that the events could take place anywhere because signifiers of place and time are not connected to plot. In film, however, through mise-en-scene, this is clearly not the case. Bakhtin focuses on effects in literature which point towards the 'problem of time' and to things which have 'a direct and

unmediated relationship to time' (1981: 86). Bakhtin first analyses the example of Greek romance novels as chronotopes, discussing 'adventure-time' in Greek romance/adventure novels of ordeal (1981: 86-87). Bakhtin continues his appraisal of the Greek romance novel, arguing that without chance encounters, what he calls 'suddenlys and at just that moments' (1981: 92), there would be no plot. He argues that all adventures in the Greek romance are governed by an interchangeability of space (1981: 100), therefore the events could just as easily take place elsewhere. However, a depiction of one's own environment cannot achieve that level of abstractness which underpins the chance element of Greek romance, which is an '*abstract-alien* world' (Bakhtin, 1981: 101). In *Coach to Vienna* (1966), the action takes place in an abstract-alien world, an interminable forest, where the road signifies the space in which the journey takes place. The very existence of the road is a process of years and years of voyaging along the same track. There are, however, features of the film that reduce its abstraction: the preamble explaining how the widow has come into capture, the uniforms worn by the soldiers and their weapons, the tanks driven by the partisans, all describe a specific time. Thus, while Hames is right to suggest that the film contains 'classical dimensions' (2003), the chronotopic effect of the signifiers of the World War II narrative brings it into a sharper focus. Filmmakers draw attention to markers of time in a multitude of ways, and in *Coach to Vienna*, this is central to the film's narrative in terms of the role the road plays. The road to Vienna through a dense forest is a symbol for the passage of time in the film: the road literally marks out centuries of human passage through this ancient forest. That it currently contains figures of the World War II setting places it within this particular grand narrative.

With the focus on screen when the carriage takes off on its journey being the weaponry onboard, the director sets up the potential for conflict during this journey. While the antihero, Hans, is armed with a rifle in hand, the shots pan to an axe hidden under the carriage, and a pistol by the injured soldier Gunter. There is the overt, military power versus

the potential for subterfuge in the form of the axe, which sets up a conventional partisan-effort-against-the-Nazis narrative. However, just as these are not conventional Nazis, the heroine is not a conventional partisan. She may have revenge in mind for the killing of her husband at the hands of the Nazis, but she is not part of an organised splinter cell – nor is she in any way the typical depiction of the partisan hero partaking in the noble fight against enemy forces. This divergence from conventions sets in motion the type of journey this film will take: rather than a straightforward journey to Vienna, this voyage through a cavernous hinterland will meet with several obstacles in the road.

The first of these is when they reach a rocky portion of road. The bumping causes Gunter, who is mortally wounded in the back, severe discomfort and Hans, afraid that Gunter's groans will draw attention to them, attempts to divert the horses onto the smoother side of the road but is unable to communicate this to them. Krista, the widow, takes control of the situation and quietly moves the horses onto the smoother terrain. They then encounter a physical block in the road which Hans again unsuccessfully attempts to negotiate. His initial instinct is to try manually to lift the heavy, fallen tree and then he engineers a plot to attach chains to it and use the horses to move it out of the way. Krista, however, leads the horses and cart off the road, through an area of the woodland, and back out the other side of the blockage. This instance demonstrates an ability to go off track without the use of force to bludgeon onwards. Thus, when gunshots are heard off in the distance, the decision to take cover in the dense woodlands follows this logic and the group's defence is set up in opposition to the brute-force tactic employed previously by Hans. In the background, off-screen, the sound of munitions firing acts as a warning of the presence of other players in this narrative. At this point, Hans strips off his and Gunter's Wehrmacht insignia and has a white handkerchief attached to the end of his rifle as a sign of surrender. Rather than take the conflict on, this approach gives them the power to assess their options. Again, this is

down to Krista, who mirrors such decision-making in her approach to the ongoing revenge plot.

From the first shots of weapons in the film and the seemingly relative ease with which she could procure firearms and have her revenge, the plot of subterfuge and cunning, symbolised in the hidden axe under the carriage, clouds this seemingly straightforward narrative. While Hames argues that she is 'resolved' to kill the soldiers (in *Kinoeye,* 2003) with a 'methodical' disarming of their items of power leverage – compass, pistol and bayonet (2003) – Krista's actions are therefore mystifying to the viewer when she starts to disarm the soldiers in the course of the journey. First, she tosses away Gunter's dagger when he is passed out. Then, with Gunter incapacitated and Hans bathing, unarmed, she has the pistol in her reach, but rather than mete out here revenge, she again disarms the soldiers, tossing the pistol and a compass into the trees. Hans' nudity reflects his reaction to the sound of the partisans off-screen, where he strips off his military insignia and raises a white flag. The inherent danger for Hans in such a move is demonstrated with Krista's holding onto the axe; given her actions to this point, her modus operandi seems to be defence over attack, and the holding of the axe may be a means to protect herself, but it does also keep alive the possibility that she will act out her revenge. As a point of reflexion, the partisans off-screen are armed, so one question raised at this point in the narrative is: would they, like Krista, show restraint against Hans and Gunter?

Hans, during these acts of being disarmed, has been distracted: first by the sight of a squirrel and then a deer in the forest, both animals traditionally subject to human hunting. Through his appreciation of these traditional objects of prey, the theme of humanism through his attachment to his prisoner is developed. When he is bathing, however, he appears in the shot from Krista's perspective; here, their roles are subverted and suddenly he is the prey. She has access to weapons, and he is unarmed and vulnerable. The implications of letting down his guard could be severe, yet she chooses not to act on the glaring opportunity,

reinforcing her pacifism. Then when he returns to the cart another possible conflict arises between the two, where a flash of her blonde hair contrasts against her black, mourning garb and causes Hans some pause. Allured by her femininity, obscured until this point, he looks longingly at Krista who returns a look of defensive scorn.

This opens another means of attack Krista must defend herself against, that of sexual aggression. Her status as female held captive by two male soldiers makes her vulnerable to such an attack; however, this dynamic has been complicated throughout, where her peasant strength demonstrated by her superior handling of the horses and cart, coupled with Gunter's incapacitation and Hans' childlike naivete, realign this conventional balance. Like his reaction to the squirrel and the deer, Hans shows restraint in his reaction to acknowledging Krista's femininity: he is likewise no sexual predator. Coupled with the question mark surrounding how the partisans might react to the discovery of Hans and Gunter, there is foreboding in this with regards to Krista's vulnerability to sexual aggression. By this point, the narrative has developed a degree of sympathy for the supposed enemy here in Hans. His character has been portrayed as complex, sensitive and eminently human: all qualities reflected in Krista, whose reluctance to attack Hans signifies her own empathy towards him. The warning at this point, however, represented through the almost spectre-like appearance of Gunter, is that Hans does not represent a typical soldier.

At this moment, a shot fires off-screen. The alarm causes Gunter to attempt suicide and he is only prevented at the last second by Hans, who prises the pistol out of his hand. Here, the unloading of weapons causes panic and when those in a panic hold weapons the warning is that the consequences can be severe. Without weapons neither the panic nor the reaction would have happened, and Krista's continued project serves as a defence against such actions and reactions. With Krista still holding the axe, however, Hans sits next to her in the cab and his defences appear lowered once again. Speaking in German, which Krista appears not to understand, he reminisces and shows her pictures of his family. All the while

Krista has her hand on the axe and when he lays on her lap and closes his eyes, he is vulnerable to attack. Again, she refuses to kill him. When Gunter notices the missing inventory, then, and informs Hans, the reaction of the two soldiers is once again panic. Suddenly Hans is transformed and shouts authoritatively at Krista in German at gunpoint, Gunter encouraging him to shoot. The axe is discovered and to check for other items she may be hiding Hans orders her to strip at gunpoint. Here, her subjection to both physical and sexual attack is magnified; Hans has all the power, and despite seeming distracted by her physical form as she stands in her white underwear contrasting with both the black forest (a symbol of protection against physical attack throughout) and her modest black garb (a symbol of protection against sexual advances throughout), he acts neither on his impulse to kill or for sex. Instead, he orders her to run off and abandons her in the forest.

After she chases after them through the forest, however, she then becomes something of a liability to Hans, and a potential obstacle to his journey through the forest to Vienna. At this point, he hunts her down with his rifle, and even successfully decoys her into a trap where he has her clearly in his sights with the rifle, but tellingly he intentionally fires the weapon well above her head. Following this warning shot, Krista is then met with another warning when she runs off again into the woods. This is the point where the Soviet soldiers finally appear on screen, driving a tank and with captured Wehrmacht soldiers pulling logs at gunpoint, a point Hames argues as commencing the second part of the film which is marked by chaos (2003). This demonstration of the power of armament and the consequences of capture reinforce the foreboding of the potential for violence against both the antihero and the heroine: the brutality demonstrated by the Soviets towards their captives does not augur well.

During this sequence where Krista, once again demonstrating her remarkable athleticism, is running through the treacherous terrain, the conflict between the road and the forest is reinforced. The woods offer refuge but are also disorienting and unforgiving,

whereas the road offers direction but can lead straight into danger. As Krista careers through the forest, her widow's garb is gradually stripped away and on meeting the road once again she symbolically pulls off her head scarf, revealing her blonde hair contrasted against the black woods behind her. The shot then cuts to Hans who looks equally exhausted as he marches the horses along the road, training his sights on his surroundings in apparent fear of ambush. At this stage, the oppressors and the oppressed have been separated, both are exhausted, and when Krista finally catches up to Hans, he is burying Gunter in a shallow grave. She catches him afterwards sleeping by the cartwheel and faces her dilemma.

Standing over him and wielding the axe which has been a symbol for subterfuge from the beginning, Krista is about to fulfil the revenge plot when Hans awakens and, terror-stricken, makes the universal shout of 'Mama', and something seems to penetrate Krista's humanity. Instead of killing him, she beats him and bloodies his nose, again a subversion of their gender roles. Language, and the inability to effectively communicate, is a theme throughout the film and Krista's response to his cries for mercy is to scream: 'You do not understand' ('*Nerozumíš*', 1:04.43). The inability to understand, to show empathy for the other side, is at the heart of the film. These two characters are in fact emblems of, despite all the barriers put in their way in terms of language, nationality, gender and circumstance, two characters who do show an ability to understand one another on a basic human level. Thus, the ambiguity inherent in the Czech negation of verbs provides a fitting inflection of subversion: '*Nerozumiš*' literally means 'you do not understand', where only a questioning tonal inflection distinguishes the statement from the question in speech. This inflection of a questioning tone to something that can otherwise be taken as a statement reflects how subversion is produced in the film, and is an example of the ambiguous tone of Kachyňa's questioning both of the machinations of the film industry and, in turn, the regime itself.

Krista still has deep anger towards what she believes Hans represents as a Wehrmacht soldier, but eventually she succumbs to human pity and they fall into an exhausted embrace.

While Hans makes sexual advances towards Krista, her refusal is accepted and instead they simply embrace. Both have been starved of human connection during this conflict – Krista in losing her husband; Hans in being separated from his fiancée – and this scene is a demonstration of their humanity towards one another. What happens next, however, inverts all of the humanity shown throughout the film to this point, and the perpetrators are the partisans who the viewer would expect to be symbols of virtue and liberty in this narrative context.

Despite refusing sexual advances, Krista is literally found sleeping with the enemy by a group of Partisan fighters. Hans is forced to wear a noose around his neck and frogmarch behind the cart as they head towards the town with Krista's horses. Despite his evident exhaustion, the partisans continue to humiliate Hans and only Krista shows any pity towards him, ordering her horses to stop. For this intervention she is first beaten and then raped by the soldiers in the cart. Eventually, the cart is stopped and one of the soldiers climbs down and executes Hans with his rifle, leaving him on the road. This sequence comes at the end of the film, yet in those five minutes the partisans manage to topple any virtue built during the rest of the voyage. Restraint against a desire for revenge, restraint against sexual desires, communication and understanding, pity – all of the humanity developed through characterisation in the film – evaporates with the actions of the partisans. The final scene offers a glimmer of optimism in that Krista returns to the forest with her horses and cart to retrieve Hans' corpse to provide him the dignity of a proper burial.

The actions of the partisans versus the characterisation of Hans is as starkly contrasted as the objects of black against white in the film, yet the warning is a clouding of these types of binarisms. Kachyňa successfully sets out to demonstrate how, in a conflict setting, individuals act in ways that dehumanise them and others. Through his characterisation of Hans and Krista and their ability to overcome the obstacles that separate them, the film is an example of the kind of restraint required to avoid the cycle of revenge

and retribution. Despite the pessimism of the ending, there is hope instilled in the narrative that grievances, however strong, can be overcome. The actions of the partisans, however, act as a warning that not everyone is capable of reconciliation. In the context of the 1960s environment and the New Wave, this acts as an example of what can be achieved through reform via compromise over annihilation. The partisans in *Coach to Vienna*, however, are completely uncompromising. In this sense, the film was somewhat prophetic given the events of 1968 and the Warsaw Pact invasion, which I will examine more closely in the next chapter, where the use of force to fulfil requirements was compelling. The tone of this defeat to the brutality of the regime is reflected in the final film Kachyňa and Procházka were credited together with, *The Ear*.

***The Ear* (1970)**

If Kachyňa and Procházka adopted the politically accepted historical narrative in *Coach to Vienna* to address taboo issues from the past and confront how history is addressed under totalitarian conditions, there was no such subtlety when it came to *The Ear*. Not only was *The Ear* produced after the generally agreed New Wave period of 1963-1968, and during the early consolidation period when the Prague Spring was being frozen out (Blažejovský, 2004: 70), its anti-establishment tone is so directly aimed at the ruling KSČ that it seems unthinkable that the film ever made it to completion. As has been outlined, Procházka's position within the Party was dismantled by this time, too, so the argument that his influence allowed it to happen is redundant. Indeed, the scepticism surrounding Procházka's links to the Party from peers and critics during the 1960s is dealt with directly in *The Ear* in relation to its central character, Ludvík (Radoslav Brzobohatý). The film depicts a married couple, Ludvík and Anna (Jiřina Bohdalová), whose leverage within the establishment is demonstrated by the formal party at Prague Castle they have just attended. When they return to their suburban Prague home, however, they find it is being bugged by the authorities and this paranoid episode serves as the stage for much of the action in the film.

For Elisabetta Girelli, *The Ear* is characterised by 'rapid and intimate dialogue between the two protagonists, unraveling the complexities of their relationship to each other and to the communist Establishment' (Girelli, 2011: 50). Girelli describes the couple finding the listening devices as the 'pivotal' moment in the film (*Ibid*.); for Steven Jay Schneider, this moment shifts the dynamic of confrontation between the married couple to one of tenderness and mutual understanding (in *Kinoeye,* 2002). Thus, within this confined space of the couple's home that hinges public and private existence, two characters who share an inseparable bond are confronted with the necessity to put aside their own divisions for their mutual benefit. As a critique of the wider situation in Czechoslovakia at the time, where both the political and public spheres were split following the Warsaw Pact invasion, this provides an amicable solution to would-be viewers in this context. This breaking down of apparent oppositions, which I have demonstrated was a key component of Kachyňa's poetics, again resists the apportioning of blame to any individuals within the system. While the couple stand out as prominent characters in the film, their co-fate is determined as a couple rather than as individuals, generating a discursive space that accounts for the collective over the individual. Thus, issues presented as black and white, personal and public, are blurred even from the focused position of these characters' home.

As with the opening to *Coach to Vienna*, the pronounced contrast between black and white presents a chiaroscuro effect that invokes the noir genre. Writing from an American cultural position, Kelly Oliver and Benigno Trigo explore the 'free-flowing anxiety of noir' in their introduction to their work *Noir Anxiety* (2015). Oliver and Trigo set out critical overviews of the genre, where critics often attribute its anxieties and fatalism to the turmoil of the postwar era (2015: xiii). From a United States perspective, they consider the anxieties of men returning from World War II to find their authority diminished at home (in the domestic setting, the workplace, and the city) due to the roles of women and people of colour during the war (*Ibid*.). Oliver and Trigo argue that 'their fear

was that “their” women had left them for jobs or other men, their families and children were no longer theirs to control’, they feared that patriarchal values were being clipped away (2015: xiii). These anxieties are each to be found in *The Ear*: the couple discuss Anna’s extramarital affair, they discuss the improprieties of Anna’s aunt who had been living with them that could have negative consequences, and they lament the indiscipline of their son. However, while these anxieties reflect those of the postwar white man in the United States, the difference here is that the concerns and fate are shared between the couple. The threat, rather than difference between sex and race, is political difference. The state is the agitator here, and its claim to power in the home is a threat not only to Ludvík and any notion of patriarchal control, but to them both as a couple. The result is a collective existential angst.

Hugh S. Manon, meanwhile, points to the lighting technique of chiaroscuro as the most easily discernible of the noir genre, with its ‘angular alternation of dark shadows and stark fields of light across various on-screen surfaces’ (2008: 1). Yet Manon counterpoints the critical reception to chiaroscuro set out by Oliver and Trigo of evoking the postwar milieu while generating an atmosphere of claustrophobia and duplicity (*Ibid*.). While these effects are central to *The Ear*, Manon’s more ‘general’ approach to the effects of chiaroscuro can also illuminate aspects of the film outside these historical, psychological and existential fields (2008: 2). Manon argues instead that the effect of chiaroscuro, in its invocation of the X-Ray, compels the viewer to consider seeing what they cannot see on the surface in the film (2008: 2). In the case of *The Ear*, this dramatic effect is espoused in both of the film’s main settings: the familial home, a site for private life, and the public building of Prague Castle, whose banquet-room setting is normally the preserve of only high-ranking officialdom. *The Ear* compels the viewer to look beneath the surface in both settings and consider their inner-machinations and to ponder how both play off one another. When the couple learn to appreciate that the state is having an overbearing effect

on their lives, the realisation brings the couple together rather than tearing them apart. In order to reach this epiphany, they first had to pick beneath the surface of what had gone on previously that night at the castle. Through a re-examination of surface-value events through flashbacks, Ludvík gets closer to the truth of the situation; through a forensic examination of the home, the couple discover the listening devices.

Oliver and Trigo also set out the critical response to noir as an expression of existential angst and anxiety over fate inherent in the human condition (2015: xiv), which reflects this joint position from the couple in *The Ear* as they consider the wider implications of the surveillance of their private residence on their material existence. The level of threat that they comprehend culminates in Ludvík considering suicide, such are the pressures of this oppressive act. For Oliver and Trigo, noir critics focus on how the existential angst, moral ambiguity, and style of noir produce a sense of 'free-floating anxiety' often displaced onto the 'fickle finger of fate' (2015: xiv). In *The Ear*, this is in the particular political situation that both benefits and oppresses the protagonists. Oliver and Trigo argue that 'behind the free-flowing anxiety of noir is a primal anxiety over borders and boundaries that manifests itself in specific fears and phobias of race, sex maternity and national origin' (2015: xiv). Again, this specifically refers to the American context but its analogous concerns over sex, maternity and national belonging – insiders and outsiders in the national-political sense – are prevalent in *The Ear*. Ludvík lambasts Anna over failing to fulfil her domestic duties, her drunkenness and her poor parenting of their son while the pretext of a political examination of their life is ongoing.

This surveillance represents the breakdown of the borders of public and private. Oliver and Trigo examine how film noir displays unconscious anxieties over borders of identity (2015: xiv). This is a phenomenon I have argued is prevalent in the works of Kachyňa from the outset of his career: from borderland settings in periods of flux, to the docudrama format hinging the real and fictional worlds, to double-agent and children's

coming-of-age narratives hinging aspects of individuals' lives. In *Noir Anxiety*, Oliver and Trigo argue that film noir is a visual manifestation of a process of identity formation (2015: 211); this identity construction is 'built by protecting it from threats of ambiguous borders' (*Ibid*.). These threats all arise from the potential breakdown of these borders – the ambiguity over which generates the anxiety in its characters. Thus, the effect of chiaroscuro provides a template on which set notions of fixed statuses can exist ostensibly in black and white. Yet, conversely and most unsettlingly, the technique only serves to highlight the possibility for different shades of black and white. Where certain shadows are pronounced, questions arise about the other shadowy representations in the mise-en-scene: even in black and white there exist grey areas that obscure from notions of clear definitions of identity.

As with the motif of the road in *Coach to Vienna*, the symbol of Prague Castle also has a chronotopic effect in how it reflects the political and military centre of the Bohemian lands through many centuries, with the shots of the castle reflecting against water establishing this mirroring theme. Again, the stage is set for an examination of character depicting one era, but which could be attributable to any other era throughout history. Kachyňa uses close-up shots within the confines of the home that squeeze in the voyeuristic gazes at the characters' private lives. The mise-en-abyme effect of this with regards to the couple's privacy being invaded upon by the authorities in the form of listening devices placed around the home deepens this sense of claustrophobia.

The viewer is reminded of their status as viewer looking in on the characters. In one scene at the party, a drunk dissident is blurting the positive aspects of the loosening of the Stalinist imperative where religious and political iconography are allowed to coexist. As the government official, who later moves away from a religious statue inside the castle because it makes him uncomfortable, takes notice, the drunk turns to the camera to complete his rant, engaging the viewer. This is an acknowledgement of the viewer's position of monitoring the

response from the government official to this lapse from a Czech dissident and helps to generate an awareness of the potential outcome for this character, thus incriminating the viewer in passive complicity as inactive spectator. As Elisabetta Girelli points out, 'off-screen space is always … implied in *The Ear*, in the form of an overarching system' (Girelli, 2011: 15). With the film's title invoking the authorities' position within the couple's home, this off-screen presence is overbearing in the film. With the use of flashbacks, the narrative weaves the plight of Ludvík's neighbour Klepáč with the discussion about this associate at the state banquet, where talks about his improprieties precede his investigation by the authorities which is a part of the real-time narrative at Ludvík's home. Again, these actions occur off-screen and are only alluded to physically through the gestures of silhouettes appearing in neighbouring windows. As Girelli argues, 'the setting provides the film with a vital part of its overall narrative: as the couple's ongoing sparring combines with a dramatic interaction with the space they inhabit, this very space ceases to be an inert agglomeration of walls and furniture, becoming instead a site of negotiation between the protagonists and the external power that seeks to control them' (Girelli, 2011: 50). However, in spite of this position of control for the authorities, Girelli argues that the couple manage to retrieve their 'invaded home' (2011: 56), both in their dismantling of the physical devices for surveillance and through the symbolic function of their imaginations (2011: 56-57). For Girelli, this represents a failure by the authorites to control the protagonists, whose derision of 'the ear' and indulgences in 'forbidden activities', such as criticizing the Party, represents a detachment from the authoritative control and the breaking of taboos (2011: 56-57).

The omnipresence of the overarching authorities is also reflected in Ludvík and Anna's relationship, where the presence of the regime in their everyday lives is felt from off-screen, altering their behaviour to toe the party line. Anna's drunkenness at and after the party, however, reflects the dissident's position and is similarly a problem for her slipping up in this sense. The difference for Anna explored in the film, however, is that rather than

having the corporeal symbol of the government officials before them, the unseen presence of the authorities in the form of listening devices in the home generates a more unsettlingly ubiquitous picture. This invisible presence of the regime in the home offers an example of the public/private overlap produced in the film. Anna's drunkenness not only lowers her guard in terms of self-incrimination, it also causes her to let her domestic duties slip (Ludvík laments the messy state of their kitchen at home as he berates her for drinking vodka from the bottle). For Anna, however, Ludvík, who is employed by the government, has also let his duties within the relationship slip in terms of physical affection, with his preoccupation with work consuming his time at home – Anna laments that she would like, at least once a week, 'even if it is drab', to have sexual intercourse. Thus, the workings of the regime are causing this public/private overlap in both of the central characters' lives.

The depiction of the relationship between husband and wife in *The Ear* is highly reflective of Mike Nichols' *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (1966). Indeed, Steven Jay Schneider draws on this intertextuality in his essay 'Who's afraid of... Big Brother?: Karel Kachyňa's *Ucho* (*The Ear*, 1970)' (2002). Schneider writes:

> Anna cries hysterically, Ludvík tries to comfort her, and the *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf*-style psychological warfare comes to an end as Big Brother closes in. The analogies established earlier between marriage (the personal/private relations between individuals) and citizenship (the political/public relations between a country's government and its residents) – both of which frequently involve suspicion, hypocrisy, resentments, tarnished ideals, secrets and lies – now diminish in import. Instead we become sensitive to the disanalogies: the limitless capacity of those in power to plot, to conspire, to utilize advanced technology or the threat thereof in order to terrorize, manipulate and control (January 7, 2002).

For viewers, the voyeuristic gaze at these marital issues is uncomfortable within the constricted confines of the family home, and this is reinforced through the discomfort felt by Ludvík in their private acts being monitored by the authorities. Indeed, when the couple are first dropped off and realise their keys are missing, Anna is about to urinate on the street, to which Ludvík snaps 'there are people around', a demonstration of his paranoia about being

watched as well as a self-reflexive nod to the viewer's gaze. So when the camera turns to Anna with her skirts held up, the viewer again becomes complicit in this uncomfortable gaze. This is reinforced later when Anna is trying to coax Ludvík to bed wearing only her lingerie, but is told to 'put something on, don't run around naked'. Ludvík's paranoia about being watched is extended here to the viewer's gaze.

Nichols' 1966 film is similarly set within the confines of a couple's home, where their apparently dysfunctional marital relationship plays out as the action of the film. Martha (Elizabeth Taylor) says to her husband George (Richard Burton): 'Truth and illusion, George. You don't know the difference?' George replies: 'No, but we must carry on as though we did.' Here, the couple's sparring helps to blur the lines between truth and illusion, the real and fiction, in classic noir fashion (Oliver and Trigo, 2015: xiv). In a film where the true motivations of the characters, whether they actually love or loathe one another, is difficult to espouse (Stevens, 2015: 1), this challenge to truth in the form of illusion underlines the anxieties brought out in noir cinema outlined by Oliver and Trigo, where fears over the breaking down of borders are all-consuming (2015: xiii). *The Ear* transposes this noir aspect of the marital relationship between George and Martha with Ludvík and Anna; however, as Schneider suggests, the focus shifts from the overlap between marriage and citizenship to the ability of the state to interfere with this private aspect of people's lives (2002). While the viewer, as Kyle Stevens argues, is left unsure what to make of George and Martha's relationship during their own voyeuristic gaze inside their home (2015: 1), it follows that the political authorities listening in to Ludvík and Anna's domestic affairs are uncertain, too. This crossover between the invasion of the private setting by the authorities listening in to the couple in *The Ear* and the viewer's gaze in both *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and *The Ear* calls on the viewer to consider their own role in watching these films.

This metafictional element points to those participants behind the scenes in the making of the film (the writers, director, cast and crew, producers, film studio and

authorities), who are the ones in control of the narrative and the characters. The viewer is reminded of this in the starting sequence when the credits roll on screen.[23] This information acts as a nod to the viewer that the narrative is controlled elsewhere, and that the viewer has an inherent inability to alter the course of the narrative against its predestination. As Manon's analogy with the X-Ray suggests, this compels the viewer to look beneath the surface and consider the wider machinations at play: what is causing the characters to act in this way? Nichols' commentary appeared at a time when Hollywood was in a state of disarray and of political turmoil in the United States (Stevens, 2015: 2). Kachyňa's film, likewise, appears during a period of significant upheaval in Czechoslovak culture following the invasion by the Warsaw Pact nations. Given that the pressure from the authorities is what drives the couple's behaviour in *The Ear*, this motif acts as a reminder to the viewer of the power of the state to manipulate people's actions through means of terror.

What this metafictional element reflects is how the characters operating under totalitarian conditions likewise have a limited ability to alter their own destiny. The sense of dispossession is reflected in *The Ear* through Ludvík and Anna's discovery of the listening devices. Since the house has been given to the couple by the authorities (Girelli, 2011: 50), the authorities retain a sense of ownership which they take advantage of with this action. Ludvík's links to the Party, however, changes this dynamic of oppression, generating a sense of complicity and an overlap between oppressed and oppressor which reflects the wider concerns of the film industry: most of the New Wave filmmakers worked for the very state they were criticising, again reflecting the liminal space Kachyňa invokes.

This is brought out by Anna, when the issue of having broken the rules by taking in her aunt to their home is thought to have been revealed by her lingering possessions in their

[23] For more on the metafictionality of the on-screen credits, see Georg Stanitzek, 'Reading the Title Sequence' in *Cinema Journal*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (summer, 2009), pp. 44-58. [Online] Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/25619727.

attic where a search appears to have been carried out. Ludvík's reaction to this is to say: 'I should have given her the boot', thus revealing a process of reassessing his actions to protect himself. This is what his straining over the series of flashbacks to the party is all about: he is trying to understand what signifiers pointed to his own suspicion to uncover some hidden meaning in what his colleagues have said. He recalls a colleague warning him to 'keep to himself' on the revelation that his associate and neighbour, Klepáč, has been arrested by the Party, which could explain his own current situation. Ludvík recalls a speech made by the regional leader, in which the elder statesman announces that 'they are still among us, those who only call themselves comrades'. Ludvík then declares to the listening devices in his home that he hardly knew Klepáč, whose home he can see from his window has its lights on with people walking around inside. At this point, his own electricity is returned, as if what he has said has been accepted by the authorities.

This is an incredibly poignant point with regards to Kachyňa's future career. I have previously argued that one reason that Kachyňa was able to continue to work apparently unhindered into the 1970s and the period of normalisation was because of the circumstances surrounding screenplay writer Procházka (Kachyňa in Liehm, 1974: 108). As Hames argues, *The Ear* can be seen as a metaphor for Procházka's treatment by the authorities; however, I would argue that this is not from the perspective of Ludvík but from Klepáč or any of the other expelled members. Ludvík is able to cling on to his position but by 1970 Procházka was cast out of the Central Committee. Ironically, in terms of a critique of the filmmaking environment, Ludvík in fact represents those who were able to get away with it. This is not to say that the film is suggesting that, in trying to avoid his own persecution, Ludvík is doing anything particularly wrong, but that his awareness of his situation gives him the advantage to heed the warnings that his associates apparently have failed to. Ludvík is, through certain deeds exposed by Anna, complicit in breaking the rules in certain regards, but his

denunciation of his peers, after which his electricity is reconnected, proves the catalyst for his survival.

Anna's attempt, then, to call Mrs Klepáč when the phone line is reinstated signifies a closer relationship to this excommunicated family than Ludvík lets on to, and she is scolded by her husband for making such an incriminating move. Ludvík is apparently willing to sacrifice others around him for his own protection, but there is a certain inference that if he does not do this then everyone will suffer. Anna retorts that 'you only care about yourself, you leave a trail of corpses. You didn't tell about your brother in England. You would join any movement, left or right, to reach the top'. This act of defiance from Anna is more like insolence, it is disruption rather than destruction, since her revelation about her brother-in-law has incriminating significance and could cause more trouble for them and for their family.

The reaction from Ludvík is to resort to violence to put down resistance; again, the oppressed becomes the oppressor. Anna is given a bloody nose and is placed under cold water, a scene which is again uncomfortable within the private confines of the home for the viewer. The outcome is also significant, with how violence puts down resistance in relation to the Warsaw Pact invasion, and the scene that follows is a kind of normalisation in itself, with a subdued Anna appearing in a bathrobe, sobered up and drinking coffee, before turning to her domestic duties to retain order. The association made here in this overlapping of personal relationships with wider, social concerns is between the nuclear, patriarchal family's methods of normalising its own structure and societal normalisation under the totalitarian state after the Warsaw Pact invasion: disruptions and dissidence are suppressed with violence. If the character development in *Coach to Vienna* demonstrated what can be achieved when understanding is reached despite the barriers put in place, it is only to be shattered by a holistic reaction based on misunderstanding by the partisans at the end. In *The Ear*, however, Ludvík refuses to oppose the treatment of his associates and instead

denounces them, for which he is rewarded and is even promoted. Their reaction to this, however, is telling, with Anna's pronouncement of 'I'm scared' demonstrating that there are no winners in this totalitarian environment; even victories for characters within the totalitarian state are met with dread, such is the feeling of scepticism and paranoia the state produces. Even in his freedom to continue to work, through the bureaucratic system Ludvík is susceptible to blackmail. Thus it was for Kachyňa by the end of the 1960s. By tracing his actions throughout the decade of the New Wave in the last two chapters, and juxtaposing these with the films *Coach to Vienna* and *The Ear*, an understanding of how Kachyňa was able to continue working after the Warsaw Pact invasion seemingly unhindered can be grasped. Those telling words, 'I'm scared', uttered by Anna in *The Ear*, however, offer an account of where Kachyňa stood by this point. He is isolated; neither an insider for the New Wave movement nor enough of an outsider to be free from persecution by the authorities.

In *Coach to Vienna*, Krista faces a similar dilemma. While ostensibly the narrative follows a revenge plot, the development of her relationship with Hans, a figure representing the oppressor in the World War II setting, reduces such binary definitions as good versus evil. In order to negotiate her journey, Krista chooses silence as her defence; a lack of understanding in terms of the language barrier acts as a weapon for her. A lack of understanding from the authorities towards Kachyňa's films during the 1960s, particularly from the president himself, is specifically pointed to by Kachyňa as an area that helped to afford him certain freedoms (in Liehm, 1974: 108). Off-screen in *Coach to Vienna*, however, as in the 1960s film context, there is an aggressive insurgency who Krista witnesses taking retributive action against their diminishing oppressors in the form of Wehrmacht soldiers. In the film-industry context of the 1960s, these are the proponents of the New Wave, which was in full flow by 1966 when *Coach to Vienna* was made. Krista is warned that any association with the Nazi forces could lead to her own self-implication and retributive action from the partisans when she witnesses their treatment of their captives. For Kachyňa, his

own links to the oppressive forces coming under increasing attack from within aligns him politically with Krista, and the outcome for the heroine is another warning against appearing to be too close to the oppressive forces; to breaking taboo. Alternatively, *The Ear*, produced under very different political circumstances, offers a warning from the opposite direction: being too close to the insurrectionists can have its own consequences, too: there are taboos on both sides.

In *The Ear*, once again the taboo theme of association with leadership is explored. Like Krista, Ludvík finds himself caught in an compromising situation with regards to his associations with individuals caught by the authorities. Just as the partisans find Krista with Hans, Ludvík faces a choice of whether to implicate himself along with his peers or to denounce them altogether. While Krista voices her objection to the partisans' treatment of Hans after his capture, Ludvík chooses to denounce his comrades. Krista is violently attacked for speaking up, while Ludvík's nightmare in his home comes to an end. For Kachyňa, this is the situation he found himself in throughout the decade. Notably, it was after Novotný was ousted from power in 1968 that Kachyňa gave his interview with Liehm. His interviewer, a key figure in the reformist movement during the 1960s, points out in the article that he has a strained relationship with Kachyňa, and points to his relationship with the authorities and scepticism from his contemporaries (Liehm, 1974). In a sense, Kachyňa is at a point similar to Krista in relation to the partisans and Ludvík with the authorities in that he has the opportunity to denounce his former relationship with a figure who has switched from a position of power to powerlessness. Kachyňa, like Ludvík, denounces Novotný, minimising their relationship and, also like Ludvík, putting it all on his associate Procházka who will soon be in trouble with the authorities.

This all comes at a time when the Warsaw Pact invasion, and the threat of military force in a move to return the political conditions to that of the pre-reformist era, has taken place. The premise of normalisation reflects the aggressive, reactionary actions of the

partisans and of Ludvík towards Anna. Krista, whose refusal to succumb to her desire for revenge and retribution, and who offers pity and redemption, is cast aside by her would-be rescuers and violently brought back into line. Ludvík, like Kachyňa, faces a similar fate at the end of the 1960s, and both choose a path away from violence and retribution, which allows them to continue in their roles. The authorities, meanwhile, live up to their own duplicity, like the partisans, where the truth is not what matters, only that what is being said is in line with what is required to retain power. For Kachyňa, power is the ability to continue to make films, something he managed to retain during the normalisation period.

How he managed to do this is not always reflective of the humanist poetics of his films. *Coach to Vienna* faced problems at the production stage and required the personal intervention of President Novotný for its release (Kachyňa in Liehm, 1974: 108-109). While the film deals with the politically accepted narrative of the partisans' efforts against the Nazis during World War II, the film itself is unconventional even in this context in how it presents the partisans in an unfavourable light (Hames, 2009: 79). Benefiting from this contact with leadership, however, signifies a crossing of the taboo by Kachyňa (Grotstein in Willock, Curtis & Bohm, 2009: 31), which he engages in for the benefit of his work. Following the Prague Spring of 1968, when Kachyňa was interviewed by Liehm after Novotný had been ousted by the reformist Alexander Dubček as head of the KSČ, Kachyňa denounced the former leader despite his favourable interventions on *Coach to Vienna* (in Liehm, 1974: 108). Ironically, since *Coach to Vienna* is the film that Novotný saved, Krista's actions in the film contrast with this move by Kachyňa in his interview with Liehm. Krista, who refuses the opportunities to enact her revenge on the Nazis after the murder of her husband, sacrifices her own physical safety in trying to protect her co-captor Hans at the hands of the partisans who have captured him. Rather than turn on Hans after her rescue by the partisans, she defends him and suffers violent recriminations at her so-called liberators' hands. Kachyňa,

on the other hand, refuses to defend Novotný and instead denounces the former president (in Liehm, 1974: 108).

This approach from Kachyňa is reflected in *The Ear*, where Ludvík's willingness to condemn his neighbour, friends, associates and even family leads to his own emancipation after a night of terror under the surveillance of the authorities. For Kachyňa, having had *Coach to Vienna* saved by Novotný, his subsequent films *Holy Night* (*Noc nevěsty*, 1967) and *Funny Old Man* (*Směšný pán*, 1969) were both banned by the authorities. Thus, this shift in approach in the central characters in *Coach to Vienna* and *The Ear* marks a change in circumstances surrounding Kachyňa. Ironically, the former survived censorship while the latter did not: the narrative of an individual calling out against the prevailing mob was released to audiences while the narrative of an individual succumbing to toeing the party line for his self-preservation was suppressed. What these differing films, their contrasting reception by the political authorities, and Kachyňa's own actions surrounding their production demonstrate is how the claustrophobic environment underpinning *The Ear* is reflective of the conditions he was working in. Moving into the normalisation-on-the-offensive, Kachyňa's ability to effectively produce films would be determined once more by his own actions, which began with the familiar retreat to the safety of the child's narrative.

CHAPTER FOUR: PEDAGOGY AND A RETURN TO CHILD NARRATIVES DURING NORMALISATION

The invasion of Czechoslovakia on the night of August 20, 1968 by the Soviet-led troops of the Warsaw Pact marked a major societal and cultural shift in the country. While the troops of five Warsaw Pact nations, the Soviet Union, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary and East Germany, moved towards the Czechoslovak political centre in Prague, there was little in the way of organised physical opposition or bloodshed (Kusin, 1978: 7-15), despite vocal and media opposition. The show of strength from Soviet powers was in large part a move to quell a perceived increase in liberalism which had culminated in the Prague Spring of that year,[24] and to bring the political sphere back into keeping with the other Soviet bloc states. The effect this had on culture cannot be understated. For one thing, it marked the end of the Czechoslovak New Wave in cinema and ushered in an era of normalisation-period film.

As Dora Viceníková argues, Karel Kachyňa, like any filmmaker willing to work after the invasion, was forced to move swiftly from subversive material during the Czechoslovak New Wave to 'highly uncontroversial works' in the 1970s (in *Kinoeye,* 2003); however, these changes did not happen overnight. In the previous chapter, I discussed Kachyňa's *The Ear* (*Ucho,* 1970) which, despite being filmed and completed after the invasion in 1968, can still be considered a New Wave film due to its subversive style and material. While Jaromír Blažejovský concurs with Viceníková that for filmmakers who worked before the invasion to continue afterwards, they had to pay obeisance to the communist regime (Blažejovský, 2004: 68), he points out that there was no official end point after 1968 in the film industry (Blažejovský, 2004: 70). During what he describes as the 'consolidation period' in film between 1969-1971, 'the purges gained momentum but the mood of the 1960s still lingered'

[24] Kusín argues that 'Armed forces were used as a means towards the achievement of essentially non-military objectives, namely the removal from power of a small group of people from among the top party and state leadership circle, while at the same time disseminating physical fear in the population, especially the intellectual community, in a vigorous and overwhelming way' (Kusin, 1978: 13)

(Blažejovský, 2004: 70). Indeed, *The Ear* was one of the films purged by the authorities, sent to the vaults before ever being released, and only finally premiered over two decades later after the fall of communism in Czechoslovakia.

Thus, the film is in essence a normalisation-period film since it was produced after the invasion in 1968, but this is not a binary distinction for films produced at that time. Blažejovský distinguishes between different types of films from the period 1970-1989: normalisation-period films that pertain to the entire era; normalisation films that carry regime-endorsing material; and normalising films which he discredits as mere propaganda (Blažejovský, 2004: 69). I will attempt to demonstrate how Kachyňa both fits alongside and challenges these categories at various points during the normalisation period. Blažejovský also describes stages of normalisation in relation to the Czechoslovak film industry: consolidation (1969-1971); 'normalisation on the offensive' (1972-1977): where the official position was that cinematography was to serve the 'working people', where the ideological function of art prevailed over the aesthetic function and the professional skills applied in the films produced plumbed new depths; and 'resurrection' (1976-1989), which he divides into the subcategories 'Charter 77', a cultural phenomenon in Czechoslovakia I will discuss in detail in the next chapter, and then 'perestroika', which I will also discuss in chapter five (Blažejovský, 2004: 69-75). In 1976, individuals connected to the Czech underground rock band, the Plastic People of the Universe, were arrested, tried and convicted by the government for disturbing the peace, with the band members serving eight to eighteen-month sentences (Bolton, 2012: 116). Within the climate of these arrests based on the denial of individuals' freedom of expression that failed to uphold the human rights terms of the Helsinki Declaration signed by the government in 1975 (Bolton, 2012: 177), a group of Czech artists, writers, and musicians circulated their 'Manifesto of Charter 77' (Bolton, 2012: 116). By examining the works of Kachyňa during each of these stages, then, I will attempt to demonstrate the extent to which his works are simply normalisation-period films

(i.e., pertaining to the era); normalisation films (carrying regime-endorsing material); and whether there is any normalising material (mere propaganda) during the period.

Consolidation (1969-1971)

Somewhat ironically, the two films made by Kachyňa during the 1960s deemed most subversive by the authorities and ultimately banned were *Funny Old Man* (*Směšný pán*, 1969) and *The Ear*; both were completed after the Warsaw Pact invasion. Thus, as Blažejovský suggests, the remnants of the mood of 1960s subversion can be found in Kachyňa's works during the early consolidation period of the normalisation period. To give a perspective on the implications of this censorship, when Blažejovský describes how ten films in the years 1969 and 1970 never went into distribution, while others were publicly screened only briefly, *Funny Old Man* and *The Ear* make up two of this list (Blažejovský, 2004: 68). With the New Wave directors' films of the 1960s denounced for their 'unacceptable trends such as scepticism, nihilism, alienation, egoistic individualism, exaggerated sexuality, cynicism, aggression and violence, negativism in relation to previous socialist development, the discrediting of communists, non-class illusion' (Blažejovský, 2004: 68), and the moves against Kachyňa's work in this regard already undertaken, it seems unfathomable that he was able to release another film as early as *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again (Už zase skáču přes kaluže,* 1971). Was this film one example of a filmmaker willing to denounce everything that had gone on during the 1960s, including his own works, in favour of promoting the values of the communist regime? Was this enough to placate the authorities who had banned his two previous works?

Part of the answer, again, offers an ironic twist: as Antonín J. Liehm and Mira Liehm argue, the release of *Holy Night (Noc nevěsty*, 1967) 'initiated the open conflict between Procházka and the establishment' (Liehm and Liehm, 1977: 291), which was followed by the banning of his and Kachyňa's next two works; however, this conflict was with Procházka and not necessarily with Kachyňa. Following the Warsaw Pact invasion in 1968, Procházka,

who had been on the Central Committee of the KSČ, was denounced, so his decade-long collaboration with Kachyňa ended – or so it appeared. The adapted screenplay credits for *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again*, the first film Kachyňa made after his previous banned works, are attributed to Ota Hofman; however, Procházka used Hofman as a pseudonym and did produce the screenplay for the film (Blažejovský, 2004: 70). This subversive act demonstrates how, rather than denouncing his past works, Kachyňa was in fact able to use cunning to continue to work on his own terms in a way that was not going to see his films blocked or censored and would keep him out of trouble with the authorities. This demonstrates the subversive space Kachyňa would occupy throughout the normalisation period, in spite of the increased pressure from the authorities on the production of films. Unlike Ludvík in *The Ear,* who denounces his associates for his self-preservation, and also unlike Krista in *Coach to Vienna* (*Kočár do Vídně,* 1966), who is violently punished for standing up for the enemy, Kachyňa occupies a middle ground where he neither rejects his long-term collaborator Procházka nor puts himself and his work at risk from retaliation from the authorities by ostensibly siding with his politically shunned colleague. This demonstrates an adeptness in negotiating the politically charged atmosphere of the normalisation period whilst preserving his own artistic value.

Blažejovský argues that 'the best conditions were granted to those who subscribed to the politics of normalisation', while others made what he calls 'genre films' – adopting the norms of socialist realism. Some 'made films for children and youths', while others who felt shunned by the New Wave came to prominence (Blažejovský, 2004: 70). Kachyňa does not quite fit into any of this; indeed, Blažejovský states that he, along with Juraj Herz, Jaromil Jireš and Jaroslav Papoušek, 'continued almost without a break', but no explanation for this is offered (Blažejovský, 2004: 70). His ability to apparently adopt the mores of the normalisation period, starting with removing Procházka from the title credits in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again*, demonstrates how Kachyňa negotiates the period. Another area is his

return to the child's narrative. Ivana Košuličová laments his use of 'young heroes' in 1970s and 1980s as a move away from his 'most creative period' during the 1960s' (in *Kinoeye,* 2003); however, she argues that his films also inhabit the world of adults that enclose the younger generation (2003). Košuličová writes: 'In the adult characters [Kachyňa] shows emotional and life disillusion. They are often unhappy personalities with feeling of emptiness and life betrayal. It is this adult world, world of sadness and disappointment that the young heroes are often confronted with. The world of adults is often dark, filthy, without honesty' (2003). This blurring of the lines between the apparently disarming perspective of children and their connection to the adult forces constricting their experiences offers a platform to critique the enforcement of arbitrary political systems on individuals in the Czechoslovak normalisation context. This depiction of adult concerns through the perspective of children also mirrors the use of child narratives by Kachyňa in his earlier works.

As I have argued in relation to Kachyňa's 1960s works, and even those of the 1950s, his apparent adoption of socialist-realist modes is coupled with the use of settings that subscribed to the politically acceptable historical narratives. However, Kachyňa's adoption of these accepted modes, as well as his use of children as protagonists, had always allowed him to get away with producing challenging films in the face of the regime. The concessions made by other artists are described as having a diluting effect on their artistry; however, Kachyňa's poetics and their link to photography and the beauty of his images in mis-en-scene allow the artist to uphold his standards. This cunning as a by-product of working in collaboration had become typical of Kachyňa by 1970, as the chapters on his earlier works demonstrate, and the choice of genre and subject for *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* shows the means for avoiding conflict with the party he had been developing throughout his career: the distancing effect of adapting the autobiographical work of Alan Marshall, an Australian writer; the country setting, away from the political centre; and the child's perspective all

provide the necessary disarming effect. Like the veneer of the pseudonym of Hofman, however, these strategic moves only serve to cover up the subversive nature of the material. This is also reflective of Kachyňa's approach to pedagogical function of socialist realism in his earliest works, where his Army Film works offered an ironic approach to ideas of his pedagogical role in both the institution of the armed forced and of the film industry. Thus, Kachyňa's return to the child's narrative in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* must be viewed with suspicion in regard to any ideas of its containing normalising material (mere propaganda) in Blažejovský's terms (2004: 69-75).

Pedagogy

By the start of the 1970s, Kachyňa had already been involved in making pedagogical works for both children and adults. As I outlined in my first chapter, his Army Film short *Crooked Mirror* (*Křivé zrcadlo*, 1956) was superficially an instructional film aimed at a military viewership on how a soldier should conduct himself in the Czechoslovak Army. Similarly, as I have also demonstrated, Kachyňa's children's narratives gave a perception of being instructional to child audiences, with *Suffering* (*Trápení*, 1961) awarded a State prize on the insistence of President Novotný for how it promoted the virtue of working in agriculture (Hames, 1985: 82). Yet this was all despite the thinly veiled subversion in these films which I have explored in some detail. Thus, while the start of the normalisation period marked a departure for some of the major proponents of the New Wave (Miloš Forman, Ján Kadár, Ivan Passer, Vojtěch Jasný and Jiří Weiss all chose exile (Hames, 1985: 4)) and the censorship of others (Jiří Menzel and František Vláčil were only reinstated in 1975 after providing 'satisfactory explanation' for their 1960s works; Věra Chytilová in 1976 (Hames, 1985: 4)), Kachyňa's return to children's narratives was far less of a break, as his continued, hidden, association with Prochazka highlights. Indeed, I will argue that this was in fact a daring period in which Kachyňa continued to challenge the regime and its hold over the film industry.

In my second chapter I dealt with the role of children in cinema, and how criticism of Kachyňa's early 1960s works based on their dealing with child narratives has tended to overlook the significance of this narrative technique in how it interacts with wider, adult issues, without allowing for the analogous connections (II: 83-88). Another feature I have highlighted throughout Kachyňa's career is his treatment of historical narratives in an unconventional manner that cunningly does not align with the requirements of socialist realism. Through his adoption of socialist realism as the basis for his own revisionism towards the application of socialist values via the structures of the Czechoslovak film industry in his films from the 1950s onwards, Kachyňa has provided a significantly subversive aspect to his work given the attack on revisionism by the authorities *through* socialist realism. The effect created by this is again an invocation of a transitional space that Kachyňa manages to occupy as filmmaker and that is produced in his films. I will argue that this subversion is produced through an ironic play with the pedagogical function of socialist-realist art that Kachyňa had been exploring throughout his filmmaking career.

Scott Alan Metzger considers the 'teaching power' of historical narratives in his essay 'Film Pedagogy: Pedagogy and the Historical Feature Film: Toward Historical Literacy' (2007). Metzger argues that any depiction of history must be considered in terms of its contemporaneous situation (2007: 67-68). Historical films are themselves located in their own history, made by people at a unique place in time, within a specific culture with specific collective meanings (Sorlin, 2001). These overlaps are honed-in on by Kachyňa to help to produce criticism of his current situation in a covert manner. As Metzger argues, 'history movies often generate resonance between the past and present', an effect that is reflexive and can at times even be unconscious (Metzger, 2007: 68). I will argue that Kachyňa manipulates this presentism to produce a critique of his own situation or, as Metzger describes is, using a historical event as a 'metaphor for current concerns' (2007: 68).

Metzger posits that 'some movies try to depict the past on their own terms' (2007: 68). For example, while the oppressive treatment of individuals and their subsequent actions under the Nazi occupation in *Long Live the Republic* (*Ať žije republika!*, 1965) and *Coach to Vienna* (1966) is accepted by the communist authorities as vindication of their own claims to power, this oppression is overtly reflected in *The Ear* against the current regime, which has an ironic pedagogical effect. The lesson to the viewer in the films collectively is that the denounced oppression of the previous regime is reflected by those supposedly opposed to it in the current. Ironically, the presentism of Kachyňa's historical narratives garners significance through a study of his historical poetics: the significance of his challenge to the authorities is explicit in *The Ear* and, as such, this serves to highlight this effect in his early, more implicit works. This sense of overlap is a feature explored in many directions by Kachyňa throughout his career, and at a period of great transition in Czechoslovakia in 1971 he continues to explore methods for challenging the structures of the film industry through a seemingly benign, distanced narrative from a child's perspective.

***I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* (1970)**

I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again opens with a child providing a voiceover which has a disarming effect in the immediate aftermath of *The Ear* in terms of setting and character. The setting has withdrawn from the centre of the political sphere in Prague back to the countryside where most of Kachyňa's films up to this time have been set. While this withdrawal does signify a move away from the overt critique of the establishment in his previous work, the main theme of the film is pointed in itself: that a youth stricken down in his prime by an outside influence, but who is able to recover and persevere with his goals acts as a potential metaphor for the New Wave movement in relation to the Warsaw Pact invasion by foreign forces. Struck down after the Prague Spring by the powers behind the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact invasion, this movement, propelled by young, emerging filmmakers, was paralysed.

The theme of restriction by authoritative figures is set out in the early scenes when the protagonist, Adam (Vladimír Dlouhý), is first seen trying to get outside his family home only to be caught and brought back by his tyrannical grandmother. Later he is beaten by his mother for being late home, yet his spirit is irrepressible: having been caught out, he perseveres and climbs out of his bedroom window and onto the roof before heading off into the village. This willingness to break the rules, however, comes at a cost. Accepting a dare from his peers to fire a slingshot at a burly, young blacksmith, Adam is chased by the victim of his prank who is carrying a large stick to beat him with. After being chased to a lake, Adam goes into the water and hides under a jetty until his assailant gives up; thinking he is in the clear, Adam returns home to find the blacksmith, Martin (Jaroslav Satoranský), waiting for him. Where the presumption of a metaphor for the spirit of the New Wave becomes more nuanced, however, is in how his authoritative mother reacts to this situation: holding a pan of boiling water, she manages to ward off the would-be attacker, protecting her son from harm. Kachyňa resists any inclination to suggests that Adam, in representing the liberal-agenda youths of the 1960s, is immune to reproach through his daring and taking shots at a figure of authority. He could have had few complaints had he been caught-up with and reprimanded for his behaviour. He is, however, protected by his own authoritative figure who has been portrayed as oppressive until this stage in the film. In the context of the metaphor of Adam as representing the youthful, New Wave movement, this layer of insulation from reproach afforded by an oppressive, domestic authority offers a more nuanced commentary on the normalisation context. A bigger, more threatening force, and one who does not have Adam's best interests at heart unlike his mother, is the one who is threatening him. The consequences of this altercation, however, manifest themselves arbitrarily, and as a by-product of the conflict between Adam and Martin.

Somewhat surprisingly, Adam is not scolded for his actions on this occasion by his maternal guardians, and the family enjoy a meal together. It is during this supper, however,

that Adam appears pallid, despite the relaxed setting, and the onset of his symptoms of having contracted polio are presented. It is thus important not to consider any potential metaphor for the New Wave here as a straightforward attempt to critique the authorities. Adam knew that taking a pop-shot at a malignant figure had the potential to cause him repercussive harm, but that a beating was worth the accomplishment of his friends' dare; that the serious harm of contracting polio was caused by his own doing – when he hid in the lake – suggests that the real malignant forces are instead arbitrary, by-products of this irreverent attitude and of his cowardice in running away and hiding. Again, in the context of the Czechoslovak film industry in 1970, where key figures of the New Wave like Miloš Forman had emigrated following the invasion of 1968, the warning here is of the consequences of stirring up trouble then fleeing the scene.

The reaction of Adam's mother and grandmother, who are depicted as tyrannical forces suppressing his youthful spirit, when he becomes ill represents how Kachyňa is being treated in being allowed to continue to work after the invasion. The malignant force of the polio virus is not the maternal authorities' doing, but they must deal with its consequences. The film opening with his mother giving birth to Adam serves as a visceral reminder of just where he comes from and whom he owes his life to. While the beatings and reproaches from his mother hinder his desire to run free, they are given, this would suggest, with his best interests at heart. According to Kusín, the Soviet Union were somewhat arbitrary members of the invading forces in 1968, initially unconvinced military action was required, with Czechoslovakia's closer neighbours advocating measures be taken to quell a perceived rise in liberalism which they feared might spread further afield in the Socialist states (Kusin, 1978: 17-18).The arbitrary, malignant force of the polio virus becomes a symbol of Sovietism in this sense; Martin, the blacksmith, representing one of the closely neighbouring Warsaw Pact nations, and Adam and his friends the youthful proponents of the Czechoslovak New Wave, whose daring one another to take pop-shots at authority led to this direct

collision between them and the full force of the arbitrary malignant force of Sovietism in the Warsaw Pact invasion.

The depiction of Adam's father (Karel Hlušička), meanwhile, acts as a warning against the spirit of liberalism, and where continuing this attitude into maturity might lead. The father tries to appease the mother during her beatings of Adam, but while performing the role of a buffer against the physical attacks from an over-protective mother, he is often drunk. This theme interacts with the metaphor for the New Wave when the custodian who endorses the spirit of liberty and seeks to quell the authoritative conditions of the household is inebriated. Indeed, when Adam first managed to complete a playful jumping task on a fence, he found that his father had fallen asleep. Meanwhile, when Adam is confronted with real threats of violence or sickness, his mother and grandmother are there to protect him. The responsible ones in the film are the maternal guardians, who despite their apparent brutality have Adam's wellbeing at heart.

During the onset of polio, Adam himself falls into delirium and the surrealist images, which confront the viewer, resonate with this characteristic of the New Wave (Hames, 2009: 168-187). Jonathan L. Owen discusses the history of surrealism in Czech and Slovak culture in his introduction to *Avant-Garde to New Wave: Czechoslovak Cinema, Surrealism and the Sixties* (2011). Owen argues that surrealism as a concept, like socialist realism, has 'gone through numerous shifts of orientation within the Czech context alone' (2011: 3). He settles on a definition as 'a movement with dreams and other imaginative products, and one that upholds the basic Freudian conception of a subjectivity divided against itself, haunted by the repressed impulses of a seething consciousness' (*Ibid*.). This description resonates with Forman's description of what motivated his early 1960s works that opposed the rigidity of socialist realism (in Pawlikowski, 1990: 00:09.45). His move towards experimentation signifies a subjectivity in his films that is divided against itself, where the filmmaker's appreciation of their own subjectivity within the objective formalism of socialist realism

leads to a search for other versions of real that do not fit with this cultural doctrine. For Owen, much of the New Wave's contents included the 'miraculous and marvellous', which are 'integral to the revelations of surrealism' (2011: 2), where surrealism had 'the most pervasive influence on the movement' (*Ibid*.). As Peter Hames argues, however, New Wave filmmakers whose works have at some time been described as surrealist have never been formally associated with the Surrealist Group, nor ever claimed to be surrealists (2009: 168). For Hames, in concurrence with Owen's argument surrounding the vagaries of the term surrealism, the New Wave's surrealist qualities were fairly non-committed (2009: 169). Thus, in accordance with the lack of formality surrounding the New Wave as an artistic movement (Hames argues that 'most Czechoslovak filmmakers would almost certainly deny the existence of any intentional movement' (1985: 5)), surrealism as an underpinning feature was not in accordance with any formal association with the movement. Moreover, as Owen argues, the New Wave's connection to surrealism fits with philosophical responses to surrealism, including Surrealist Group founding member André Breton's *Manifestoes of Surrealism* (1969), as consistently conceiving of the movement as 'liberatory' (2011: 2).

With my argument that Forman's motivations in his earliest 1960s works that helped to commence the New Wave were to challenge the depiction of real in films from the previous decade (in Pawlikowski, 1990: 00:09.45), the approach to concepts of real within surrealism are paramount in the New Wave context. Indeed, Owen stresses that rather than offer mere portrayals of 'make-believe', surrealist films assert 'an interplay of the imaginary and real' that ultimately problematise the very distinction between the two (2011: 4). Given the metafictional possibilities of film that I have outlined previously (I: 56), this problematizing of the real becomes a charged element in the subversive potential of these films. As Owen argues, the real remains 'a vital inspiration or reference point for the surreal' (2011: 4); thus, however fantastical a narrative may appear, it remains rooted in the real world, with the potential to challenge the representation of the real in film. Here, the

transcendental quality of surrealism comes to the fore, where its resistance to formalism is its fundamental quality: surrealism should be conceived of as 'grounded in steadfast hostility to an essentially ever same "status quo"' (Owen, 2011: 4). The more formal and definable the practice becomes, the easier it is to challenge. As Hames argues, surrealism as a feature of the New Wave was an attempt by filmmakers to break free from the rigidity of socialist realism and present a different version of the real: a subjectivity divided against itself, as Owen describes it (2011: 3).

The surrealist dream images in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* representing sickness is therefore significant, and the reflection of his delirium with his father's drunken stupors reinforces the motif of negativity towards the spirit of the New Wave. While in this state, Adam has a nightmare in which the blacksmith is relaxing in a field in the sunshine, but he is holding a knife and Adam imagines that he is coming after him again. In reality, however, when Adam is about to be transported to a nun's convent where his treatment is to continue, Martin, his assailant, apologetically looks on as he is placed in a stretcher onto the back of a cart to be taken away. The humanity of this scene is deeply emotive and the redemptive effect it has is poignant. Again, in serious matters of sickness and health so-called enemies within a community are naturally inclined to unite. While moments of conflict, even trivial ones like Adam's dare, cause opposition, when it comes down to it the people of this community are united. This is an effect reflective of the outcome for the couple in *The Ear,* where the reality of their shared fate in relation to the surveillance of their home becomes apparent and, rather than continue their domestic disputes, they unite.

Thus, when the theme of overcoming a debilitating condition is achieved by Adam at the end of the film, when he rides a horse again despite his disability, Martin's actions are pivotal. During Adam's recovery, the blacksmith becomes aware of his goals and in an act of true kindness and reconciliation, Martin hands Adam a saddle that he has made especially for him and the fulfilment of his ambition is complete. This serves as a symbol of conflict

being resolved, and the role of apparent aggressors in Adam's recovery demonstrates a nuanced approach to a theme that could otherwise have been portrayed in polemic terms of good versus evil. Kachyňa again rejects a binary approach and again occupies a middle ground that celebrates the community's ability to resolve its inner conflicts. The allegory of the film is that Adam, representing the youthful spirit of the New Wave and the Prague Spring, is cut down in his prime by an arbitrary, malignant force. It could be easy to blame Martin for this, but his chasing Adam was a result of Adam's own reckless behaviour. The polio virus represents an arbitrary affliction in this sense, not one that is maliciously thrust upon the victim. Like the consequences of the invading forces during the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia, however, the effects of the virus will have a crippling effect on Adam. Kachyňa, however, points to a redemptive role in Martin that offers a collaborative approach for those who were prevented from working together.

In this sense, pinning Kachyňa's work down in Blažejovský's terms of normalisation or normalising films becomes extremely difficult (2004: 69-75). Their status as normalisation-period films is inescapable, and it is from this position that Kachyňa, despite his subversive works of the 1960s, was able to continue his output in the normalisation period so prolifically whilst retaining his artistic integrity to such a high degree. In reconciling the apparent aggressor responsible for cutting the youth down in his prime, Kachyňa offers an optimistic lens with which to view the authorities. After all, it was outside interference, arbitrarily malignant forces, which caused the invasion just as Martin was not directly responsible for Adam contracting polio. Kachyňa strikes an optimistic note that compromise can be reached by those struck down, and that together this stricken youth can be revived and return to making a valuable contribution to culture.

Normalisation on the Offensive (1972-1977)

Following Blažejovský's timeline of the various periods of normalisation cinema, *Train to Heaven Station* (*Vlak do stanice Nebe,* 1972) comes during the normalisation on the

offensive period (1972-77). For Blažejovský, this period marked a steep decline in the quality of the Czechoslovak films produced as those working in film production became 'functionaries' of the state-controlled industry (Blažejovský, 2004).

Kusín outlines the process whereby the idea of structured opposition within the regime was diminished from 1972 onwards. Kusín writes: 'In the summer of 1972, when the leaders of the Socialist Movement of Czechoslovak Citizens [a dissident movement which sought to change the direction of socialism in Czechoslovakia, rather than to remove it altogether] were put in jail, the idea that the regime can be opposed by a structured, semi-communist movement, died' (1978: 275). Crucially, however, Kusín points out that those who felt a moral obligation to continue to be actively dissident had to look for less organised modes of protest (Kusín, 1978: 275). This light-touch approach, as I have sought to outline throughout this thesis, was Kachyňa's modus operandi by this time. In terms of the normalisation context, he had produced, under the guise of a far-removed autobiographical work about a child, subversive material in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* in 1970, so it is conceivable that he would continue to do so during this period. The death of Jan Procházka in February 1971 certainly marked the end of an era for Kachyňa, but would his works diverge entirely and follow the principles of the normalisation period? For Blažejovský, 'the ideological function of art prevailed over the aesthetic function' in Czechoslovak film production during the period 1972-77, where 'the principles of Stalinist aesthetics from the 1950s were re-applied, and the professional skills applied in the films produced plumbed new depths' (Blažejovský, 2004). During this period, however, Kachyňa directed *Train to Heaven Station* (1972), *Love* (*Láska,* 1973), *Hot Winter* (*Horká zima,* 1973), *Pavlínka* (1974), *Robinsonka* (1974), *Ugly Village* (*Škaredá dědina,* 1975), *The Little Mermaid* (*Malá mořská víla,* 1976), and *Death of a Fly* (*Smrt mouchy,* 1976).

***Train to Heaven Station* (1972)**

Train to Heaven Station (*Vlak do stanice Nebe*, 1972) is another film presented from a child's perspective, as Dáša (Zdena Smrčková) arrives at her grandfather's house in the mountain village of Chmura to avoid the Prague air raids towards the close of the Second World War in 1944. The recurring theme of avoiding an arbitrary threat is omnipresent in the film. There is no suggestion that Dáša understands why she is having to live at her grandfather's house, but she is willing to adapt to the circumstances. There is an analogy of this phenomenon in her keeping mice as pets. On several occasions and for different reasons, she finds their cage to have been breached and must retrieve the mice. Their behaviour, whether in captivity or in apparent freedom, does not change: to the mice it makes little difference whether they are in a cage or not, and while in a cage there is no desperate attempt to be freed. The walls that condition their apparent capture are arbitrary, and so it is for the evacuee children. Regardless of the parameters set in terms of location, they will go to school and experience growing up. Given the pedagogical significance of child narratives I have outlined in relation to wider, adult concerns, this is a point that targets the condition of living under any authoritarian conditions and is a theme explored throughout Kachyňa's works.

As has been demonstrated in Kachyňa's works presenting children's narratives, children, like adults, deal with arbitrary distractions by getting on with their lives. In *Long Live the Republic*, for instance, the threat of air raids which looms on the soundtrack and is realised towards the end of the film is nothing more than a distraction until the point where it has a tangible effect on the protagonist. This is also reflected in the depiction of the threat of surveillance in *The Ear*. Surveillance was an everyday occurrence but when it enters the central characters' home it becomes personal; it is a targeted attack on the individuals in question. In *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again*, the threat of polio is not even considered until it becomes a reality. When the apparent threat is arbitrary, however, Kachyňa demonstrates how children reflect adults in their apathy. Questions have been asked by critics of Kachyňa

in terms of continuing to work after the Warsaw Pact invasion and moving from the subversive material in *The Ear* to films primarily for children in the 1970s (Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003). Again, I will argue that Kachyňa's child narratives do not signify a break from subversive material and are in fact reflective of much of his work over the previous two decades.

While refusing to be directly critical of the regime allowed Kachyňa to continue to work, his early 1970s films certainly do not fall into the bracket of normalising films. The extended theme of arbitrary, malignant forces outwith characters' control generates nuance in these films. The supposed disarming effect of the child's narrative, too, is ironically inverted at the conclusion of *Train to Heaven Station*, where children's apathetic attitudes to war are converted to a kind of militarism. At first, Dáša and her friend Franta (Michal Vavruša) rebel against authority, most notably in their joyride on the village train. The impressionistic imagery is, like the dream sequence in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again*, connected with the negative consequences of breaking the rules. While the surrealist images represent liberty and playful fancy, the question Kachyňa offers is: to what end? The answer he provides is that on their return, when a wedding party waiting to use the train catches up with them, Franta is reprimanded when he is chased and caught. The wedding party, a cheerful, carefree community, quell the recriminations and the schoolchildren are invited onto the wedding train. Alcoholic beverages are passed round, again with echoes of the theme of adult inebriation in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles.* When the adults supposedly responsible for the children become complacent, the consequences are that the children are missing school and engaging in anti-social behaviour. When they return to school and their drinking is detected by their authoritative teacher, they are reprimanded, linking the teacher to the authoritative maternal guardians in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again*. At this point, the viewer is invited to welcome the attitude of the wedding party and to consider the teacher as overbearing, cruel even.

This is reinforced when the teacher detects lice in Dáša's hair and her long blond locks are shorn to her evident dismay. The sense here is a doubling of authoritative oppression from the teacher, who is angry at the children's truancy, and this act of cutting Dáša's hair appears almost to be a punishment. Again, however, Kachyňa resists the temptation to portray authoritative figures as mere oppressors against the liberty of youth – in reality, the teacher only wants what is best for the children: that they do not miss school, get drunk and, more presciently, that the contamination of lice is dealt with. Thus, Kachyňa offers an apology for authoritarianism at the same time as accepting that it may not be as attractive as acts of liberalism. Liberal characters are often depicted as careless, even reckless.

Like the contracting of polio by Adam in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles*, however, it is when the real ambivalent forces arrive that these seemingly petty differences are set aside. The arrival of the Nazis in Chmura again provides the community an opportunity to unite. The malignant Nazi soldiers pillage the town, with Dáša's grandfather being forced to milk his cow for the soldiers. The soldiers then ransack the school for wood and supplies leading to an emotive scene where the previously authoritative teacher tries to collect her students' work which is being ignored by the boorish soldiers, with Franta, recently scolded by her for her truancy, leading his peers to help. Again, like the authoritative maternal parents in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again*, the teacher having been presented as an oppressive force against the children's liberty has their best interests at heart and cares about what they have achieved under her guidance. Just as cutting lice-affected hair may be unaesthetically pleasing, it is done to rid the silent, arbitrary contagion.

Rather than this being a completely propagandist message in support of the authorities, however, the contrasting reactions from the youths and the adults of the village to the oppressive Nazi forces acts as a warning. The adults, like Dáša's grandfather and teacher, comply while the children come up with a plot to steal back their beloved train and

with it the munitions held onboard. The children are caught attempting to put the plans into action and the Nazis open fire. The shot cuts to Dáša, who has a gunshot wound to the head. In this shocking moment she utters '*je nic'* ('it's nothing' (01:37.22) then the scene descends into a dream sequence mirroring the earlier joyride on the train. Again, the mirroring with the New Wave style of surrealism and youthful ebullience is counterbalanced by the tragedy of the situation. In her dying delirium, Dáša imagines it is her own wedding day on the train, with drink being passed around. Even her teacher has some, before comically throwing it away. The effect is a presentation of the community as one under this dream-like condition, but the warning is that the reality is completely different. The dream of a peaceful utopia brought about by a challenging youth is a myth against the backdrop of the forces outwith the characters' control who have the ability to suppress this abruptly. This acts as a criticism of the New Wave movement and Prague Spring: Kachyňa acknowledges the allure of the dream, but presents a reality at odds with it.

While the audience is encouraged to be on the side of Dáša and her peers, the warning is that their fate is ultimately tragic, and that those who refuse to resist are the ones who remain. Through his depiction of the dignity of the older generation in the village in *Train to Heaven Station* subserviently obeying the commands of the invaders to quell repercussions for their peers, Kachyňa even presents this inaction as virtuous. This is not to say that they accept their situation, but in order to survive they comply silently. The deployment of the Nazis as the oppressive force has the effect of an already concluded narrative, in that the audience knows that, in 1944, this force is on its way out. In terms of how this interacts with the arbitrary malignant force in 1972 is another indication of the kind of subversion available in this film. While it presents positives and negatives to both a liberal and authoritative approach, ultimately the message for liberal individuals is to bide their time; the apparent enemy may not be as powerful as believed and to be more selective in how attacks are made. From Kachyňa's perspective, as an elder statesman with regards to

the New Wave, there is a certain frustration with immaturity, which is reflected in his child subjects. Embedded in this theme is a warning against the consequences of acting on immature impulses rather than at least appearing to comply with oppressive forces. Kachyňa joins the adults in *Train to Heaven Station* in making his normalisation-period films: he is milking the cow for the occupying forces but not in compliance and obedience, but in order to protect himself and the wider community.

Pressure to follow strict party lines was intense and the fact that Kachyňa continued to work demonstrates at least some adherence to these forces on his part. *Hot Winter* (1974), however, does retain some of the poetic motifs typical of his earlier works. While the film promotes the image of the socialist hero, Karel (Petr Haničinec), in its depiction of a Slovak communist's plight during World War II, and his role in the guerrilla Partisan movement, Kachyňa still manages to offer some compelling humanist scenes. Under intense pressure from the Nazis, the group's solidarity in circumventing the oppressive powers in the hazardous winter conditions offers a message of collective resistance to ambivalent forces and in the contemporary political conditions this could be taken as a form of allegory for the plight of the oppressed after the invasion.

Pavlínka (1974), likewise, depicts a historical narrative removed from contemporary concerns but, again, its promotion of socialist values is not as straightforward as a means for endorsing the regime. Based on a true story – the death of a 16-year-old girl following the crushing of a workers' strike in the town of Svárov in 1870 – the theme of the collective rising against capitalist forces offers a pro-socialist message. Yet the suppression of the insurgents again reflects the contemporary conditions where reformist-leaning communists of the Prague Spring were being suppressed by the Husák administration. *Robinsonka* (1974), which was released in the same year, meanwhile, acts as an apology for previous generations. A little girl, Bláža, discovers her mother's tale of losing her own mother as a young teenager and having to take over domestic duties. The storybook *Robinson Crusoe*

helped her to escape her situation and inspired her to deal with the hardship, while the help of her family and neighbours allowed her to continue her goals of going to school. The role of the collective and the resolve of the individual against difficult circumstances promotes the values of socialism. While the story of the girl's plight is complicated by a less favourable family history, her resilience and the good faith of her comrades sees her through. *Ugly Village* (1975), meanwhile, is a film that pits the socialist against the greedy capitalist in a tale about two brothers in the Moravian-Silesian village of Žitková. Josef returns to his father's cottage from the city during the economic crisis of the early 1930s, but his brother Vendel, keen to inherit their father's business, proves to be a malignant presence in the small town. Vendel hatches a plan to cash in on an insurance policy by giving matches to a mentally impaired local before leading him to the barn. Vendel's drinking and obvious greed push Josef to stand his ground and claim his share of the business, and his unwillingness to yield to the greed of individuals is his heroism.

***The Little Mermaid* (1976)**

While these films seem innocuous enough and reflect a stagnant period in Kachyňa's artistic output, as is to be expected during the normalisation-on-the-offensive period, according to Blažejovský (2004: 70), the overlapping effect of historical narratives explored earlier in this chapter allows them to retain a tangible connection to the hostile political and cultural environment of normalisation on the offensive. Yet, while *The Little Mermaid* (*Malá mořská víla*, 1976) is ostensibly another children's film based on the fairy tale by Hans Christian Andersen, the film offers another pointed analogy for the normalisation period.

The tale is about a mermaid who falls in love with an earthly prince only to forsake her family and kin in her vain pursuit of romantic love. While the film produces moralistic undertones in relation to the events of the generation blamed for the Prague Spring, the pursuit of greater choice within the socialist establishment, revisionism, is also reflected in one of the key themes of the film. The ubiquitous nature of choice is presented with the

pageantry of the various kingdoms' coming together in the undersea world, with the spoils of shipwrecks and fancy confectionaries and drinks aplenty. The customary exchange of princess daughters between families is an example of a system which reduces free will, and this system is rejected by the eponymous mermaid, who wishes to pursue her own desires. The chief warning the film offers, however, is how rash decisions can generate negative repercussions for individuals who make them. When the mermaid chooses the prince to be her lover, little does she know that when she saves him from his own shipwreck, he will awake to see another, earthly princess with whom he will fall in love. Thus precipitates a series of decisions in pursuit of a forlorn goal borne out of earthly desires which will see the mermaid betray her family and kin and seal her own demise. Her father's warning that 'you know what happens to little mermaids who get too inquisitive' is ironically self-reflexive. The dialogue plays on the fact that the fairy tale is well told. When she goes after her romantic love, then, the warning that she will 'melt like sea foam' is a self-fulfilling prophecy. The folly of giving up the traditions and mores of her people for her own selfish whim will be her undoing, but the system which she is neglecting will go on regardless.

The film is a warning to 'inquisitive' individuals that it is better to play by the rules. While this stance would threaten to place the film in Blažejovský's category of 'normalisation film' (i.e., carrying regime-endorsing material (2004: 70)), the sympathetic narrative towards the mermaid complicates this outlook. The narrative favours a happy union between the little mermaid and the prince, and its denial is the tragedy of the tale. The viewer not only shares the frustration with the anti-hero when she is unable to express herself due to being rendered mute by the witch's spell, but through negative narration in the voiceover, the viewer shares in this experience with her. Thus, when her father, the symbol of the establishment order in her world, provides her with the tool to kill off the prince and the earthly princess and return to the old order, her rejection is a kind of martyrdom, given that she knows the consequence is that she will turn into sea foam. Thus, there is a second level

of morality in the film which acknowledges the folly of abandoning her people, while also generating sympathy for a character who is unwilling to eliminate those who stand between her and saving her own skin.

Individual choice, therefore, becomes a fundamental theme in Kachyňa's works of this period. This connects his early normalisation-period films to his humanist poetics of the previous two decades, and in so doing highlights Kachyňa's position with regards to the role he is performing as a filmmaker. Aware of his pedagogical powers in his role, Kachyňa not only questions the authorities and the filmmaking culture under which he works but warns individuals of the consequences of their choices and actions. Rather than supporting a destructive, partisan approach to issues surrounding the regime, Kachyňa promotes dialogue. If silence was a tool used to disarm censorship in his New Wave films *Coach to Vienna* and *The Ear*, it has become a noose around characters' necks by the time of *The Little Mermaid*. As the normalisation era continued into the late 1970s and 1980s, Kachyňa imparts on his viewer the need to find their voice, but with a warning from history that 'you know what happens to little mermaids who get too inquisitive' (*The Little Mermaid*, 1975, 00:38.15). Kachyňa was once again pushing the boundaries without transgressing into a complete *disarmament*. In a manipulation of the pedagogical function of socialist-realist art, Kachyňa ironically teaches his viewers how to approach their own individual desires under a totalitarian system that seeks to reduce individuality. Kachyňa demonstrates how taboos can be crossed and that the outcome may not be universally popular, but that such moves are not only acceptable, but required for individuals to grow.

Releasing *I'm Jumping Over Puddled Again* in 1971 after his previous work, *The Ear*, had been banned for its overt criticism of the regime appears to be a disarming move by Kachyňa. The appearance of having split with long-term collaborator Jan Procházka, who was the target of rebuke from the authorities for the overtly critical tone of their three previous works, and the return to the child's narrative in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again*

appear to have placated the authorities, who allowed Kachyňa to continue to work into the normalisation period. The adoption of an autobiographical work from an Australian writer about a young boy contracting polio appears to be far removed from contemporary concerns in the Czechoslovak context; however, in this chapter I have explored how the retention of Procházka as adapted screenplay writer, coupled with the theme of a stricken youth dealing with arbitrary malignant forces, generates a subversive strand to the work. The retention of child narratives, too, in *Train to Heaven Station* and *The Little Mermaid*, does not signify a move towards normalising works from Kachyňa; indeed, I have explored in previous chapters how this was a device he deployed at various times to get away with a more critical approach. I have argued that Kachyňa manipulates the pedagogical function of socialist realism as well as the child's narrative to generate subversion in his works as part of a humanist poetics that seeks to question how individuals deal with extreme circumstances. While, as I have elaborated on in this chapter, the normalisation-on-the-offensive period precipitated a strict suppression by the authorities in Czechoslovak film culture, the retention of child narratives allowed Kachyňa to continue to explore the treatment of individuals under totalitarian conditions. Without taking a polemic, condemnatory position towards authority in these films, while also considering the naivety of youth in attacks on authority, Kachyňa retains sympathy for the individual without falling into the *disarmament* of censorship.

CHAPTER FIVE: CHARTER 77 AND RESURRECTION: ARTIST AS INDIVIDUAL

In the previous chapter, I outlined the various stages of normalisation in Czechoslovakia following the invasion by Soviet troops in 1968 in response to a perceived rise in liberalism in the political and cultural sphere leading up to the Prague Spring of 1968. This atmosphere, which is captured in the films of the Czechoslovak New Wave, caused political anxiety amongst the rulers of neighbouring Warsaw Pact states. Following the Soviet-led invasion there was a period of consolidation (1969-1971), during which remnants of the mood of 1960s subversion continued to appear in culture (Blažejovský, 2004: 69-75). I demonstrated that during this time that two films made by Karel Kachyňa, *Funny Old Man* (*Směšný pán*, 1969) and *The Ear* (*Ucho*, 1970), were banned. I considered the implications of Kachyňa continuing to release new material as early as 1971 with *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* (*Už zase skáču přes kaluže*, 1970, prem. 1971) as evidence that the focus of political ire towards his work was directed at his decade-long collaborator Jan Procházka, a former member of the Central Committee of the KSČ whose reformist attitude had led to his expulsion from the Party and political exile. The adapted screenplay for *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* being written by Procházka under a pseudonym offers a significant account of Kachyňa's own subversive attitude at this time, which goes against any notion that he was simply willing to accept the principles of normalisation and denounce the reformist movement of the previous decade. Furthermore, I sought to demonstrate how one theme of the film, of a child struck down in his youth by an arbitrary malignant force, was reflective of the plight of the New Wave movement in Czechoslovakia which ended after the 1968 invasion, but that the retention of respect for harsh authority figures in his work provided a nuanced approach to this subject in the context of the regime.

I then explored the retention of this theme of arbitrary forces impacting youths' freedoms in *Train to Heaven Station* (*Vlak do stanice Nebe*, 1972) and the sympathy

afforded to authority figures again demonstrating a more nuanced approach to the application of normalising rules. This film was presented in the context of the normalisation on the offensive period (1972-1977), where the authorities sought to suppress subversive works in culture (Blažejovský, 2004: 70). I argued that the use of children's narratives as a tool for avoiding scrutiny and censorship was a tactic applied throughout Kachyňa's career which corroborates my argument that his works were not necessarily apologetic for his previous films. The final film I examined during the period of normalisation on the offensive was *The Little Mermaid* (*Malá mořská víla*, 1976), which I argued also carried the theme of a youth stricken by some malignant, arbitrary affliction but this time somewhat through their own agency. I argued that this augmented the reproach of children acting out against authorities in defiance which is found in both *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* and *Train to Heaven Station*, where the repercussions would be severe.

I have argued throughout this thesis that Kachyňa avoids polemics in his subversive work and tends to avoid direct criticism of the authorities through an awareness that these acts can lead to an individual's own *disarmament* and even, as these films suggest, demise. I have argued throughout this thesis that Kachyňa's film poetics often occupy a hybrid space, where a blurring of the lines occurs. In the context of the normalisation period, this theme applies to the film *The Little Mermaid*, appearing as it did in 1976. While retaining the theme of the child's narrative and the setting as removed from Kachyňa's own socio-political context, there is an analogous effect in the narrative in relation to contemporary concerns surrounding the removal of the voice of the younger generation during the normalisation period and where their pursuit of personal desire may lead them into conflict with their own authority figures. In this context, I will now outline a major turning point which occurred in 1976 in Czechoslovakia under the period known as normalisation: that of the inception of the Charter 77 movement.

The Plastic People of the Universe and Charter 77

As Jonathan Bolton argues, the standard account of the inception of the Charter 77 movement in Czechoslovakia is that it arose in response to the arrest and trial of the Czech underground rock band The Plastic People of the Universe in 1976 (Bolton, 2012: 115). In fact, saxophonist Vratislav Brabenec was the only member of the band arrested alongside the band's artistic director, Ivan Martin Jirous, Pavel Zajíček of another underground band, DG 307, and Svatopluk Karásek, a Protestant minister and folksinger who were all tried for disturbing the peace (Bolton, 2012: 116). Nonetheless, a group of Czech artists, writers, and musicians, including Václav Havel, perceived the arrests to be an attack on artistic freedoms and human rights and circulated a petition for their acquittal (Bolton, 2012: 116).

In 1975, the Czechoslovak government had signed the Helsinki Declaration, which included guarantees of human rights and individual freedoms and it was the aspect of human rights which was central to the Manifesto of Charter 77 (Bolton, 2012: 115). The Czechoslovak government, however, condemned all signatories of Charter 77, several of whom were subsequently tried and imprisoned (Bolton, 2012: 177). However, Charter 77 was the first public action of a newly emergent Czechoslovak dissident movement mobilised to combat the attack on civic expression perpetrated by the authorities since the start of the normalisation period (Bolton, 2012: 116). Again, this did not appear out of a vacuum. As Vladimír V. Kusín outlines, there was a great increase in the number of protest statements from as early as 1975 in anticipation of the signing-off of cooperation talks in Helsinki (Kusin, 1978: 284), including prominent New Wave filmmaker Věra Chytilová voicing her concerns to newly appointed President Gustáv Husák about her ordeal living as a 'politically suspect person' (Kusin, 1978: 285), wherein she had not been allowed to make films for five years since the beginning of the normalisation period.

Open letters of disapproval of the practices of normalisation sent to government officials and signed by groups of academics and cultural figures were becoming an

increasing occurrence by 1976 (Kusin, 1978: 283-285). Kusín outlines three thematic factors underpinning this unrest: continuing infringement of human rights, how this practice was incompatible with apparently positive international relations, and ongoing kinship with Prague Spring ideas as part of a 'Eurocommunist' democratic-socialist opposition reflective of Western communist parties (Kusin, 1978: 286-303). While Kachyňa may not have joined the movement in any official capacity, I intend to demonstrate how his films of the period explore these issues as part of his humanist poetics in a subversive manner.

In cultural terms, the focus in the charter was on freedom of information and freedom of expression. The latter alluded to the 'tens of thousands' who, like Chytilová, were being barred from working in their own fields due to voicing their own opinions, and the argument against the recent case of the young musicians (Kusin, 1978: 306). Upon the inception of Charter 77, the cultural sphere in Czechoslovakia was essentially split in two. The breakthrough came with the return of Chytilová. Once an exclusive intellectual author, she shot *Apple Game* (*Hra o jablko*, 1976), an experimental comedy about male egoism, under the auspices of Kamil Pixa in the Krátký film studios. Contemporaneously with this backdrop of social and cultural opposition in Czechoslovakia, Kachyňa filmed *Death of a Fly* (*Smrt mouchy*, 1976, premiere 1977). The film marked a sharp departure from his previous films during the normalisation-on-the-offensive period, such as *Hot Winter* (*Horka zima*, 1973, premiere 1974), *Pavlínka* (1974) and *Robinsonka* (1974), whose socialist-realist themes were depicted in sentimental, historical narratives; or even the more subversive fairy-tale narrative *The Little Mermaid* (1976) which I explored in the previous chapter.

During the period 1972-1977, described by Blažejovský as normalisation on the offensive (2004: 69), Kachyňa produced works which could be described as 'normalisation films' (i.e., carrying regime-endorsing material (*Ibid*.)) in *Hot Winter* (*Horká zima*, 1973),

Pavlínka (1974), *Robinsonka* (1975) and even *The Little Mermaid* (1976) leading up to the Charter 77 movement (hence his ability to continue to work so prolifically during this most stringent period of censorship). However, as I have argued, Kachyňa rejects polemics and his works are not mere 'normalising' films (i.e. propaganda (Blažejovský, 2004: 70). This ability to hinge normalisation material with subversive notes is testament to his longevity, and in fact is a major element of his poetics. Kachyňa was forced to take a side from the outset of his career, and as an enthusiastic socialist he was able to graduate from FAMU alongside his early collaborator Vojtěch Jasný, yet their works often depict conflicted protagonists at odds with the headstrong hero of socialist realism. This rejection of polemics on both sides is a fundamental aspect of his film poetics and is reproduced in his works during the 'resurrection' period of normalisation (1976-1989 (Blažejovský, 2004: 71)), as I will explore in this chapter.

In the 1960s, working with Jan Procházka who at that time was a member of the Party's central committee, Kachyňa was able to make increasingly subversive material despite this strong link to the establishment. In the 1970s, during the normalisation period, Kachyňa continued to protect his ability to produce films with inflections of normalising material, yet his poetics remained strongly connected to his previous works. Indeed, Kachyňa began to explore this dichotomy in his characters in a contemporary setting from *Death of a Fly* (1976) onwards. The film's release coincides with the 'resurrection' era (Blažejovský, 2004: 70), which marks an increase in subversion and the beginning of a resurgence against normalisation in the cultural sphere. For Kachyňa, *Death of a Fly* also marks a major departure artistically, and one feature is the placement of the photographic artist at centre-stage (which he first introduced in *Love* (1972)).

Returning to the contemporary Czechoslovak urban setting for the first time since *The Ear*, the focus has shifted from faraway settings, historical narratives, fairy tales and children's perspectives to those of young adults in the modern city, signifying a move to

more topical concerns that were shaping the emerging producers of culture. The central character, Milan, is a seemingly normal adolescent, yet one with a secret passion for photography. His preferred subject, an unknowing one in his neighbour and love interest, assumes the role of the taboo, and Milan's fetishisation of his subject is kept hidden from his peers. Here, Kachyňa is producing something more personal than his previous works. The motif that his love for his art removes him from his peer group is again at the heart of Kachyňa's poetics, as reflected in Kachyňa's reception from peers during the 1950s and 1960s. The auteur is intrinsically at odds with the collective. The individualism of such an art form is reflected in Kachyňa's work, which through two and a half decades has had to endure various models of production and censorship. This message is perhaps Kachyňa's ultimate subversive theme: it is a rejection of a template for society which only strives to celebrate the success of the collective rather than appreciate the talents of the individual as artist, regardless of how their works are received by their peers. However, the response to Charter 77 from the authorities demonstrates why Kachyňa might still be apprehensive about expounding these themes openly. Indeed, this was a common reaction: according to Blažejovský, the majority of artists did not sign Charter 77, some even signed the so-called 'anti-charter' (2004: 73). Indeed, Kachyňa did not sign the charter; in fact, he was a signatory for the 'anti-charter' (*Rudé právo,* January 31, 1977: 3). Yet, in keeping with Kachyňa's rejection of polemics, this is more nuanced than it may appear on face value, as I will outline further.

The Charter and the Anti-Charter

In response to Charter 77, the KSČ issued *For New Creative Deeds in the Name of Socialism and Peace*. In it, their disdain for the Charter 77 movement is clear:

> We hold in contempt those who, in the unbridled pride of their *narcissistic haughtiness*, for *selfish* interests, or even for filthy lucre in various places all over the world – even in our land a *small group* of such backsliders and *traitors* can be found – divorce and *isolate* themselves from their *own people* and its life and real interests and, with *inexorable logic*, become instruments of the

> antihumanistic forces of imperialism and, in its service, the heralds of disruption and discord among nation [my emphasis] (in Prečan, 1990: 36).

The tone presented here is unequivocal in its condemnation of the Charter 77 signatories; however, attributing this attitude squarely with the apparent signatories of the anti-charter, like Kachyňa, should be treated with scepticism. As I have sought to demonstrate throughout this thesis, often Kachyňa can be seen to be saying the correct thing as far as the authorities were concerned, while meaning something else. While it is notable, then, that Kachyňa did not sign Charter 77 despite, as Kusín describes it, its 'scrupulously legalistic character' which allowed 'an unusually high number' of signatories (Kusin, 1978: 309), there is precedent in Kachyňa's career for avoiding such conflicts. A reason for this can be proffered from his 1960s works, where the theme of selective utterance is explored in depth in the films *Coach to Vienna* (*Kočar do Vidně,* 1966) and *The Ear* (1970), where speaking out is demonstrated to have severe consequences. In the latter work, the central characters have developed an awareness that what is being said is being monitored closely by the authorities, and that their power in terms of their own personal liberty is attached to saying the right thing.

Kachyňa presented these themes sympathetically, in a manner which apologises for this apparent hypocrisy, which in turn acts as a justification for his own inaction. For Kachyňa, overtly speaking out of turn only leads to trouble and causes oppressive forces to suppress subversive actions before they can reach any meaningful conclusion. I demonstrated in my previous chapter how the fate which befalls the young protagonist, Adam, in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* (1970) is a direct consequence of his decision to take a shot at an authoritative figure. Likewise, in *Train to Heaven Station* (1972), the young protagonist meets a tragic fate after an act of subversion against the Nazi occupiers. Both films act as a warning that lashing out against authority figures can lead to avoidable, tragic consequences. Thus, Kachyňa's appropriation to the anti-charter also has a logical

explanation. Kachyňa had learned in the late 1960s and early 1970s how his subversive works would be treated by the authorities, with *Funny Old Man* (1969) and *The Ear* (1970) banned. Furthermore, as Kusín points out, with special attention from the authorities afforded to the arts in their reaction to the charter, many unions signed the anti-charter on behalf of their members (Kusin, 1978: 314). Thus, while Kachyňa may not have joined his fellow artists in signing Charter 77, it is likely he did not personally sign the anti-Charter either. To reinforce this position, in this chapter I will demonstrate how his films from 1976 onwards present an artist sympathetic to calls for change and the protection of the freedom for individuls to express themselves rather than one willing to propagate the normalisation agenda.

By the time *Death of a Fly* was released in 1976, Kachyňa had successfully released nine films since the Warsaw Pact invasion in August 1968 (*I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* (1970), *The Secret of the Great Narrator* (*Tajemství velikého vypravěče*, 1972), *Train to Heaven Station* (1972), *Hot Winter* (1973), *Love* (1973), *Pavlínka* (1974), *Robinsonka* (1974), *Ugly Village* (*Škaredá dědina*, 1975), *The Little Mermaid* (1976)). In the previous chapter, I outlined how the production of *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* was a subversive continuation of Kachyňa's 1960s works, most notably in how its adapted screenplay was written by his blacklisted, long-term collaborator Jan Procházka under a pseudonym. In the Charter 77 context, this move acts as a precedent for the return of Chytilová with *Apple Game* at the onset of the movement. The theme in *I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again* of a youth stricken down in his prime by some arbitrary, malignant force is reflective of the issues facing the New Wave directors from the 1960s following the 1968 invasion, yet the retention of a nuanced approach to the role of authoritarian guardians and even oppressive forces within the community offers a more humanistic rather than aggresive approach to these issues.

Following the death of Procházka in 1971, Kachyňa's first film released was *Secret of the Great Narrator,* a biopic of the French writer Alexandre Dumas (père). Here, the device of a removed historical setting of nineteenth-century France – both in terms of time and place – insulates the film from censorship due to its distance in time and setting from contemporary Czechoslovak concerns. However, the poststructuralist theme of understanding the role of the narrator in retelling history is a metafictional device: the viewer is encouraged to question *who* is telling the history and *why*. In the context of a heavily censored period in Czechoslovak culture, this is a subversive approach by Kachyňa. In *Train to Heaven Station* (1972), I have outlined how Kachyňa deployed the devices of a child's narrative, the country setting and the historical narrative of the Nazi occupation to once again disarm the censors, although instances of subversive material regarding the authorities can be found in the film. In *Hot Winter* (1973), Kachyňa depicts an anti-fascist member of the Slovak National Uprising during World War II in regime-endorsing style, but in *Love* (1973) he once again provides a child's narrative which offers a more nuanced approach under the guise of its apparent safety, while both *Robinsonka* (1974) and *Pavlínka* (1974) depict hyperbolic support of socialist ideals.

What is produced during this normalisation-on-the-offensive period where the authorities suppressed perceived acts of subversion in the arts is a toeing of the party line that continues to search for humanism within the auspices of the regime (Blažejovský, 2004: 69). As Blažejovský argues, the guarantee of human rights through the Helsinki agreement signed in 1975 was an integral motivation for the Charter 77 movement (Blažejovský, 2004: 72), which further aligns Kachyňa with the dissident movement. I will argue that a focus on the individual becomes a central theme in Kachyňa's work during this time. A feature of *Love* which is explored by Kachyňa at stages throughout the normalisation era is that of the artist as individual. In my introduction I outlined the concept of film poetics in relation to Kachyňa's works; I will now examine how the

concept of the artist as individual is wrapped up in Kachyňa's poetics and demonstrates how his works provide a level of subversion with regards to the authorities at odds with Kachyňa's apparent siding with the anti-chartists. By exploring how the Marxist metanarrative operated under the communist regime, I will examine the problematic space Kachyňa occupied as a filmmaker attempting to continue to make films of value under increasingly oppressive conditions amidst the Charter 77 movement.

Individual Versus the State

Since the Enlightenment, the individual has been seen as autonomous and self-determining, achieved via their faculties of Reason and through Knowledge, whose self-determination will emancipate them from arbitrary political authority and religious mystification (Newman, 2007: 23). This concept of the individual subject within modernity is thus opposed to totalitarianism and its arbitrary political power. The Czechoslovak communist regime was propped up by an appeal to Marxist ideology. In *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (1985), Jürgen Habermas begins with his approach to Hegel, the 'first philosopher to develop a clear concept of modernity' (1985: 13). Habermas outlines branches of Hegelian philosophy: what he calls 'Left Hegelianism', which leant towards revolution against the bourgeois world; and 'Right Hegelianism', which followed Hegel in the conviction that the substance of state and religion would appease the restlessness of bourgeois society (1985: 56). The problems that Left Hegelianism produces, according to Habermas, is in its development into neo-Marxism, where Marx is 'weighted down by the basic conceptual necessities of the philosophy of the subject' (Habermas, 1985: 63). It is from this problematic space that Kachyňa's difficulties in reconciling socialist ideals with the neo-Marxist communist regime arise. While the communist revolutions in Europe of the twentieth century, including in Czechoslovakia, appeal to this Left Hegelianist

revolution against the bourgeois world (Duchacek, 1950: 359)[25], the move into totalitarianism denies the subject the necessities of self-determination and autonomy. Indeed, at this stage, Left Hegelianism resembles Right Hegelianism in how it relies on the certainty of the state and its attached doctrine, or grand narrative, for legitimacy. This very phenomenon underlines the subversivity of Kachyňa's numerous invocations of the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia in his works in how the two regimes mirror rather than oppose one another.

Metanarratives are hostile to any form of questioning, and they marginalise and denigrate other forms of Knowledge (Newman, 2017: 20). This position is reflected in the official response to the signatories of Charter 77: 'We hold in contempt' their 'narcissistic haughtiness, for selfish interests', a 'small group of such backsliders and traitors' who 'isolate themselves from their own people' with 'inexorable logic' (in Prečan, 1990: 36). The signatories are marginalised and denigrated, their access to Knowledge repudiated, and critically the law is a crucial element at play here. Charter 77, then, in the context of the normalisation period where the totalitarian demands of the neo-Marxist state were reinforced, represents renewed calls within Czechoslovak culture for reform. It is on this basis that I would argue that Kachyňa's prevailing call for humanism, and in particular his focus on the freedom of expression by individuals through the motif of the photographer as artist, signifies a subversive strand in his work at odds with normalisation. That his earliest work containing this theme was in 1973 in *Love* demonstrates that criticism of his work during the normalisation-on-the-offensive period, which tends to treat his works as particularly politically biased and unserious, overlooks the significance of these themes in the wider socio-political context. Dora Viceníková discusses his 1970s works as 'the

[25] Ivo Duchacek discusses communist infiltration in the eastern bloc during and after World War II in his essay 'The Strategy of Communist Infiltration: Czechoslovakia, 1944-48' in *World Politics*, Vol.2, No.3 (Cambridge University Press, April, 1950), pp. 345-372. Duchacek argues that, as early as the partisan resistence during the war, the communists were also using the denegration of the Masaryk and Benes republics as 'bourgeois' to enhance the 'glorification' of a 'People's Democracy' (359).

sentimental world of children' (in *Kinoeye*, 2003), while Markéta Dvořáková laments the 'vulgar comedy' of Kachyňa's increasingly sexualised works during the normalisation period (in *Kinoeye*, 2003), which she argues he deployed 'to exploit popular taste' (*Ibid*.).

Ironically, these reactions are reflective of Kachyňa's depiction of how responses to the artist's works are received in the films *Love* (1973), *Death of a Fly* (1976) and *Good Lighting* (*Dobré světlo*, 1986). The photographic artist's subjects in these films are generally women, with a growing level of eroticism attached from film to film, and the responses from peers and critics in the films are a mixture of appreciation and denigration. While Kachyňa provided a more sexualised style in the 1980s, there is more to *Nurses* than *Carry On*-style, cheap comedy as Viceníková suggests (in *Kinoeye*, 2003). Its reflection of *Funny Old Man* (1969) is highly significant: *Funny Old Man* was banned by the authorities, as was its follow-up *The Ear*, and what proceeded from Kachyňa was an apparent retreat to child narratives that allowed him to make films that could be viewed by the public. In returning, then, to a setting which mirrors this censored period of his career, I will argue that Kachyňa was testing the boundaries again with regards to what was acceptable, a theme explored in his earlier normalisation films with regards to the artist as outsider. This theme continues throughout the decade and where, as I demonstrated in the previous chapter, the theme of the photographer as artist and outsider is returned to in *Good Lighting* (1986).

Markéta Dvořáková has also criticised Kachyňa's sexualised style in *Nurses* (*Sestřičky*, 1983) (in *Kinoeye,* 2003). Dvořáková is critical of the recurring depiction during the opening credits of a patient sneaking up behind a nurse and slapping her on the backside as 'bawdy humour'; however, she later concedes that Kachyňa 'does not use sex for its own sake' (2003). She also acknowledges that Kachyňa's works of this period, even his 'lesser-known films' are 'worth paying attention to' (*Ibid*). Following on from her comment about bawdy humour, she describes *Nurses* as a 'bitter comedy', which is more

nuanced than the former term regarding humour, and that it was, 'quite surprisingly', enjoying [in 2003] great popularity in the Czech Republic (2003). Thus, while there is an air of scepticism to Dvořáková's assessment of the film and indeed its ongoing reception, she adds that Kachyňa is a director who is 'sometimes accepted only with reservation' – although she fails to outline to whom she is referring to in terms of critics and/or audiences. As I have demonstrated in previous chapters, Kachyňa tended to struggle with his reception from both his peers and from Party officials, a theme which he had begun to explore in *Love* and *Death of a Fly* through the motif of the photographic artist as an individual, whose works divide opinion. This is a theme I have demonstrated he reproduced in *Good Lighting* (1986), and Dvořáková's highlighting of this issue with regards to Kachyňa reflects an ironic oversight in her reception of the film *Nurses*.

Dvořáková posits that 'many fine Czechoslovak directors made films that seem compromised' during the 1980s, and that *Nurses* is 'definitely not one of the worst films of this period' (in *Kinoeye,* 2003). Thus, there is an inherent conflict between criticising Kachyňa's apparent pandering to the authorities in this work, while accepting that the constraints of the regime made this inevitable. This conflict is reinforced in the criticism of the use of 'bawdy humour' while acknowledging that the film does not indulge in sex for its own sake (Dvořáková, 2003). Dvořáková, meanwhile, is right to highlight the link between the 1950s countryside setting and the theme of the collectivisation of agriculture to his 1960s works, particularly *Holy Night (Noc nevěsty,* 1967) (*Ibid*). She also highlights the connection to his early 1960s works, which deal with the plight of animals and, in particular, the plight of young women; however, these are themes I have argued throughout this thesis which are central to Kachyňa's poetics of humanism. The distancing effect of providing historical narratives, sometimes from the perspective of youths and children, removed from urban settings, which pertain to the accepted narratives (here, of the collectivisation of agriculture) is a recurring motif of Kachyňa's work. Again, Dvořáková

ironically underlines this point when she posits that the film demonstrates that the collectivisation 'was not always accepted voluntarily' in his works (in *Kinoeye,* 2003). This position goes against the accepted treatment of the subject of the collectivisation of agriculture, and connects *Nurses* to the subversion found in Kachyňa's 1960s and even 1950s works.

While acknowledging the link to Kachyňa's earlier works through the young, female perspective in *Nurses*, the age of the protagonist is significant. Rather than a young girl in the countryside as in *Suffering* (*Trápení,* 1961), for instance, here the protagonist is a young woman in the process of maturing into adulthood. This is much more in line with Kachyňa's later works such as *Love* (1973), *Death of a Fly* (1976) and *Love Between the Raindrops* (*Lásky mezi kapkami deště*, 1979). Indeed, that the protagonist Marie is played by Kachyňa's future wife Alena Mihulová, who plays the love interest in *Love Between the Raindrops*, generates a visual connection between these films. Thus, the contemporaneous release of *Golden Eels* with *Love Between the Raindrops* is significant in this climate of Kachyňa pushing the boundaries once again. I will argue that Kachyňa's works, in their focus on how individuals deal with oppressive conditions and on the photographic artist as individual, challenge the conditions of normalisation.

***Love* (1973)**

Love is another film where the real and the imagined dovetail on screen. It is also another film that considers the dichotomy between young and old. At forty-nine years old during the time of production, Kachyňa was far removed from the contemporary youth scene depicted early in the film and the contrasts between young characters and the older generation are apparent in the film. The working, everyday scene of the older generation is depicted as monochromatic, with a bleached-out colour filter over the opening sequence. When colour is introduced, then, its emphasis is keenly felt. The fashions presented in the film appear up to date (very colourful polyester clothing worn by the young males and females, with very

short skirts, tight-fitting clothes for both sexes and longer hairstyles for the adolescent boys), with the progressive rock soundtrack also giving the film a kind of cosmopolitan feel. Thus, even well into the normalisation period, Czechoslovakia is presented here as a modern, vibrant setting. The characters appear happy, carefree, young students. In their family lives, they enjoy their trips to second homes at the lakeside, swimming and playing together in the sunshine.

The title of the film, however, comes with conditions for its characters. For the adult couple, Petr and Eva, their co-existence in a familial setting is with a background of both having children from previous marriages. Thus, the teenage Andrea and Petr are brought together by this chance union and are expected to cohabit a house having never known one another. While there is romantic chemistry between the two, within this setting their romantic union would be considered forbidden, taboo. In dream sequences, Andrea attempts to work out what is coming between her fantasy of freedom and expression and the answer she imagines tends to be a malignant youth (usually appearing on motorcycles). This, however, is reflected in the real-life scenes in the film. Kachyňa uses a vast number of extras in this film, with characters interrupted in their dialogue by arbitrary extras who trade common greetings. Thus, the obstructers within both the real and imagined worlds of this film tend to be youths without direction or motive to cause trouble.

Trouble, however, appears in motifs in the film. In contrast to the dull monochromatic mis-en-scene, the shot cuts to a drink at a party attended by Petr (snr) who is attempting to cut down on his problematic drinking. The drink appears red and inviting, and this is reflected elsewhere when the motif of the forbidden fruit is reproduced through Andrea. There is thus a forbidden lust throughout this film which is presented in stark contrast to the everyday. The suggestion appears to be that desire for the forbidden represents characters' attempts to realise their dreams. This transcendence is imbued with concerns of old and new – its theme is represented visually through the dichotomy of old, back-and-

white film technology and the new in the form of technicolour. Thus, the theme of transgression, the crossing of taboo, is reflective of Kachyňa's treatment of taboo subjects in his contributions to the New Wave movement, where the dream sequences also reflect the New Wave theme of surrealism. That his adolescent central characters are more grown-up than the children of his previous two films also links the adolescent themes to the aforementioned depiction of youth narrative of the New Wave.

For Petr (jnr), his outlet is the art he produces through photography. Here, Kachyňa is tying in his own artistic outlet, and the performance Petr puts on for the townspeople at a local picture house feels like an indulgence in Kachyňa's own interests and background in photography. The outcome of this performance, however, is that on walking home Petr is attacked, this time by a malignant youth who reflects those seen in the dreams of Andrea. When their burgeoning love for one another is realised by both characters after this attack, Andrea's dreams now appear carefree. When the previously ambivalent youths arrive on their bicycles, they remove their masks and smile. In reality, then, when there is an inquest into who attacked Petr, both he and Andrea refuse to reveal who their attackers were. This leads to a reconciliation with those who had previously sought to attack him.

While it is an unlikely and forbidden love, the viewer is invited to react sympathetically to Milan and Andrea's happy union. Regardless of the conditions placed upon this younger generation by a weary parental generation, whose own deficiencies (both coming from failed marriages) bring the young lovers together in the first place, the viewer is encouraged to favour their union over the reconciliation between their respective parents. As a metaphor for the younger generation in Czechoslovakia at the time, the chequered past of the century and the contemporary youth as products of that past are reflected here. Kachyňa celebrates the individual in this film and admonishes ideas of collective responsibility on behalf of arbitrary systems that are brought about by the failures of previous generations. The result in this film is that the old rules no longer apply

when those who are attempting to implement them do not adhere themselves: who are Petr and Eva to judge their respective son and daughter's love affair when their own dealings with love have been so destructive? In terms of a metaphor for normalisation, this admonishment from Kachyňa highlights how those overseeing the doctrinal discharge of the totalitarian system in a positivist fashion themselves come from conflicting backgrounds. The adult population in Czechoslovakia at this time had crossed over from the interwar republic years to the Nazi occupation, and from the liberation of the republic by the Red Army to the communist *coup*. Since then they have traversed competing approaches to the application of socialism under communist rule, from increasing calls for liberalism to this latest suppression by the authorities during normalisation. The compromised position from which the parents in *Love* attempt to assert their authority, then, is reflective of the goals of normalisation. It becomes an authoritative construct geared at suppressing individual choice for the young generation on the basis of their own failures in this area.

Kachyňa, during the period of normalisation on the offensive, where the authorities were imposing tighter control on subversion within the cultural sphere, was simultaneously disarming official criticism and censorship while at the same time holding onto the subversive arsenal he had been deploying throughout his career. That he was able to do this having had two films suppressed post-Warsaw Pact invasion is a mark of his incredible artistic achievement during this time, despite criticism generally denouncing his works of this period as merely self-serving propaganda.

Thus, when the Charter 77 movement commenced and cultural in-fighting began over the regime's approach to, specifically, human rights (over the arrest of the individuals association with the punk band in 1976), Kachyňa's position as keeping in line with the Party was fixed. This cultural moment is *the* moment that defines Kachyňa's career; where his focus lies in the film *Death of a Fly* is a signifier for where his priorities as an artist lie.

***Death of a Fly* (1976)**

As touched on earlier, one feature of *Death of a Fly* that marks the work as a major departure artistically is the placement of the photographic artist at centre-stage. While the aforementioned normalisation-on-the-offensive-period films marked a particularly safe thread of films under increased pressure from the authorities, *Death of a Fly* is highly reflective of his earlier work *Love* (*Láska*, 1973), which appeared at the beginning of the normalisation-on-the-offensive period. Returning to the contemporary Czechoslovak urban setting, the focus has shifted from faraway, historical narratives, fairy tales and children's perspectives to those of young adults in the modern city at the political and cultural centre. The central character, Milan (Luboš Knytl), is a seemingly normal adolescent, yet one with a secret passion for photography. His preferred subject, an unknowing one in his neighbour and love interest, assumes the role of the taboo, and Milan's fetishisation of his subject is kept hidden from his peers. The motif that his love for his art removes him from his peer group is reflective of Kachyňa's poetics: the auteur is intrinsically at odds with the collective. The individualism of such an art form is reflected in Kachyňa's work, which has had to endure various oppressive models of production and censorship. These concerns are reflected earlier in *Love* (1973), and later in *Good Lighting* (1986), in which an adult discovers his own love for controversial photography. This message is perhaps Kachyňa's ultimate subversive theme: it is a rejection of a template for society which only strives to celebrate the successes of the collective rather than to appreciate the talents of the individual, regardless of how their works are received by their peers.

Teenager Milan's fixation on his neighbour and high-school classmate Magdalena (Jana Krausová) is at the heart of generating a self-reflexive voyeuristic gaze into adolescent love and the lives of individuals within the brutalist high-rise living quarters on the outskirts of Prague in *Death of a Fly*. The opening sequence creates the contrast between the uniformity of these living conditions and the flashes of colour from a

beachball. The soundtrack during this sequence is significant also, with the tremolo strings creating a buzzing effect reminiscent of the sound a fly makes. Whenever this motif appears in the music, the pictures on screen pause. The arrival of the fly off-screen and its interrupting the flow of the music correlates with the interruption in the flow of action on screen. On top of this, the overbearing block-orange text with deep drop-shadow effect obscures the viewer's ability to see the action. The credits in this sense reflect the motif of pest, which is significant when considering who is being credited: the studio administrators behind the film industry. The credits for the music, cast and crew appear differently, however, with the text carefully framing the leading actor's face.

This motif of a pest-presence is reinforced in the opening scene and is one of the underlying themes of the film. The contrasting of the everyday with something that stands out is repeated as the shot follows Milan running home with a loaf of bread in his hand. This mundane task is interrupted when he catches the image of Magdalena on the glass door as he is about to enter his building. His stopping in his tracks when he notices her, however, is also reflective of the effect the arrival of the buzzing of the fly has on the soundtrack, and this is reinforced as the tremolo strings reappear on the soundtrack at this point. Thus, this beguiling girl is connected to the role of pest. The shot then cuts to Magdalena from Milan's perspective, and her movements mimic those of a fly, with her silhoutted, outstretched arms holding plastic carrier bags invoking images of a fly's translucent wings. Conversely, if the fly represents a nuisance in this film, it is also something beguiling to Milan and, in turn, the viewer, so the message from the outset is that perceived pests are worthy of attention.

The source of the film's gaze is Milan, who dictates emphasis on certain subjects. The viewer is invited to share his voyeuristic gaze which is honed to his photographic subjects. In the opening scene, the viewer shares his gaze through the telescopic lens of his camera at Magda hanging out her laundry in her bath towel. While this is clearly an

intrusion on her privacy, the viewer shares the beguilement with the beautiful subject, and the outcome is a challenge to the observation of the everyday. Given the potency of the critique of surveillance in *The Ear*, this casual watching of a subject seemingly at ease in their own private surroundings provides a stark warning to the viewer of their complacency with joining such an intrusive act. Clearly, for Milan there is value to be found in watching this everyday task; however, the value is self-serving as he keeps the photographs to himself. The scene cuts to Milan hanging the photographs he has taken in his red room. This action mimics Magda hanging her laundry and produces a mise-en-abyme effect, with the photographs pertaining to the previous scene hanging inside this scene, which is presented within the confines of an internal setting. The viewer, then, is not only complicit with Milan's voyeuristic gaze but is also intruding on this private act by Milan, who is hiding his work from his parents.

The implications of the viewer's status as voyeur are brought out in the theme of the fly as pest in the film. The viewer is in essence a fly on the wall in Milan's everyday life, and Milan's aversion to flies is telling in this regard. Kachyňa provides a contrast with Petr in *Love* here, whose decision to share pictures of his headmaster washing his car in his underwear provides kudos with his schoolmates. This generates a contradiction in values from the younger generation: on the one hand, Milan wishes to be left alone by the older generation to express himself freely, but on the other Petr and his friends find humour in their intrusion on an authority figure's privacy. The reaction from the authoritarian headmaster to discovering the images of himself is to admonish the youths who are in the role of pests. This is a characteristic reinforced at points in the *Death of a Fly*, where Milan and his friends are chased away by the landowner when caught picking cherries on his orchard. Thus, Milan's aversion to pests is oxymoronic in relation to his status as one.

Yet the final scene in the film offers humanistic pathos on Milan's part. A rebellious youth rides a motorcycle in the quiet lakeside community where Milan's family

vacation. The whirring of the motorcycle engine reverberates with the motif of the tremolo strings, while the rider's cap and goggle mimic the appearance of a fly. This pest-presence then causes real upset when he collides with a vehicle on the road. The locals all rush to the scene to attend to the driver of the car, who is minimally injured, while the outcast motorcyclist is fatally injured on the ground. Milan, whose aversion to flies has been evident throughout, rushes to the motorcyclist and calls for help. Milan, finally seeing himself in this pest to the community, steps outside the crowd to help an individual who represents Milan's own irrational fear of flies. Milan rides with the fatally wounded youth in the back of an ambulance where he comes into contact once again with a fly. Having taken a sympathetic approach to a character on the fringes of society, Milan discovers an ability to face his fears and allows the pest to settle next to him.

***Good Lighting* (1986)**

The opening scene of *Good Lighting* presents a wedding at a church in a town square where a drunken groom stumbles into married life. His actions cause both consternation and amusement for those looking on. In this self-reflexive episode, where the long shot places the viewer in communion with people on the street, onlookers laugh at the groom's antics as he stumbles around. For the wedding party, the bride in particular, however, his actions are a nuisance and source of embarrassment. The film presenting the breakdown of a middle-aged couple's marriage in a bitterly comic tone reflects this opening scene, where viewers looking in can find some amusement in a tale of great upheaval on individuals' lives.

Viktor (Karel Heřmánek) is a professional architect who decides he wants to quit his job and leave his stagnant marriage after turning forty years old. At his birthday party at his pleasant apartment he shares with his wife, Viktor's behaviour is embarrassing as he, mirroring the groom in the opening scene, gets drunk and makes a fool of himself in front of their friends. In the aftermath of this party, Viktor moves out and lives in a rudimentary

studio apartment. This setting is a symbol of his emancipation from what he feels were the trappings of his former existence and creates an artistic space where he can explore his passion for photography. Simultaneously, however, the space is presented as somewhat pathetic: a bedsit where, having quit his esteemed job as an architect, Viktor lives a degenerate and disorderly life.

Viktor explores his new-found liberty from the trappings of family life and enjoys relaxing by a swimming pool. The close-up shots of young women in bikinis reflect Viktor's gaze and offer a glimpse into one of the motivating factors in his decision to follow a new path in life. This sexual desire for young women is not reciprocated at this poolside scene, where his voyeuristic gaze is met with suspicious glances from his subjects and a young woman even flees from the scene when she notices his staring. In the next scene, Viktor is presented holding a camera and taking shots of the landscape around him. Here, his fleeting gaze is given purpose and his voyeurism is mitigated by an occupation: that of the photographer. In a bid to combine his desire for the young female form with this new vocation, Viktor recruits a young model, Aranka (Anna Tomsová). During a shoot in the woods with Aranka, the young model decides of her own volition to remove her clothing and allow Viktor to photograph her nude. There is an uneasiness attached to this at first, with the large flash from his camera jarring with the viewer. However, as the film progresses, there is a proliferation of nudity which crosses over into a sexual relationship between Viktor and Aranka.

Before quitting his job, Viktor was shown some pornographic images by a colleague in his office which is ironically self-reflexive of the nudity on film. Taking into account the reception from Dvořáková over the apparent bawdiness of Kachyňa's films at this stage of his career (in *Kinoeye,* 2003), the proliferation of nudity in this film has a normalising effect. From fetishizing female flesh by the poolside, Viktor now works unmoved around Aranka's nudity during their shoots. What was considered extreme

develops into normal, accepted practice which becomes part of Viktor's working life. This has metaphorical significance for the effects of normalisation on filmmakers' careers. From filming subjects they are interested in, suddenly the shock of oppression from the authorities has become normalised and their behaviour reflects this. Again, mirroring *The Ear*, the overlapping of the personal and private, where Viktor's studio apartment doubles as his photography studio, is reinforced when he starts a new relationship with a more mature woman, who eventually becomes his latest photographic subject. Despite their sexual relationship, her stripping for their shoot in his studio is presented as a mundane activity. What shakes this, however, is when she turns the camera on Viktor when he is lying nude in bed. Suddenly, he is startled and orders her to stop. In this sense, Kachyňa is self-reflexively highlighting his own insecurities as filmmaker reflective of Viktor and Ludvík in *The Ear*: aware that he is being watched and recorded, the photographic artist moves into fight-or-flight mode. Earlier in the film, a collection of Viktor's works are exhibited locally and a wide range of individuals view his gallery. There are a range of reactions, mirroring the wedding reception in the opening scene, from insecure laughter at the nudity to sincerity and appreciation. People react in different ways to extremes; in his films denoting photographic artists and their reception, Kachyňa does not preclude the artists from potential backlash: Milan over his voyeurism towards Magda; Petr over his prank on the schoolteacher; and here, Viktor, over his fetishizing of the female form. Kachyňa does not present photographic artists whose occupation is unequivocally good for them. Instead, he presents a convincing account of the role of the individual in producing art, what their desires are, and how their reception will always be contentious, much like his own. In this sense, Kachyňa's films during this resurrection period in the normalisation era, rather than his position as signatory of the anti-charter, offer an understanding of his role as individual artist under the oppression of the authoritarian regime which sought to reduce individuality.

CHAPTER SIX: THE HOLOCAUST AND THE REGIME

In the previous chapter, I explored the conflict between the individual as artist and the constrictions of the normalisation period under the communist regime in Czechoslovakia in the works of Karel Kachyňa. The Plastic People of the Universe arrests in 1976 led to the inception of the Charter 77 movement in relation to the Helsinki Declaration on human rights. Kachyňa's refusal to sign the charter and his appearance as a signatory of the so-called anti-charter suggest an alignment with the authorities over these issues. I have sought, however, to illuminate areas where this position is open to further scrutiny, such as the proxy nature of the appropriation of signatures to the anti-charter by the artists' unions, and in particular with close examination of Kachyňa's films of this period. By exploring ways in which an artist's works can be received in different ways by peers, and by exploring the motivations behind the individual as artist, Kachyňa's works can be seen to conflict with the mores of the anti-charter as outlined in my previous chapter. The official stance, for instance, was unequivocally opposed to individualism, condemning signatories of the charter in the harshest terms as being opposed to socialism (Prečan, 1990: 36). As I have sought to demonstrate throughout this thesis, however, rather than oppose socialism, Kachyňa's poetics promote humanism in a socialist context. It is this revisionism, under the programme of normalisation in culture, which aligns Kachyňa more closely with the values of the Charter 77 movement as opposed to the official stance.

I have argued throughout this thesis that from his earliest works as a student in the 1950s, Kachyňa promoted humanism – the issue at the heart of the Charter 77 movement in response to the issue of human rights obligations made in the Helsinki agreement. In the previous chapter, I demonstrated how his 1973 film *Love* (*Laska*) introduced the theme of the photographic artist as individual auteur long before the onset of the Charter movement and that this was a theme he returned to in *Death of a Fly* (*Smrt mouchy,* 1976) and *Good Lighting* (*Dobré světlo,* 1986). In *Death of a Fly*, I argued that Kachyňa demonstrated an

artistic shift that placed the issue of individualism into the home of a contemporary youth in an urban setting and was produced contemporaneously with the Helsinki agreement and subsequent charter movement. By 1986 in *Good Lighting,* I showed how these issues had developed from an adolescent narrative to that of a middle-aged man. However, in the intervening years, I will now examine another breakthrough in Kachyňa's filmmaking – that of Holocaust cinema. In tandem with this shift, I will also consider how his works in the 1980s returned to themes that pushed the boundaries of what was acceptable in a manner comparable with his works of the 1960s, which were heavily scrutinised by the authorities for their apparent subversion towards to the regime.

Up to this point, I have presented elements of Kachyňa's poetics spanning his career that tie his works together: the historical narrative, children's narratives, pedagogical works, dealings with the taboo, and identity in the form of the individual as artist in the face of oppressive forces. In this chapter, I will explore how all of these elements come together in three of his works, *Golden Eels* (*Zlatí úhoři*, 1979), *Death of a Beautiful Deer* (*Smrt krásných srnců*, 1986 and in particular in *The Last Butterfly (Poslední motýl*, 1990). The depiction of the experiences of characters during the Holocaust is a defining feature of Kachyňa's work and his Holocaust films were deployed at critical junctures in his filmmaking career.

I will outline the groundbreaking nature of his Holocaust works, with *Golden Eels* breaking a decade-long abandonment of Holocaust narratives in Czechoslovak cinema. The release of *Death of a Beautiful Deer* fell during the normalisation period described by Blažejovský as the time of perestroika (Blažejovský, 2004: 72). Martin Štefek, however, has argued against any particularly meaningful perestroika occurring in Czechoslovakia following the election of Michail Gorbachev as general secretary of the USSR in 1985 (2014). Indeed, Štefek concurs with David Mason's assessment that Czechoslovakia, unlike Poland and Hungary who embraced reform, 'held the "middle" position and

launched modest reforms' (Mason 1988: 437). Štefek proposes three 'distinct phases' in the Czechoslovak context: 'Waiting game (1985-1987)', where a neutral attitude towards the reform proposed by Gorbachev was taken by the Czechoslovak authorities; 'Reform (Economic) – January 1987', which only occurred following an accidental publication of Gorbachev's reform ideas in the state-sanctioned *Rudé právo* newspaper.[26] Finally, Štefek describes 'another waiting game' of the summer of 1988, where the Party worked on producing a document outlining their own plans for reform (Štefek, 2010: 23).

Thus, any notion that the fall of communism was apparent during the 1980s and in any way inevitable by the close of 1989 are particularly skewed in the Czechoslovak context. Conversely, there was an appetite for conservatism within the Czechoslovak communist leadership that opposed reformist moves made by Gorbachev in the USSR. In terms of positioning Kachyňa's Holocaust-themed works during this decade, these circumstances once again demonstrate a subversive strand that questioned the prevailing political attitude during the most stringent period of the regime.

Holocaust Cinema

In my introduction, I touched on the allegorical nature of *The Last Butterfly* (1990) in terms of individuals' actions under the auspices of extreme, oppressive forces with regards to the communist regime in Czechoslovakia. Using historical narratives as the basis for criticism of the regime was, as I have argued throughout this thesis, a prominent feature of Kachyňa's work. There was an apparent awareness, however, from the authorities that Holocaust narratives were capable of producing an allegorical link to the terror experienced by citizens under the Czechoslovak communist regime. In a chapter entitled 'The Holocaust', Peter Hames argues in *Czech and Slovak Cinema: Theme and Tradition*

[26] On the back of the Charter 77 movement, two factions of conservatives and reformists remained within the Party, with the former still far stronger; however, this mistake in *Rudé právo* strengthened the reformists' position, with even the most conservative members of the leadership being powerless to say 'no' to Gorbachev (Štefek, 2010: 23).

(2009) that Czechoslovakia is 'probably unequalled' in its breadth and persistence of Holocaust narratives in film following the Second World War (95). However, there is also the issue of pervading anti-Semitism in the communist bloc after the war. Šárka Sladovníková's argument that the Czechoslovak communist era was marked by a 'varying degree of latent (and often even open)' anti-Semitism is at odds with Hames' assessment of the success of Czechoslovak Holocaust narratives in film (2018: 7). Indeed, as Sladovníková points out, between 1948 and 1958 and again between 1970 and 1979, there were no Holocaust films made in Czechoslovakia (2018: 8).

Tomas Sneigon points to two reasons Holocaust narratives were neglected in European cinemas falling under the influence of the Soviet Union. He first highlights how the communists monopolised power and chose to present communist suffering at the hands of the Nazis and heroic efforts against this power during the war as part of socialist realism (Sniegon, 2014: 56-57). He then outlines the concern from authorities that the terror of the Holocaust might be linked to the Stalinist-era regimes in eastern Europe (*Ibid*.). This is reflective of the concerns surrounding Kachyňa's unconventional treatment of accepted narratives to do with the collectivisation of agriculture, the partisans' efforts against the Nazis during the war, and the liberation of the republic in his 1960s films. In particular, the depiction of the Czech partisans in *Coach to Vienna* (*Kočar do Vídně*, 1966) in an unflattering light speaks to concerns raised by Tatjana Lichtenstein in her essay '"It Is Not My Fault That You Are Jewish!": Jews, Czechs, and the Memory of The Holocaust in Film, 1949-1989' (2016). Lichtenstein argues that after the Munich Agreement of 1938, some Czechs were radicalised further towards a version of Czech nationalism that was afforded privilege by the Nazis at the expense of Jews during the occupation from 1939 to 1945 (2016: 118). This argument starts to pick away at the notion that anti-Jewish laws were implemented by Germans while Czechs stood by, with Lichtenstein arguing that even before the transportation of Jews to concentration camps from 1941, Czech towns used the

idiom ‘ghettos without walls’ for areas with high numbers of Jewish residents, indicating Czech participation in their persecution (2016: 118).

Just as Kachyňa had started to question the role of Czech partisans in terms of atrocities committed during the war versus the version of events preferred by the authorities, this active participation by Czechs goes against the notion of a passive obedience under threat of terror, which again poses questions for citizens living under the communist regime. Lichtenstein argues that the need to ‘distance Czechs from accusations of collaboration with the Nazis’ fed a desire to deport Germans after the war (2016: 122). This is a phenomenon I detailed in my first chapter, where some 2.5 million Germans were during the Sudeten Movement (Introduction: 38). In *Coach to Vienna*, Kachyňa highlighted the brutality of acts of retribution by Czechs against those perceived to be Nazis; this was a reality that was ‘unsettling to some Czechs’ in how it ‘bore a disturbing resemblance to the methods employed by the Nazis against the Protectorate’s Jews’ (Lichtenstein, 2013: 123).

For Lichtenstein, these unsettling reflections between the actions and reactions of Czechs in the wake of the Nazi occupation to the suffering of Jews under the Nazis was problematic for the communist regime (2016: 130). The authorities ‘had little use for Jewish suffering’ partly because of ‘uncomfortable truths’ about Czech participation (Lichtenstein, 2016: 131). As Hames points out, however, there were exceptions to this, particularly during the 1960s and the New Wave, where some filmmakers provided narratives which both tackled the treatment of Jewish people under the Nazis and reflected the treatment of citizens under the communist regime. Hames’ chapter introduces the history of Holocaust films in Czech and Slovak cinema, with particular attention paid to Ján Kadár and Elmar Klos’s *Shop on the High Street* (*Obchod na korze*, 1965), with the theme explored as a moral fable consisting of tragicomic modes (Hames, 2009: 97). Hames explores almost accidental complicity by ordinary Czechs in the treatment of people as

other, pointing to the theme of the Nazis generating otherness for political control (*Ibid*.). In the normalisation context, the countering of Charter 77 with the anti-charter by the authorities mirrors such a move, where the signatories of the original charter are denigrated and marginalised. The signatures for the anti-charter being largely appropriated via state-controlled unions only serves to heighten this problem for individuals in this system. Blind complicity aids the state's severe oppression of individuals; yet Holocaust films tell the stories of individuals treated as other and who were outside the political and even cultural narrative of the 1970s until, as Sladovníková posits (2018: 7), Kachyňa's *Golden Eels* in 1979.

The film *Golden Eels* was made for television contemporaneously with Kachyňa's cinematic release *Love Between the Raindrops* (*Lásky mezi kapkami deště*, 1979). This film, coming during the period described as resurrection in the normalisation era (Blažejovský, 2004: 72), was part of a reconnection with earlier, subversive works. Given the socio-political environment surrounding issues relating to the Charter 77 movement, which was centred on issues to do with the protection of human rights under the regime, the focus in *Love Between the Raindrops* on a youthful, contemporary and urban setting offers a critique of the wider cultural concerns and connects the film with his 1972 work *Love*. Later, the ostensible link between *Look Out! Nurses Rounds* (*Pozor, vizita!*, 1981, prem. 1982) and *Funny Old Man* (*Směšný pán*, 1969) demonstrates Kachyňa's contribution to the calls for a humanist poetics in a manner which throws into question any notion that he was a committed signatory of the so-called anti-charter.

Pushing the Boundaries Again

While, as I have argued, Kachyňa tends to avoid direct criticism of the regime in his films, this move was a bold statement of intent in the years following the onset of the Charter 77 movement. However, as outlined in my fourth chapter, his works of this period have been dismissed by some critics as 'bottom-pinching', crudely humorous and unserious

(Viceníková in *Kinoeye,* 2003; Dvořáková, 2003). What I will aim to demonstrate in this chapter is that, like much of the humanistic discourse of Kachyňa's work throughout his career, one major aspect of the 'vanished history' of the Holocaust has been simmering beneath the surface in his works in relation to the treatment of individuals under oppressive systems (Sniegon, 2014). In a career in which what is said and represented on screen explicitly is often at odds with the effects produced in his works, Kachyňa's focus on unconventional individuals was consistent. In my previous chapters, I explored how, during the normalisation years in the 1970s and 1980s, Kachyňa managed to continue to nurture and develop his poetics in relation to, in particular, the treatment of individuals in his films. Two films I have not explored from that period until now are *Golden Eels* (1979) and *Death of a Beautiful Deer* (*Smrt krásných srnců*, 1986).

One of the characteristics of the historical treatment of the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia in November 1989 James Krapfl argues is often overlooked is that the revolution arose from a stifled population whose revolutionary concerns continued beyond the accession to power of Václav Havel in December, 1989. I have argued in favour of Kachyňa's poetics in this thesis as being a totem of artistic merit in spite of and, at times, even because of the regime in place for a majority of his career. Kachyňa's first film after the fall of communism was *The Last Butterfly* (1990), a Czechoslovak-British produced Holocaust film. This links his post-communism work to his work produced during the harshest period of the regime. What this thread demonstrates intrinsically is the central aspect to his poetics: that he is not a filmmaker who stands for the revolution, nor is he a filmmaker who stands for the regime, just as he is not a filmmaker who stands for the Czechoslovak New Wave, nor the post-war Stalinist era and socialist realism. Throughout his career, Kachyňa's films always stood for real people; his humanism which, demonstrated in his own treatment with regards to the New Wave, was considered to have a diminishing effect on his work, is actually what binds it together as an artistic whole.

This is what makes his Holocaust films so powerful: Kachyňa's poetics, in always attempting to rehabilitate the other, makes him the perfect filmmaker for this genre. I will argue in this chapter that none of his films stand out more than *The Last Butterfly*, *Death of a Beautiful Deer* and *Golden Eels* in their ability to criticise the arbitrary attribution of the status of 'other' to individuals and the human cost of such actions.

***Golden Eels* (1979)**

In the first of Kachyňa's Holocaust-themed films, *Golden Eels*, the central narrative is largely removed from the horrors of the Shoah. Only through the overt suggestion as the film's main protagonist, a young boy named Prdelka (Martin Mikuláš), watches his father and older brothers being taken away with stars of David emblazoned on their clothes does the viewer appreciate this dark aspect of the narrative. The naivety concerning wider political concerns is a product of the child's narrative, and is a device deployed throughout Kachyňa's career in his dealing with taboo subjects as I have argued in previous chapters. Indeed, this apparently naïve perspective allowed him to say more about certain taboo subjects, because his narratives were dismissed as mere children's perspectives. Ostensibly, the film is about a family who leave Prague for the countryside, where the youngest son befriends a local fisherman (Rudolf Hrušínský) and learns how to catch fish in the river Berounka, a pastime that ultimately allows Prdelka and his mother to survive in the absence of his father and brothers.

The naivety produced in the child's perspective fulfils a function for Kachyňa in his dealing with the taboo subject of the Holocaust. As I have outlined previously, the authorities were reticent about this element of the World War II narrative in terms of how it could highlight Czech participation in the genocide of six million people (Sniegon, 2014: 56-57). This uncomfortable reality went against the accepted narrative that occupying forces were solely responsible for the atrocities that existed before the liberation of the republic. Furthermore, there was a fear that a narrative concerning individuals persecuted

under totalitarianism could be linked to the Stalinist show trials of the 1950s and, in turn, the normalisation period which sought to return Czechoslovak culture to an era of conformity under the communist regime. Thus, the sidelong glance at the Holocaust in *Golden Eels* acts as a distancing technique in relation to these issues. Also, the perception of the child's narrative as unserious removes the film from the context of subversive work directed against the contemporary regime. However, as I have demonstrated previously concerning Kachyňa's deployment of the child's narrative, both the sympathetic gaze towards an oppressed group and the pedagogical function of such narratives serves a subversive purpose. Far from a socialist-realist film offering children an instructional narrative on how to behave in a socialist society, *Golden Eels* informed its audience of a narrative that was, as I have outlined above, completely absent from contemporary culture.

Other distancing techniques deployed by Kachyňa in *Golden Eels* are those of the historical narrative and the country setting. In the opening scene, a Czech family is depicted, somewhat frivolously, to be fleeing the city of Prague, Czechoslovakia's political centre. The family hastily pack their things and leave their luxurious apartment building for a home in a small village in the countryside. Looking to assimilate into their new surroundings, Prdelka's father (Vladimír Menšík) takes his three sons fishing and they later retire to the local pub, where the landlord (Karel Heřmánek) is holding court with its occupants. In this setting, where the public house overlaps with the landlord's private home, the publican makes a joke about Adolf Hitler which amuses the other men at his table. However, the shot cuts to Rudolf Hrušínský, who looks unimpressed. In this instance, the landlord is unaware of the implications of his dismissiveness towards the Nazis yet this quiet fisherman seems more cautious. This scene demonstrates that despite the far reaches of this country setting, the prevailing political narrative has an ability to penetrate to these remote quarters. In this overlapping public/private setting, the publican seems oblivious to how the forces of this political narrative are going to invade his private

enterprise and individual freedoms. In the context of the country setting and the communist-era themes of the collectivisation of agriculture and public ownership of private businesses, these themes can thus be interpreted in an analogous context. The viewer sharing suspicion of the Nazi-invasion narrative provides a character whom they can sympathise with and who seems to understand the gravity of the impending occupation.

Another element of the country setting which heightens the subversive angle towards contemporary concerns is in the depiction of the act of fishing in the river Berounka. The river is presented as thriving with fish that are there in bountiful supply to be collected. However, the film first warns against designs to quickly make a large catch in a scene where Prdelka is sent out into the rapids with with multiple hooks on his father's line. His father ignores both his lack of strength to cross the rapids and his inexperience in fishing and ultimately has to rescue his son from drowning. Later, Prdelka joins Hrušínský who teaches him with a measured approach and the results are almost instantaneous. Hrušínský demonstrates how to deal with the fish humanely and Prdelka garners more skills in this pursuit. In stark contrast, when the Nazis have arrived and taken over the village, there is a scene where Prdelka is poaching minnows using his bare hands in a quiet part of the river. A group of Wehrmacht soldiers arrive and interrupt him, one throwing a grenade into the river. After it explodes, several dead fish rise to the surface and the sneering soldiers go and collect them. Here, the political forces of military power are applied to the river and its arbitrary inhabitants. While this reflects how the Nazis occupied foreign territories, it also acts as a commentary on the appropriation of property through violent means, an effect reflective of both the Nazis and the communists. Prdelka is forced to use his own cunning to poach the fish despite warnings in Czech and German on signs around the river, while the Nazi soldiers simply apply violent force. In the context of a pedagogical film made during the normalisation era, this offers another contemporary

subversive angle to this work. For filmmakers operating under the regime, meanwhile, Prdelka offers a template of how to survive against a totalising ideology backed by military force.

This theme of individual cunning in the face of political and military forces also highlights the theme of the treatment of the individual in this work. Reflecting the fish in the river as a unknowing child, Prdelka has unwittingly become a subject of the Nazi occupation. Again, this is reflective of filmmakers following the Warsaw Pact invasion in 1968 and the ensuing period of normalisation. The Nazi invasion has denied Prdelka access to both his favourite pastime and a source of sustenance and income for his family. Despite his powerlessness in the face of the invading forces, Prdelka continues to apply his skills in a covert manner. With the Nazis' presence instigating the departure of his father and brothers, Prdelka and his mother are left destitute. However, with help from sympathetic members of his community, Prdelka continues to use his skills in fishing to provide food and a source of income for his family.

Finally, the fate of the outspoken publican personifies the metaphysical overlap between treatment of fish in the river and humans in the village in the film's narrative. After fleeing interrogation under torture from Wehrmacht soldiers, the publican makes it to a bridge over the river and is trapped between two groups of armed soldiers. In desperation, he jumps off the bridge into the water and the soldiers go in after him. He is beaten, pulled out of the river and taken away as a prisoner. Not only does this augment the analogy of the fish with the human inhabitants of the village in relation to arbitrary forces against them, this scene also echoes Kachyňa's position that patent objection to oppressive forces leads individuals toward tragic consequences. On the one hand, Prdelka uses his skill and cunning to circumvent the situation amidst his own dire circumstances, while on the other, the publican is publically scolded for his objections and has to attempt to break free. Here, Kachyňa provides a commentary on the treatment of individuals as artists in his

field of filmmaking under the regime following the Warsaw Pact invasion of 1968. While some were persecuted and others exiled, Kachyňa stayed and continued to work. Like Prdelka, however, this was not an acceptance of his new conditions, but unlike the publican it was not an overt objection to the oppressive forces either. Kachyňa offers a template for survival, where artistry and skill can still be applied but without the immediate threat of censure.

Through this narrative dealing with the Holocaust, whose Final Solution was to exterminate people who did not fit into an arbitrary ideological metanarrative, Kachyňa provides a commentary on the treatment of individuals who are consigned to a status of otherness in his own context. Kachyňa's template of his own filmmaking, where care and skill allow for an industry to survive, is applied in the context of a culture that pitted in diametric terms the signatories of Charter 77 and the signatories of the anti-charter. Thus, Kachyňa offers a middle ground where an individual can survive, perhaps even thrive, in spite of the oppression they face.

***Death of a Beautiful Deer* (1986)**

In 1985, Kachyňa returned to work on another of Ota Pavel's works, *Death of a Beautiful Deer*, which deals with the Holocaust. In the opening scene, Kachyňa sets up the theme of reflecting the treatment of animals with that of humans when the protagonist, Leo Popper (Karel Heřmánek), spots a group of wild deer while out fishing with his sons. Leo says: 'Look at those eyes. It is as if they were human' (00:01.36). Right from the outset, a hierarchy of species is established, where fish are at the bottom as stock for human consumption and even entertainment as sport, and deer, through this connection to humans established by the main protagonist, are treated differently. As in *Golden Eels*, Rudolf Hrušínský plays an old angler, Karel, who resides near the lake and is an expert at fishing. His dog, Holan, a large Alsatian, is a hunting dog and Leo is upset when he catches and kills one of the deer off-screen. Leo calls: 'He's a murderer! I just saw him attack a deer',

to which Karel responds: ‘You’re nuts!’ (00:03.12). At home, Leo’s wife (Marta Vančurová) serves venison but he refuses to eat it, justifying the eco-cycle when the comparison to fishing is brought up, insisting ‘fish and deer are different’ (00:05.34). Indeed, Leo’s preference for the protection of deer is at odds with his willingness to use insects as bait for fishing. Here, setting animal on animal for his own gain reflects the use of Holan for hunting deer, but it is through this sympathy that Leo has developed for the deer that he repels from this act of killing.

At the end of the film, however, in desperation, Leo will turn to Holan to hunt deer for his own sons’ survival, and this theme of dehumanisation through desperation is threaded throughout this Holocaust narrative, where Leo and his sons are to be sent to the concentration camps after the Nazi invasion. The arbitrariness of the dehumanisation of Jewish people under the Nazis reflects Leo’s position with regards to the hunting of deer, and his willingness to abandon his own principles in this regard in extreme circumstances offers an ominous warning as to how individuals could be drawn into a project of dehumanisation when placed in extreme conditions.

Through this metaphor for dehumanisation and the arbitrary attributing of a hierarchy of species, Kachyňa sets up a socialist-realist metaphor in a critique of capitalism when Leo starts his job as a vacuum cleaner salesman, a business which relies on a different kind of eco-system. In sales, Leo relies on income for his sustenance, and to succeed he must provide the correct sales pitch to customers. In this environment, however, he is treated differently in the city-office setting to his peers. At first, he is regarded as a country dweller too naïve for the harsh environs of business life. Indeed, his initial sales pitches to country folk are incompatible with the product he is selling, and he is even chased out of a farmer’s house after trying to sell a vacuum cleaner to his wife. Her response is that there are people employed by the farmer who carry out cleaning duties, but Leo insists this piece of machinery will allow those employees to do other jobs. When this

idea is rejected, Leo realises he must find another way to make his product relevant to a seemingly uninterested audience. The incentive, or bait, he establishes reflects his own goals in being a successful salesman. On first joining the company, Leo attends a lavish ceremony in which the top salesman is rewarded with accolades and is allowed to kiss the boss's glamorous wife, Irma (Dana Vlková). His own incentive now is both financial gain and sexual desire, and this opens up his own sales pitch to potential customers in the country setting.

In visiting the homes of lonely housewives, Leo sexualises his sales pitch and seduces women who in turn buy his products. This crossing the sanctity of marital boundaries eventually leads Leo into trouble when he is caught with an army officer's wife, with the victim sending a letter to Leo's boss, Korálek (Ladislav Potměšil), condemning his behaviour. Korálek accepts that Leo's actions have led to unlikely sales but warns him to 'leave the army alone' (00:31.25). Thus, while immorality is tolerated, a hierarchy is established with regards to would-be victims of Leo's baiting, and individuals connected to the establishment are to be left alone.

The unscrupulous nature of the business world then turns on Leo when, buoyed by his new-found wealth through his excellent sales performance, he agrees to buy a lake from a business associate of Korálek for a high price on the promise that it contains a healthy stock of fish. The transaction turns out to be a fraud, however, and he is left to populate the lake at his own expense and through his own hard work. Later, an opportunity to act out his revenge presents itself when he sells the scammer an expensive refrigerator that, like the lake that was sold to him, does not contain the necessary parts to work. Here, again, however, he is warned by colleagues not to upset a powerful lawyer.

With these warnings accumulating, Leo's continued pursuance of Irma appears to be an ill-judged enterprise. His strategy for wooing her, however, becomes more complex. Aware that she wishes to have her portrait taken by a renowned artist Nejezchleb (Lubor

Tokoš), Leo gains the professor's confidence and even makes lucrative sales to the frugal artist, which impress his colleagues. This friendship also leads to Nejezchleb agreeing to do the portrait, but on seeing Irma, he says: 'Me? Paint such a madam? (00:53.06), which leaves her distraught and she leaves in tears. Leo, however, takes her to a friend's trailer to comfort her and here fulfils his sexual desire; however, the encounter is presented as deeply unfulfilling. Rather than feeding on would-be customers' desires, Leo has acted on the misery of his love interest and this shift in his approach marks a turning point in the film.

The scene cuts to Leo sitting at his local pub in the country with his wife and Karel. At this point, Leo has betrayed both his family and his employer in this act of adultery and the mood of the scene is distinctly sombre. Colour has been bleached out of the shot and the surrounding area is shown to be gloomy and icy. Reading the newspaper earnestly, Leo then hears of the announcement that the Nazis now occupy the lands and have created the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. Leo, because of his religious background, loses his job as a result and returns to his lake to try and make a living from its yields; however, he soon discovers that the Nazis have taken possession of his property. Later, he returns to the lake to find Wehrmacht soldiers fishing there. With his star of David insignia on display, Leo is taunted by the soldiers, and when he returns home he discovers that his sons are to be transported away for 're-education' (01:.01.20). Here, his own double-crossings confront him: Leo is exploited and taunted by military figures whom he was warned to leave alone; he has been notified by Korálek, whom he has betrayed, that he is no longer employed; the lake sold to him by the lawyer, whom he took revenge on, has been taken from him and he has no legal defence against that; and his family, who he has betrayed through his adultery, are being victimised by the Nazi invasion. None of these instances of oppression are directly linked to Leo's actions: the Nazi invasion, which, like in *Golden Eels*, has not been a prominent narrative in the film to this point, has arbitrary

consequences for Leo based on his religious background. Yet there is a sense that Leo has colluded in enterprises that pitch human against human. At first, he utilised desires; however, on finally seducing Irma, he had fed off her misery.

Thus, when Leo's position within this system turns from wealthy excess to scarcity and desperation, his own actions change direction. Determined to provide for his family one last time before his sons' transportation, Leo embarks on an illicit fishing trip at Karel's to feed them before their internment. The conditions, however, are unsuitable for fishing and in his desperation Leo turns to deer hunting, imploring Karel to give him use of Holan for the task. Karel responds: 'You always said it is nearly liking killing a human' (01:18.08), but seeing Leo's desperation he assents. On setting the dog on the deer, the shot cuts to a close-up of Leo baring his teeth, calling to the dog: 'Get him by the gullet!' (01:32.53), before he turns away in disgust after the deed. Leo, in his fervour for survival, gets caught up in the act of killing an animal he has hitherto treated as almost human, and this acts as the ultimate betrayal in the film.

The death of this deer marks a descent into the dehumanisation brought on by an extreme narrative. Leo returns home with the meat to feed his sons, who he watches as they are taken away for transportation. Looking through a pair of binoculars, the shot mimics Leo's view, with images of the children cut with images of deer out in the fields. In creating this final connection between the innocent children and the deer, Kachyňa reinforces the metaphor of the dehumanising effect of the Nazi project. While an understanding of Leo's decision to hunt deer can be grasped through his desperation to provide for his family, the soldiers marching these children away to the transportations are more difficult to sympathise with. What Leo's plight demonstrates, however, is that even the incentives of capitalist greed and sexual desire can cause individuals to betray those closest to them. Therefore, when it comes to necessity and survival, individuals can go to extremes of behaviour that undermine the fabric of their own principles.

***The Last Butterfly* (1990)**

In *The Last Butterfly*, Kachyňa not only brings together the themes of the Holocaust informing his two earlier works, *Golden Eels* and *Death of a Beautiful Deer*, but I will argue that this film is a culmination of his life work to this point. In my introduction to this thesis, I outlined how *The Last Butterfly* inhabits a liminal status as a film. The international production was conceived before the fall of communism in Czechoslovakia, was completed in 1990, just after the regime change, and released in 1991. It was only on November 10, 1989, at a regular meeting of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, one day after the fall of the Berlin Wall and one week before the student demonstration in Prague, that the Czechoslovak Velvet Revolution commenced (Štefek, 2014). The timing of the production of *The Last Butterfly* cannot, then, be conflated with any prevailing sense of political or cultural reform and, as such, stands out as a particularly subversive work of the period.

The film opens with renowned mime artist Antoine Moreau (Tom Courtenay) in his Paris apartment with a young girlfriend, Michele (Ingrid Held), during the Nazi occupation of France in the early 1940s. With the aging Moreau jealous of the attention his beautiful young lover receives, they engage in a petty argument before Michele leaves. Moreau follows his girlfriend through the streets of Paris, which is reflected in Moreau appearing to be followed by officials in trenchcoats. Moreau catches Michele sitting in a bistro with a younger man and confronts them in a jealous rage. After the confrontation, which was observed by the spy in the trenchcoat outside the restaurant, Moreau has a glass of cognac with the publican, who seems familiar with him. During their conversation, Moreau criticises the audiences to his performances, describing them as ‘German pigs’ (0: 07.40). This reflects the moment in *Golden Eels* where the publican in the village is making jokes about Hitler during the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia, with his fate acting as a warning to this dismissive attitude in public from Moreau.

The scene then cuts to a stage show, where an audience made up of Wehrmacht officers and their girlfriends are enjoying a *cancan*. Here, the overlap between the high register of the orchestral music and the bawdiness of the dance acts as a prelude to the show Moreau will lead in Terezín later in the narrative, where his musicians are luminaries of classical music in Europe and are seconded for his comedic play. As the shot pans across the officers in the audience, there is a mixture of stoic appreciation for the music and drunken debauchery and cat-calling for the female dancers. Behind the scenes, Moreau is preparing for his act and demonstrates contempt for the whole scene, exclaiming 'I am an artist!' (0:07.52). This situates Moreau as an artist whose poetics go against the grain of the prevailing attitudes of his audience and, coupled with his disparaging remarks about the Germans, generates a subversive space for the show he is about to perform. This subversive attitude is reinforced off-stage where the French performers brazenly mock the Nazi leadership despite the occupation, which produces the allegorical space in relation to the communist regime in Czechoslovakia. Like Moreau in this production, Kachyňa had been forced to apply his high skill set to the less-esteemed genre of child narratives during the normalisation period. This outburst from Moreau, 'I am an artist!', is reflective of the frustration felt in the treatment of the artist as individual in Kachyňa's films of the normalistion period.

While the expected form is socialist realism, Kachyňa is demonstrating how appropriating this form from a subversive angle is a means for an artist to reduce their artistic compromise under these oppressive conditions. Moreau's act itself, then, has to appeal to the audience at the same time as producing this effect, and Kachyňa demonstrates the inherent difficulty in negotiating this subversive space. Firstly, Moreau has to contend with drunken heckling from the crowd, responding by turning the joke on the officer who calls out by incorporating them into his act. The response from the officer at first is of indignation, which signals danger for Moreau, but when the audience shows its

appreciation for his comedic artistry, the heckler's avarice is neutralised. The effect here is one of controlling the narrative for Moreau, with the heckling ceasing after this.

This effect is then replicated in the thrust of his act. Using mime, Moreau manipulates a narrative where he is ushering an invisible dog to perform tricks for the audience. Here, Kachyňa demonstrates the power of suggestion, with the motif of showing without saying crucial to his subversive works throughout his career. As I have argued previously, Kachyňa faced greater pressure from the censors and the authorities when his works overtly criticised the regime and pushed the boundaries too far. In many of his films, I have demonstrated how not speaking out allows characters to get away with more than when they implicate themselves directly. Thus, as Moreau's act reaches its climax, where his character finds his arm stuck in a Nazi salute when trying to get the dog to leap over it, the comedic effect comes full circle. Moreau is satirising the fanaticism of Nazism, suggesting that a key symbol for adherence to its grand narrative becomes an uncontrollable reflex, and at this moment another drunken officer approaches him in a stupor and returns the faux salute, an ironically self-reflexive example of the satire at play. Crucially, the audience appreciate the humour and are able to laugh at themselves. However, this is not wholly appreciated, as the shot cuts to some gestapo officers in the wings who do not join in with the applause. Again, this acts as allegory for the reception to subversive works under the communist regime, where the popularity of works has little bearing on how they will be received by high-ranking officials. Moreau, however, is saved when a higher-ranking official appears in the wings and leads the others in applause, which they obediently perform. Again, reflecting Kachyňa's own career, this resounds with how President Novotný's personal intervention saved *Coach to Vienna* during the post-production stage.

With the foreboding around spying from earlier in the film, however, this acceptance comes with a warning for Moreau. On returning to his Paris apartment, where

he reconciles with Michele, their joviality is interrupted by news on the radio of executions carried out by the Nazis in France. Again, the ability for the Nazi metanarrative to penetrate into their private space is expressed here. At this point, the gestapo arrive at the apartment building, and the warning over the espionage theme comes into focus. Again, this resonates with Kachyňa's previous dealing with this theme, particularly in his supposedly socialist-realist film *It All Ends Tonight*. With the figure of the femme fatale as a symbol of the workings of espionage, and how through desire she manipulates a character into acting against socialist values, the gestapo's charge against Michele in *The Last Butterfly* is reflected by this character trope. In this scene it is revealed that Michele's meeting with the younger man in the bistro was actually for the purpose of helping him to gain illegal papers to aid his fleeing of the Nazi occupation. As in *It All Ends Tonight*, the consequences of these actions are mortal, as Michele falls from their apartment balcony to her death when the gestapo catch up with her.

In the next scene, Moreau is then interrogated by gestapo agents over his perceived involvement in Michele's plot, which he denies. After some questioning under physical duress, the same high-ranking official who had placated the other agents at Moreau's show arrives and pacifies the interrogators, insisting that his actions amounted to 'nothing which could hang a man' (0:22.39). This officer's ulterior motive for leniency towards Moreau, however, is revealed at this moment and is again reflective of Kachyňa's light treatment by officials following the Warsaw Pact invasion. The officer suggests that Moreau should coordinate a play at Terezín for the visiting Red Cross delegation who are going to inspect the conditions of the town for its inhabitants, and urges him to make a show for children. 'They like a fairy tale,' he says (0:24.34). Again, the intertextuality with Kachyňa's earlier works is highlighted with this choice. The officer wants to put on a show that will defuse the Red Cross visitors to the camp and his suggestion that a show for children is most fitting reflects the tactic used by Kachyňa throughout his career of adopting children's

narratives producing a de-escalating effect. The fairy tale, too, is a genre Kachyňa adopted in *The Little Mermaid* during the most stringent period of normalisation to produce subversive material which appeared to be innocuous children's entertainment, but which also echoed themes of a subversive individual having no voice. Here, the authorities are seeking to deploy the same tactics for avoiding suspicion that Kachyňa has.

The scene then cuts to Moreau arriving at Terezín, and his entrapment in this system of obfuscation starts to take hold. Believing that he has a deal to perform the show and he will be set free, Moreau takes to his lodgings and begins his preparations, yet the reality of the façade he has entered starts to become apparent. Moreau encounters celebrated musicians, one of whom has led the Vienna philharmonic orchestra, interred in the camp and acknowledges their high esteem. When he assumes his role of hiring them for his performance, however, the incongruity of their denigrated status becomes apparent. This inversion of roles within a hierarchy of performance is reflective of Kachyňa's criticisms of the film boards during the 1950s, where highly skilled individuals were relegated either to lowly positions or out of their field altogether while inexperienced and unqualified individuals deemed appropriate by the authorities were parachuted into high-powered roles (in Liehm, 1968: 106).

The artifice of the setting then augments this arbitrary system, where the shopfronts and restaurants are shown to be without substance when Moreau tries to order a meal, only to discover that the restaurant is merely a façade giving the impression of normal life. There is a self-reflexive aspect to this as his setting reflects the stage-set and props of a play, and in his revulsion he attests that he will not take part. However, as he realises the power he possesses in his ability to recruit the children for the play in order to shield them from the transportations to the death camps, he becomes besotted by one young girl, Stella, and accepts his responsibility to offer the children a reprieve. In its self-reflexivity, the artifice of the setting acts as a warning to the viewer about the depiction of any

environment from the point of view of those who rule over it, which in turn highlights the allegorical power of the film through the motifs of set design and scripting through *mise-en-abyme*, which I explored in reference to the documentary format in my first chapter (I: 56-60). Stella, however, becomes jealous over Moreau's love affair with the guardian of the children in the camp, and in her desertion from the show she has an altercation with two guards who catch her stealing. Stella flees to Moreau's room where he assures her she is safe, but on returning to her own living quarters Stella finds the two guards in waiting at her dormitory and she is taken away.

The guards wearing stars of David is another warning, where the oppressors in this situation belong to the group being oppressed at large. This also acts an as allegorical statement concerning the treatment of accepted narratives under socialist realism, where the Nazis were presented as the enemy and the Czechs are saved by socialist heroes. Here, like in *Coach to Vienna*, those administering the evils of the occupying forces are part of the occupied community, who turn on their own. This is another example in the film of how Kachyňa avoids a polemical position and presents the nuances at play in a system of oppression, where the oppressed can bring about their own persecution. The inherent frustration in this quandary is interrogated by Moreau, who implores the orchestral ensemble to fight back against the guards. Moreau says: 'Don't you realise you outnumber them? Even without weapons you could overpower them!' (01:20.17). The maestro replies: 'How many people are there in Paris? How many people are there in Europe? How is it that all those people allowed this nightmare to happen in the first place?' (01:20.35). This perspective asks uncomfortable questions of the Western viewer in this multi-national production. Moreau (Sir Tom Courtenay), is a French character whose plight places him behind the barracks of the Jewish prisoners in Terezín. Here, the horrors of the Holocaust are laid bare to someone who is otherwise ignorant. Reflexively, this is a commentary of the dearth of Holocaust narratives in Czechoslovak culture, but also of the ability for the

Allies to turn a blind eye to the atrocities committed by the Nazis as they rose to power. As an allegory for the communist regime in Czechoslovakia, Kachyňa is setting this film up as a covert warning to Western viewers about the oppression facing Czechoslovak culture in a manner that is universally accessible: that the overarching façade of a civilised, thriving community is a narrative controlled by the ruling class of any society, and that through closer examination, the paucity of this façade is revealed.

Again, however, Kachyňa refuses to frame this in a polemical fashion. Just as Moreau's call to arms for the orchestral ensemble is met with the reality that one insurrection would not be adequate, his move to save Stella from the transportations is shown to have its own negative repercussions. When Moreau arrives for a dress rehearsal on the day they are to perform to the Red Cross visitors, he discovers Stella is missing, and is told she has been sent to the transports. Moreau rushes to the train platform and finds here there, but is told by a guard that she cannot return. He reasons that her name is on a list, and that the list is drawn up by the Jewish council in Terezín. Again, this council represent a group within the community who accept the patronage of a position of perceived influence in order to oppress their own people at the decree of the Nazis. In order to save Stella, Moreau is forced by the bureaucracy of the system to sacrifice another young boy to take her place. In his horror at realising what he has been party to, Moreau again threatens to boycott the show. However, after the maestro's demoralising summation of the situation outside the camp, in Paris and across Europe, Moreau decides the show must go on for the sake of his ensemble whose lives are spared to put it on.

The show, however, will take a new form. Moreau changes tack on his production of *Hansel and Gretel* in an attempt to show the Red Cross representatives the reality of the situation. This move makes some members of his ensemble uncomfortable. One musician asks: 'May I ask what it is we are playing?' and the maestro innocently replies: '*Hansel and Gretel*. Just a fairy tale'. The musician responds: 'Yes, but what version? One that is

likely to get us all shot!' Moreau responds: 'But we haven't said a word. Not a word.' (01:28.07). Here, the theme of the mime artist showing without saying is reflected in the theme of covert subversion. The fear is that the message will bring harm to them, while Moreau's anxiety is that the subtlety of the message will go unnoticed by the visiting Red Cross delegation. Again, this reflects the balance Kachyňa faced between pushing the boundaries and pushing the boundaries too far.

While there is the futility of sparing the children's lives only for as long as it takes to stage the show, Moreau's love interest in the camp, Vera, attests that she is willing to take the chance. She says: 'If we fail, at least we know we have tried' (01:33.45). The Jewish council, whose well-dressed appearance contrasts the other prisoners, implore Moreau to get the children to play along in happy roles; however, one of the councillors comes to Moreau's defence. He says: 'He is the artist. Why should we stand in his way of giving the Germans what they want?' (01:33.35). On the side, however, this councillor says to Moreau: 'You have chosen a different route, a more dangerous one. An unusual art, speaking through signs. Don't worry about the papers with the names, someone will find them after the war. They may find your name, too' (01:33.55). Here, Moreau is presented with the realisation that he, like the councillors and guards of the camp, has been blinded by his own patronage under this system. The delusion that their privileged position will prevent them from joining the tragic fate of the other inhabitants of Terezín is put under scrutiny by this warning. At this point, Moreau realises that he is in as perilous a situation as the rest of his ensemble, and his resolve to demonstrate this through his work is increased.

Moreau, sensing the precariousness of his situation, decides to push the boundaries too far with the play and lay bare the reality of the situation for the inhabitants of the camp. This moment reflects the period in Czechoslovak culture that followed the Warsaw Pact invasion in 1968 that Blazejovsky labels 'consolidation' (2004: 68). Faced with the reality

that the reformist movement of the 1960s had been suppressed and that the Prague Spring and New Wave were being brought to a close, two of the ten films banned by the authorities between 1969-1971 were made by Kachyňa: *Funny Old Man* and *The Ear* (Blažejovský, 2004: 68). With hindsight, however, Kachyňa was patently aware that these films, particularly in their suppression from public screenings, were unable to proffer their accounts of the contemporary situation in a meaningful way.

Thus, the Red Cross delegation arrive in the makeshift theatre to find the show already underway. The audience, made up almost entirely of the children from the camp, are laughing at Moreau's antics on stage. However, Moreau then appears in a witch's costume and screeches. The sonic effect of this is jarring with Moreau's stage persona to this point, which has been as a mime and without voice. The atmosphere in the theatre shifts immediately from relaxed to uncomfortable, and the children sit up startled. The backdrop on-stage depicting a colourful gingerbread house falls away and behind the façade are children in striped uniforms with stars of David emblazoned on them. Terrified, they reach out through the cage of the gingerbread house structure as the witch sets a fire in a furnace and drags the children into it. Again, the screams as the children enter the flames jar with the silent mime show and the audience, including the Wehrmacht generals and Red Cross delegates, look on horrified. The show's climax sees Moreau enter in mime costume to save the children and banish the witch to the flames. On stage, Moreau is able to bring his assertions about strength in numbers against the guards to life, but the reality is to be different.

When the Red Cross delegates ask to speak to Moreau after the performance, they are informed that he has already left the camp. The scene then cuts to Moreau at the train platform with a number around his neck, waiting for the transportations with the rest of his ensemble. However, he is given one last chance to perform before boarding the train, and decides to do the same act he performed for the generals in Paris. In resignation for their

shared fate, Moreau attempts to please the crowd by returning to his old, accepted routine. This time, however, the joke is turned on the Wehrmacht soldiers as the Jewish prisoners laugh at the preposterousness of Moreau's character's Nazi salute. This is one last salvo for the prisoners, but ultimately they are packed onto the trains and depart for the death camps. In providing this outcome, Kachyňa again offers an apology for the approach of artists working under oppressive conditions. The futility of Moreau's performance to demonstrate to the Red Cross delegation the reality of Terezín shows how even works that overtly criticise oppressive systems can go unheeded, especially when their exhibition is controlled by the oppressive forces. Kachyňa was aware of the power of using symbols in his work and of the dangers of open criticism. Furthermore, the fate of Moreau demonstrates the tragic outcome that can accompany the move from an artistry of gestures into public outbursts under a system of mass surveillance, and of the possible futility of the latter as forewarned by the maestro.

In the previous chapter I explored how, despite his appropriation to the anti-charter, Kachyňa continued to produce subversive material during the normalisation period in Czechoslovak culture. By appearing to toe the party line, and with a retreat to child narratives and historical settings, Kachyňa was able to continue to produce a humanist poetics from within a culture that refused the Charter 77 calls for a protection of human rights under the Helsinki Agreement. This theme of an art of gestures, where Kachyňa shows rather than tells, is reflected in his Holocaust films of the normalisation period, *Golden Eels*, *Death of a Beautiful Deer*, and *The Last Butterfly*. In this chapter I have explored how his depiction of a Holocaust narrative in 1979 with *Golden Eels* ended a decade-long break from Holocaust films in Czechoslovakia. I outlined how fears over the reality of Czech and Slovak participation in carrying out the abhorrent project as well as the potential for analogy between the Nazi occupation and the current regime's heavy-handedness meant that the area was disregarded in culture during the first decade of

normalisation. I have argued that Kachyňa, in releasing the first Holocaust film in a decade, breaks this taboo in Czechoslovak culture, continuing to push the boundaries as to what was deemed acceptable by the authorities.

Criticism of Kachyňa's normalisation works, however, does not reflect this position. While *Golden Eels* marked the first Holocaust narrative in Czechoslovak cinema in a decade and *Death of a Beautiful Deer* explored the lengths individuals will go to survive under extreme circumstances, Dora Viceníková and Markéta Dvořáková focus on Kachyňa's use of child narratives and an increasingly sexualised style respectively during the normalisation period. This oversight is reflected in the character of Moreau in Kachyňa's final film coming out of the normalisation period, *The Last Butterfly*. The film depicts a character, like Kachyňa, whose message falls on deaf ears. Despite trying to subvert his brief to produce a play at the Nazi interment camp at Terezín to appease Red Cross inspectors, Moreau's attempts to highlight the atrocities being carried out there in a covert manner go unheard. Moreau, like Kachyňa, attempts to appease the authorities by making it a play about children. He adopts the fairy-tale genre to further distance himself from suspicion, a strategy Kachyňa deployed during the normalisation period in *The Little Mermaid*. However, Moreau, a satirical mime artist, pushes the boundaries too far in this play when he depicts the children being cremated by the witch. While the message fails to land with Red Cross delegates, Moreau is still punished for his actions and is sent to the death camp along with the other prisoners. This reflects Kachyňa's awareness that by pushing the boundaries too far with the authorities, as he did towards the end of the New Wave period when *Holy Night* (1967), *Funny Old Man* (1969), and *The Ear* (1970) were all banned, he would fall into a complete *disarmament*. Throughout the normalisation period, Kachyňa upheld an art of gestures while continuing to push the boundaries in terms of what was acceptable without having his works censored. This is a feat which I believe deserves great credit and greater attention in scholarship.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis has been to provide a case study for Karel Kachyňa as an artist operating within the constraints of the totalitarian communist regime in Czechoslovakia over the majority of its four-decade existence. The research carried out set out to challenge the existing criticism of Kachyňa's works, particularly his films that appeared outside the Czechoslovak New Wave period where the focus of much of the criticism of his work lies. The work undertaken provides a comprehensive analysis of the work of a prolific filmmaker of the twentieth century, with an in-depth analysis of a significant body of his work. This approach has contributed to the field of film poetics in a novel way that generates potential for further investigation into a filmmaker whose work requires greater attention in scholarship. The approach to analysing Kachyňa's films also provides a template for further research in the field of Czech and Czechoslovak film, including works pertaining to the totalitarian communist regime and beyond. Furthermore, this approach can be adapted to other filmmakers and artists outside the Czechoslovak communist setting, such as in neighbouring communist-regime countries or further afield where the conditions of the film industry have a profound impact on the work of artists.

While this approach to Kachyňa's work has been necessary since so little scholarship exists on his work outside the New Wave context, the need to cover such a broad spectrum of films has limited the approach to certain areas of Kachyňa's oeuvre. Thus, while this thesis has been able to illuminate themes in Kachyňa's work such as his subversive approach to socialist realism (Introduction, Chapter One), child narratives (Chapter One, Chapter Four), contribution to the Czechoslovak New Wave (Chapter Two, Chapter Three), his works of the normalisation period (Chapter Five), and his Holocaust-themed works (Chapter Six), further research into these specific areas can now follow this thesis; there is also potential to adapt this approach to other contemporary filmmakers and beyond in various artistic contexts as outlined above.

The first film I discussed in my introduction was the first film Kachyňa released after the fall of communism in 1989, *The Last Butterfly* (*Poslední motýl*, 1990, prem. 1991). My intention has been to demonstrate how the film's inception during the regime and release after its demise is reflective of the recurrent theme of crossing borders in Kachyňa's work. I have outlined in this thesis how intuitive Kachyňa's feel for themes pertaining to the period was. His earliest works opposed the dogma of socialist realism in the early communist era. He managed to provide a humanist poetics in the post-Stalinist era, influencing and contributing to the New Wave movement. He was able to produce highly controversial works during the brief consolidation period after the 1968 invasion (without being penalised), before returning to children's narratives mirroring his earlier subversive works during the normalisation-period suppression. His focus on the individual during the Charter 77 movement championed the issue of human rights at the heart of the controversy, while his Holocaust-themed films up to the time of Perestroika demonstrated a willingness to hold up individual stories of oppression under totalitarianism.

As Stephen Heath outlines, the basis for a historical approach to poetics is in the demand to know where the image comes from (Heath, 1981: 1). By having Kachyňa as the central point of my thesis, I have been engaging in a study of auteurism, considering the institutional and social aspects to the filmmaking environment as shaping the work of the artist. By examining Kachyňa's work over various periods of the Czechoslovak communist regime, this approach has naturally involved a study of historical poetics, a study of patterns and change over time that seeks for causal explanations for effects within the artist's work (Bordwell, 2005: 142). My study of Kachyňa's films applies a focus on the historical, political and film-industry context surrounding their production and, as such, a cumulative study of his work throughout the regime demonstrates the overwhelming theme of overlap in his works. My analyses of space in Kachyňa's works are examples of analytical poetics, a study of the ways and means of films through their visual and aural

style (Bordwell, 2005: 142), which again increases the overlap inherent in the poetics approach to the study of film. Thus, by providing historical context at each stage of Kachyňa's career in this thesis before analysing his works in this context by engaging with concepts to do with space, I have developed a study of Kachyňa's poetics throughout his career under the communist regime.

The third aspect to poetics outlined by David Bordwell, of spectatorial theorising (Bordwell, 2005: 142), also takes on an increased significance in Kachyňa's career. The importance of the viewer is a key concern of Kachyňa's in the context of the highly censored environment of Czechoslovak film during the communist regime. The necessity to approach criticism of the socio-cultural environment through subversive means to avoid censorship makes Kachyňa's work a fertile ground for a study of his analytical poetics. Thus, I have included criticism both in the context of the release of his films and in recent secondary scholarly articles that have emerged long after the fall of the regime. Through interviews with Kachyňa conducted during the regime and shortly after its fall, I have provided an insight into how the artist had to negotiate the precariousness of the viewer's responses to his films: from film-industry administrators to professional colleagues to film critics and right up to the president of the country.

In providing a critical angle to his overtly socialist-realist work, Kachyňa helped to create a template for colleagues on how to approach problems they faced in the industry and in culture at large without seeing their work censored or indeed their ability to work removed. This is another area that could be explored in further detail, with other filmmakers also contributing to this approach – either in the Czechoslovak context or elsewhere. As the restructuring of the film industry following the deaths of Stalin and Gottwald in 1953 and a slow liberalisation of culture into the 1960s ensued, the Czechoslovak New Wave filmmakers would be able to emulate this tactic through other accepted genres, such as comedy (Forman in Pawlikowski, 1991). Kachyňa, in the early

1960s, would turn to children's narratives and politically accepted topics and settings to continue to challenge the insufficiencies he saw in the regime. This allowed him to get away with a more critical approach given that the authorities dismissed them as films for children. Ironically, this seems to be the predominant approach in criticism and scholarship (Liehm, 1976: 59-60; Košuličová in *Kinoeye*, 2003; Viceníková, 2003; Dvořáková, 2003; Blažejovský, 2004: 70; Hames, 2009: 79). Through the analysis in this thesis of *The Last Butterfly*, the aim has been to demonstrate that Kachyňa was aware that his works were going unnoticed in this respect. This raises the question of whether other filmmakers' works similarly have gone unnoticed in criticism and scholarship in this regard.

Kachyňa would continue to push the boundaries as the 1960s and the Czechoslovak New Wave progressed. Again he opted for the politically accepted narratives of World War II and the liberation of the republic by the Soviet Army (*Long Live the Republic* (*Ať žije republika!*, 1965), the Czech partisans' efforts against the Nazis during World War II (*Coach to Vienna* (*Kočár do Vídně*, 1966) and the collectivisation of agriculture (*Holy Night* (*Noc nevěsty*, 1967)). His works, however, were coming under greater scrutiny from the authorities at this time. This was in large part due to the unflattering light in which he depicted these subjects, touching with increased daring on those taboo subjects (Hames, 1977: 291). In this context, Kachyňa must be considered a proponent of the New Wave. Not only did the movement, chiefly propelled by emerging talents from the renowned FAMU film school in Prague, require inspiration from an older generation, but part of its essence was also in providing a cacophony of voices that included filmmakers from the previous decade (Viceníková in *Kinoeye*, 2003). Kachyňa had begun to say the unspeakable in his films through his dealings with the taboo: were the Red Army really the liberators of evil? Were the partisans free from guilt? Was the collectivisation of agriculture accepted and beneficial for the people?

Somewhat ironically, however, Kachyňa's most controversial New Wave film, *The Ear*, sits least comfortably in his canon. The film is peculiar in the New Wave context in that it falls after the generally accepted time frame of 1963-1968, when the Warsaw Pact nations led by Soviet forces invaded Czechoslovakia to suppress a perceived liberalisation of culture in the communist regime. While I have demonstrated how the restructuring not only of the film industry in the years 1968-1970 but of the entire political establishment saw films reach completion that went beyond the levels of criticism of the regime accepted even during the New Wave period (Blažejovský, 2004: 68), this film marks the zenith of subversion Kachyňa would attempt. With its focused, present criticism of the overbearing peer-to-peer surveillance within the establishment and its impact on the lives of Czechoslovak citizens regardless of their standing in society, *The Ear* was fiercely critical of the authorities and was banned immediately on its completion. This final factor, I have argued, ironically reduces the film to insignificance in the context of the New Wave period. While his previous works had grown in their levels of daring with regards to criticism, this film was unable impress its target audience. With hindsight, not least from the vantage point of the film's premiere in 1990, after the fall of communism in Czechoslovakia, Kachyňa's position in relation to the political authorities at the time is clearly negative. I have argued that this, despite some reservations from critics, has helped to integrate Kachyňa alongside his fellow New Wave filmmakers in posterity. The focus on Kachyňa in this thesis has limited the ability to explore other filmmakers who likewise continued to work after the Warsaw Pact invasion of 1968.

In order to scrutinise Kachyňa's work of the normalisation period, I first set out to challenge the approach to his films of these decades in criticism and scholarship which tends to be dismissive chiefly on account of his depiction of children's narratives and return to accepted narratives that placated the stringent censorship of this time. In my study of Kachyňa's poetics, I have identified how he consistently manipulated the role of the

child in his films to produce subversive material that could be overlooked by censorship. Indeed, in his contribution to the New Wave, the films that actually reached their audience were chiefly from this child's perspective. I have also outlined that, again, during this period Kachyňa's level of daring in his films increased, where he reintroduced accepted narratives such as World War II to offer analogous plots to the oppressive nature of the contemporaneous regime.

Ultimately, I have argued, Kachyňa's retention of the central theme of his poetics, that of the individual's plight in the face of extreme conditions, was refined in his works during this period through his depiction of the photographic artist and through his Holocaust films. Rather than an overt focus on the authorities' impact on individuals as seen in *The Ear,* which was banned immediately, Kachyňa manipulated accepted narratives, genres and themes to reflect this central focus of his most subversive work in a manner that would be accepted and thus made available to his target audience. In the case of the child's narrative, I have argued that the role of pedagogy is reflective of the stage of Kachyňa's career (IV), where he had been removed as a tutor at FAMU but was still in a position of influence over his contemporaries as an experienced filmmaker.

A criticism of Kachyňa that can still be made for his works during this time is that they did not go far enough in opposing the authorities' strictures. Indeed, his actions (or indeed relative inaction) during this time can also be called into question. In the pivotal period in culture during the normalisation period, when the Charter 77 movement emerged in the mid-to-late 1970s, Kachyňa submitted to having his signature included amongst a litany of anti-chartists in the state-controlled media publication *Rudé Právo* (1977: 3). While I have demonstrated that this was an arbitrary process (V: 168-169), Kachyňa could be seen as having shirked his responsibility to show solidarity with those who stood up to the regime at the time. I have argued, however, through a study of his film poetics, that Kachyňa's process was always to challenge the authorities from within the establishment

while the film industry remained an institution of the state. I have argued that, from the outset of his career, this approach helped to make possible some of the other challenges to the regime that occurred. Given that Kachyňa's name appears on an exhaustive list of individuals working in the film and television industries, there is great potential for further investigation into other figures appropriated to the so-called anti-charter.

Kachyňa himself appears to accept that his covert poetics did not go far enough, however. In his final film emanating from the communist era, *The Last Butterfly*, the role of the artist as mime, whose art is in gestures, goes unheeded by the target audience – the Red Cross delegation, who miss the chance to discover the atrocities surrounding them in the Nazi internment camp at Terezín despite Moreau's best efforts. The tragic outcome, too, has portents for why Kachyňa resisted the opportunity to oppose the authorities overtly during the normalisation period, and could be reflected in the works of other artists operating under these conditions. When Moreau's play crosses into an explicit criticism of the camp, with mime replaced by sound, the art of gestures disappears. Yet even without the subtly of delivery, the message is still missed.

Nevertheless, for Moreau, this action consigns his tragic fate. When considering how this move is reflective of *The Ear* in the context of Kachyňa's film poetics, the authorities' ability to control the narrative is ominously overpowering. With the theme of pedagogy prominent in Kachyňa's children's narratives, this demonstrates an evolvement borne of experience that Kachyňa has taught himself. Just as *The Ear* was suppressed, so too is Moreau's attempt to control the narrative towards the Red Cross at Terezín. The fate of Moreau, then, is a kind of martyrdom that Kachyňa was unwilling to follow in his career. Furthermore, had he been obstructed from making films again in Czechoslovakia after 1970, as many of his New Wave colleagues were, his ability to continue to provide resistance from within would have been removed.

What my study of Karel Kachyňa's film poetics throughout his career under the communist regime has demonstrated is that he was an artist who continued to push the boundaries of what was is acceptable while avoiding censorship. From his earliest socialist-realist works to his children's narratives of the early 1960s, to the 'black trilogy' that pushed the boundaries during the New Wave (Hames in *Kinoeye*, 2003), to his return to children's narratives during the normalisation period, to his Holocaust films, Kachyňa's focus on the individual is a constant in his works. With the exception of *The Ear* and his previous New Wave films, *Funny Old Man* (*Směšný pán*), 1969) and *Holy Night* (1967), Kachyňa was successful in pushing his humanist agenda in Czechoslovak culture throughout the regime, despite the authorities' opposition to the upholding of human rights during the extremism of the normalisation period. His Holocaust films depict the ultimate denial of the rights of the individual in modern society and, as analogy for the communist regime, demonstrate the suffocation of human rights under totalitarianism. Rather than dismiss his works as supportive of the regime, and rather than deem him a facilitator of totalitarianism, my argument is that it is time to see the art of gestures in his canon. Kachyňa's is a loaded body of work that allowed the individual to be seen within a culture that sought to reduce the individual's rights to nothing. My study of Kachyňa's poetics shows that the necessity to obscure the message causes the artist to miss the mark with his audience at times (the critical responses to Kachyňa's work for over half a century reflect this position). It has been my intention, however, to speak up for the artist and make the case for a body of work that deserves greater attention in scholarship.

FILMOGRAPHY

Chytilová, Věra

Apple Game (*Hra o jablko*, 1977), dir. by Věra Chytilová (Prague: Bontonfilm, 2015) [DVD].

Forman, Miloš

Talent Contest (*Konkurs*, 1963), dir. by Miloš Forman (London: Second Run, 2005) [DVD].

Black Peter (*Černý Petr*, 1963), dir. by Miloš Forman (Prague: Filmexport Home Video, 2005) [DVD].

Loves of a Blonde (*Lásky jedné plavovlásky*, 1965), dir. by Miloš Forman (London: Second Run DVD, 2011) [DVD].

Firemen's Ball (*Hoří, má panenko*, 1967), dir. by Miloš Forman (Prague: Centrum českého videa, 2005) [DVD].

Herz, Juraj

The Cremator (Spalovač mrtvol, 1968), dir. by Juraj Herz (Prague: Second Run, 2006) [DVD].

Jireš, Jaromil

Valerie and her Week of Wonders (Valerie a týden divů, 1970), dir. by Jaromil Jireš (Prague: Filmexport, 2008) [DVD].

Kachyňa, Karel

The Clouds Will Roll Away (*Není stále zamračeno*, 1950), dir. by Karel Kachyňa and Vojtěch Jasný.

It All Ends Tonight (*Dnes večer všechno skončí*, 1954, prem. 1955). dir. by Karel Kachyňa and Vojtěch Jasný.

Crooked Mirror (*Krivé zrcadlo*, 1957), dir. by Karel Kachyňa, in Alice Lovejoy, *Army Film and the Avant Garde: Cinema and Experiment in the Czechoslovak Military* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2015) [DVD insert].

Smugglers of Death (*Král Šumavy*, 1959), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Fetters (*Pouta*, 1961), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Suffering (*Trápení*, 1961, prem. 1962), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Hope (*Naděje*, 1964), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Long Live the Republic (*Ať žije republika!*, 1965), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Coach to Vienna (*Kočár do Vídně*, 1966), dir. by Karel Kachyňa (Prague: Bontonfilm, 2008) [DVD].

Holy Night (*Noc nevěsty*, 1967), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Funny Old Man (*Směšný pán*, 1969), dir. by Karel Kachyňa (Czechoslovakia, Ústřední půjčovna filmů: 1969) [DVD].

The Ear (*Ucho,* 1970, prem. 1990), dir. by Karel Kachyňa (UK: Second Run, 2005) [DVD].

I'm Jumping Over Puddles Again (*Už zase skáču přes kaluže*, 1970, prem. 1971), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Train to Heaven Station (*Vlak do stanice Nebe*, 1972), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

The Secret of the Great Narrator (*Tajemství velikého vypravěče,* 1972), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Love (*Láska*, 1973), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Hot Winter (*Horká zima*, 1973), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Pavlínka (1974), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Robinsonka (1974) dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Ugly Village (*Škaredá dědina*, 1975), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

The Little Mermaid (*Malá mořská víla*, 1976), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Death of a Fly (*Smrt mouchy,* 1976, prem. 1977), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Love Between the Raindrops (*Lásky mezi kapkami deště*, 1979, prem. 1980), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Golden Eels (*Zlatí uhoří*, 1979), dir. by Karel Kachyňa (Prague: Česká televize, 2010) [DVD].

Look Out! Nurses Rounds (*Pozor, vizita!*, 1981, prem. 1982), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Good Lighting (*Dobré světlo*, 1986), dir. by Karel Kachyňa (Prague: Bontonfilm, 2013) [DVD].

Death of a Beautiful Deer (*Smrt krásných srnců*, 1986, prem. 1987), dir. by Karel Kachyňa (Prague: Centrum Českého Videa, 2005) [DVD].

The Last Butterfly (*Poslední motýl,* 1990, prem. 1991), dir. by Karel Kachyňa (New Jersey: Shanachie, 2005) [DVD].

The Cow (*Kráva*, 1994), dir. by Karel Kachyňa (Česká televise, 2000) [DVD].

Fany (1995), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Hanele (1999), dir. by Karel Kachyňa.

Kadár, Ján and Elmar Klos

Three Wishes (*Tři přání*, 1959), dir. by Ján Kadár and Elmar Klos (Czech Republic: Filmexport, 1993), [DVD].

Shop on the High Street (*Obchod na korze,* 1965), dir. by Ján Kadár and Elmar Klos (Connoisseur Videos CR, 1993) [VHS].

Menzel, Jiří

Closely Observed Trains (*Ostře sledované vlaky*, 1966), dir. by Jiří Menzel (Prague: Arrow Films, 2004) [DVD].

Nichols, Mike

Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf? (1966), dir. by Mike Nichols (Warner Home Video, 2009) [DVD].

Pawlikowski, Pawel

'The Kids From FAMU' in *Tales From Czechoslovakia*, 1990, dir. by Pawel Pawlikowski (Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 1990) [DVD].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allan, Keith and Kate Burridge, *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Allan, Keith, *The Oxford Handbook of Taboo Words and Language* (Oxford: Oxford Universtiy Press, 2019)

Althusser, Louis, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. Ben Brewster. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971).

Ariès, Philippe, *Centuries of Childhood* (New York: Vintage, 1962).

Ballester, César, 'Subjectivism, Uncertainty and Individuality: Munk's Człowiek *na torze/Man on the Tracks* (1956) and its Influence On the Czechoslovak New Wave' (2011) in *Studies in Eastern European Cinema*, Volume 2, Issue 1, pp.61-73. [Online] Available at: https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/doi/pdf/10.1386/seec.2.1.61_1?needAccess=true.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, 'Chronotope in the Novel: Notes Towards a Historical Poetics' in Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* [electronic resource] (Austin: University of Texas Press, c.1981), p. 84-258.

Barthes, Roland, 'Death of the Author' (1967) in *Image, Music, Text* (London: Fontana, 1977).

Bates, Robin, 'The Ideological Foundations of the Czech New Wave' in *Journal of the University Film Association*, Vol. 29, No.3, STUDENT PAPERS (Summer 1977), pp. 37-42. [Online] Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/20687379?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents.

Bazin, André, 'The Ontology of the Photographic Image' (1960), translation by Hugh Gray, in *Film Quarterly* Vol. 13, No. 4 (Summer, 1960), pp. 4-9. [Online] Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1210183.

Bazin, André, *What Is Cinema?*, trans. By Hugh Gray (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1967).

Behrends, Jan, 'Exporting the Leader: The Stalin Cult in Poland and East Germany (1944/45–1956)', pp. 161–178 in Balázs Apor et.al. (eds.), *The leader Cult In Communist Dictatorships: Stalin and the Eastern Bloc* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

Benzaquen, Adriana S., 'On Childhood, Wildness, and Freedom' in *Childhood*, Christina Ritchie and Jacob Wan (eds.), Spec. Issue of *Public 21* (2001): 33-41.

Bettinson, Gary, *The Poetics of Chinese Cinema* (New York: Palgrave, 2016).

Blažejovský, Jaromír, 'Czech Cinema in the Normalization Period (1969-1989): A Time of the Servants' in Marta Sylvestrová (ed), *Český filmový plakát 20. století* (Brno/Prague: Moravská galerie/Ex libris, 2004) pp. 106-114.

Boardman, Frank, 'Film Ontology: Extension, Criteria and Candidates' (2019). In Noël Carroll, Laura T. Di Summa and Shawn Loht (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of the Philosophy of Film and Motion Pictures* (Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing; Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).

Bolton, Jonathan, *World of Dissent: Charter 77, The Plastic People of the Universe, and Czech Culture Under Communism* (MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

Bordwell, David, 'Transcultural Spaces: Towards a Poetics of Chinese Film' in Bordwell, *Chinese Language Film: Historiography, Poetics, Politics* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005), p. 141-182.

Bordwell, David, *Poetics of Cinema* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

Bordwell, David, 'Five Lessons From Stealth Politics' in Gary Bettinson & James Udden (eds.), *The Poetics of Chinese Cinema* (New York: Palgrave, 2016), p. 15-28.

Brenner, Christiane, *"Zwischen Ost und West": Tschechische politische Diskurse, 1945-1948* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009).

Breton, André, *Manifestoes of Surrealism* (University of Michigan Press, 1969).

Buchar, Robert, *Czech New Wave Filmmakers in Interviews* (NC, USA: MacFarland & Co, 2004).

Burgoyne, Robert, *Film Nation: Hollywood Looks at U.S History* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).

Burian, Emil František, Untitled, *Kulturní politika* [September 14, 1945].

Daniel, František, 'The Czech Difference' in David W. Paul (ed.), *Politics, Art and Commitment in the East European Cinema* (London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1983), pp. 49-56.

Derrida, J., *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

Eagleton, Terry, *Marxism and Literary Criticism* (London: Methuen, 1976).

Festinger, Leon, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1962).

Ferretter, Luke, *Louis Althusser* (London: Routledge, 2006).

Fisher, William, 'Production Report' in *Screen International* (London: Media Business Insight, 1990), Issue No. 741.

'For New Creative Deeds in the Name of Socialism and Peace', in Vilém Prečan (ed.), *Charta 77 1977-1989. Od morální k demokratické revoluci* [Charter 77 1977-1989. From a Moral to a Democratic Revolution] (Scheinfeld-Schwartzenberg: Čs. Středisko Nezávislé Literatury and Bratislava: ARCHA, 1990), pp. 35-38.

Foucault, Michel, *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984*, Volume II: *Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology* (ed. James D. Faubion), trans. Robert Hurley et.al. (London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 1998).

Foucault, Michel, 'Of Other Spaces', in N. Mirzoeff (ed.), *The Visual Culture Reader* (London: Routledge, 1988), pp. 229–236.

Girelli, Elisabetta, 'Subverting Space: Private, Public and Power in Three Czechoslovak Films from the 1960s and '70s' in *Studies in Eastern European Cinema*, Volume 2, No. 1, pp. 49- 59 (01 January, 2011). [Online] Available at: https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/10.1386/seec.2.1.49_1.

Grierson, John, 'The First Principles of Documentary', in Forsythe Hardy (ed.), *Grierson on Documentary* (London: Faber & Faber, 1966), p. 147.

Grodal, Torben, 'Docudrama and the Cognitive Evaluation of Realism' (2018). In Catalin Brylla and Mette Kramer (eds.), *Cognitive Theory and Documentary Film* (Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing; Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

Grotstein, James, 'Taboo: Its Origins and Its Current Echoes', in Lori C. Bohm, Rebecca C. Curtis, and Brent Willock (eds.), *Taboo or not Taboo? Forbidden Thoughts, Forbidden Acts in Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy* (London: Karnac Books Ltd, 2009).

Habermas, Jurgen, *The Philosophical Discours of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1985).

Halamíčková, Jana, on 'Of Cowards, Informers and Soul Engineers: The Novelist Josef Skvorecky' (radio show), in Maria Ohmer (dir.), Bettina Wenke (ed.), *Czech Storytellers* (Südwestrundfunk, SWR2: Broadcast Thursday, May 11, 2006, 8.30 a.m.).

Hames, Peter, *The Czechoslovak New Wave* (Berkeley/LA/London: University of California Press, 1985).

Hames, Peter, *Czech and Slovak Cinema: Theme and Tradition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009).

Hames, Peter, *The Czechoslovak New Wave* (London: Wallflower Press, 2005).

Hames, Peter, 'Alienated Heroes: Marxism and the Czechoslovak New Wave' (2014) in Mazierska, Ewa and Lars Kristensen (eds.), *Marx at the Movies: Revisiting History, Theory and Practice*, (September 2014). [Online] Available at: http://www.palgraveeconnect.com/ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/pc/doifinder/10.1057/9781137378 61 3.0001.

Hames, Peter, 'Ján Kadár', in *KINEMA* (Spring 2013 Issue). [Online] Available at: https://openjournals.uwaterloo.ca/index.php/kinema/article/view/1289/1667.

Hames, Peter, 'A sixties trilogy: Karel Kachyňa's *Ať žije republika!* (*Long Live the Republic!*, 1965), *Kočár do Vídně* (*Coach to Vienna*, 1966), and *Noc nevěsty* (*Night of the Bride* [*Holy Night*], 1967), in *Kinoeye: New Perspectives on European Film*, Vol. 3 Issue 9, September 15, 2003. [Online] Available at: www.kinoeye.org/03/09/hames09.php.

Havel, Václav, 'The Power of the Powerless' (1987), in J. Vladislav (ed.), *Living in Truth* (London: Faber & Faber, 36–122).

Heath, Stephen, *Questions of Cinema* (London/New York: Macmillan Press, 1981).

Hepburn, Allan, *Intrigue: Espionage and Culture* (Yale Scholarship Online, 2005).

Hovarth, Agnes, et al., *Breaking Boundaries: Varieties of Liminality* (New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2015).

Hubbard, Phil and Rob Kitchin (eds.), *Key Thinkers on Space and Place* (second edition) (London: SAGE, 2011).

Iuoras, Mihnea Remus, 'Land Reform and Collectivisation of Agriculture: Case Study Romania and Other Communist Countries', in *Studia Europaea*, Vol. 61, Issue 1 (Universitatea Babes-Bolyai, March 2016). [Online] Available at: https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A515795147/AONE?u=glasuni&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=21d7504c.

Knapík, Jiří, 'Czechoslovak Culture and Cinema, 1945-1960' in Karl & Skopal (eds.), *Cinema in Service of the State: Perspectives East German and Czech Film Culture, 1945-1960* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2015), pp. 39-68.

Kokeš, Radomír 'Poetika disonance: Král Šumavy', in *Rozbor filmu* (Brno: Masaryk University: 2015).

Košuličová, Ivana, 'After the Black Wave: Poetry and Tragedy in the post-1960s films of Karel Kachyňa' in *Kinoeye*, Volume 3, Issue 9, September 14, 2003. [Online] Available at: https://www.kinoeye.org/03/09/kosulicova09.php.

Kuhn, Annette and Guy Westwell, 'Auteur Theory', in Kuhn and Westwell (eds.), *A Dictionary of Film Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p.25-27.

Kusin, Vladimir V [Vladimír V Kusín], *From Dubček to Charter 77: A Study of 'Normalisation' in Czechoslovakia 1968-1978* (Edinburgh: Q Press Ltd, 1978).

Lebeau, Vicky, *Childhood and Cinema* (London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 2008).

Lichtenstein, Tatjana, "'It Is Not My Fault That You Are Jewish!": Jews, Czechs, and the Memory of the Holocaust in Film, 1949-2009' (2016), in *Dapim: Studies on the Holocaust*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp.117-141. [Online] available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/23256249.2016.1166591.

Liehm, Antonín Jaroslav, 'Interview with Karel Kachyňa' (1968) in *International Journal of Politics*, Volume 3, No.1/2, 'Closely Watched Films: Filmmaking and Politics in Czechoslovakia' (Spring-Summer, 1973), pp. 105-111. [Online] Available at: https://www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/stable/27868763?pq-origsite=summon&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents.

Liehm, Antonín J., *Closely Watched Films: The Czechoslovak Experience* (White Plains, N.Y: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1974).

Liehm, Antonín J., 'Triumph of the Untalented' (1976) in *Index on Censorship* (London: SAGE, Volume 5, Issue 3, September 1976).

Liehm, Mira and Antonín J. Liehm, *The Most Important Art: East European Film after 1945* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977).

Lovejoy, Alice, *Army Film and the Avant Garde: Cinema and Experiment in the Czechoslovak Military* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2015).

Lovell, Terry, *Pictures of Reality: Aesthetics, Politics, Pleasure* (London: British Film Institute, 1980).

Luncan, Camelia Diana, 'Children and Childhood in Movies' in *Confluenţe. Texts and Contexts Reloaded* (January, 2018). [Online] Available at: https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=752634.

Manon, Hugh S., 'X-Ray Visions: Radiography, Chiaroscuro, and the Fantasy of Unsuspicion in Film Noir' in *Film Criticism*, 32(2), 2-27 (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Library, Winter 2008). [Online] Retrieved from: http://ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/scholarly-journals/x-ray-visions-radiography-chiaroscuro-fantasy/docview/2060517/se-2?accountid=14540.

Marx, Karl, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (ed. D. Struik), translation by M. Miligan. (New York: International, 1964).

Marx, Karl, *The German Ideology*, in *Collected Works*, Volume V: *Marx and Engels 1845-47* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, and New York: International, 1976).

Mason, David, 'Glasnost, Perestroika and Eastern Europe' in *International Affairs*, Vol. 64, No.3, Summer 1988, pp. 431–448. [Online] Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/2622850.

Mazierska, Ewa and Lars Kristensen (eds.), *Marx at the Movies: Revisiting History, Theory and Practice*, (September 2014) in Bruce Williams, *Film-philosophy*, Volume 19 No. 1 (01 December, 2015).

Mervart, Jan, 'Czechoslovak Marxist Humanism and the Revolution' in *Studies in Eastern European Thought*, Vol. 69, March 1, 2017, pp. 111–126. [Online] Available at: https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/10.1007/s11212-017-9279-8.

Metzger, Scott Alan, 'Film Pedagogy: Pedagogy and the Historical Feature Film: Toward Historical Literacy' (2007) in *Film & History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 2, January 1 2007, pp. 67-75. [Online] Available at: https://muse.jhu.edu/article/223506.

Newman, Saul, *Unstable Universalities: Postmodernism and Radical Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

Nichols, Bill, *Introduction to Documentary* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017).

Oliver, Kelly, Benigno Trigo, *Noir Anxiety* (Minnesota: Minnesota University Press, 2015).

Olsen, Debbie C., Andrew Scahill (eds.), *Lost and Othered Children in Contemporary Cinema* (Lanham/Boulder/New York/Toronto/Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2012).

Owen, Jonathan L., *Avant-Garde to New Wave: Czechoslovak Cinema, Surrealism and the Sixties* (New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2011).

Paul, David (ed.), *Politics, Arts and Commitment in the East European Cinema* (London: Macmillan, 1983).

Plantinga, Carl, 'Characterization and Character Engagement in the Documentary' (2018). In Catalin Brylla and Mette Kramer (eds.), *Cognitive Theory and Documentary Film* (Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing; Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

Poster, Mark, *Existential Marxism in Postwar France: From Sartre to Althusser* (Princeton University Press, 1975).

Ryan, Marie-Laure, Kenneth Foote and Maoz Azaryahu (eds.), *Narrating Space/Spatializing Narrative: Where Narrative Theory and Geography Meet* (Ohio: The Ohio State University, 2016).

Sanders, Irwin T., *Collectivization of Agriculture in Eastern Europe* (University of Kentucky Press, 1958).

Schneider, Steven Jay, 'Who's Afraid of… Big Brother?' in *Kinoeye*, Volume 2, Issue 1, January 7, 2002. [Online] Available at: http://www.kinoeye.org/02/01/schneider01.php.

Sladovníková, Šárka, *The Holocaust in Czechoslovak and Czech Feature Films* (Stuttgart: Ibidem Verlag, 2018).

Sniegon, Tomas, *Vanished History: The Holocaust in Czech and Slovak Historical Culture* (New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2014).

Soja, Edward W., *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989).

Sorlin, Pierre, 'How to Look at an 'Historical' Film' (2001), in M. Landy (ed.), *The Historical Film: History and Memory in Media* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001), pp. 25-49.

Štefek, Martin, 'The Scope and Limits of Czechoslovak Perestroika: The case of Party's Programme' in *The Free Library* (University of Craiova, 2014). [Online] Available at: https://www.thefreelibrary.com/The+scope+and+limits+of+Czechoslovak+Perestroika%3a+the+case+of+party%27s...-a0386746545.

Steinby, Liisa, Tintii Tintii (eds.), *Bakhtin and his Others: (Inter)subjectivity, Chronotope, Dialogism* (London/New York: Anthem Press, 2013).

Stevens, Kyle, *Mike Nichols: Sex, Language, and the Reinvention of Psychological Realism* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).

Szczepanik, Petr, 'Veteran and Dilettantes' in Karl & Skopal (eds.), *Cinema in Service of the State: Perspectives East German and Czech Film Culture, 1945-1960* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2015), p. 71-88.

Szymański, Karol, 'Psychological Ballet in a Specific Configuration of Power: On the Polish Reception to "*Carriage to Vienna*" by Karel Kachyňa' ('*Psychologiczny balecik w konkretnym układzie sił. O polskiej recepcji „*Wozu do Wiednia*" Karela Kachyni*') in *Kwartalnik Filmowy* (Issue No. 101-102: 2018), pp. 275-299. [Online] available at: https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=706997.

Teikmanis, Andris, 'Towards Models of Socialist Realism' in *Baltic Journal of Art History*, Vol. 6, 2013. [Online] available at: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/25068467.pdf.

Viceníková, Dora, 'Generation 57 and Beyond: A Portrait of Karel Kachyňa' in *Kinoeye*, Volume 3, Issue 9, September 14, 2003. [Online] Available at: https://www.kinoeye.org/03/09/introduction09.php.

Volkov, Solomon, *Shostakovich and Stalin* (London: Little, Brown, 2004).

Warf, Barney and Santa Arias, *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (Abingdon, Oxon/New York, NY: Routledge, 2009).

Williams, James S., 'Space, Cinema, Being' in *Space and Being in Contemporary French Cinema* (Manchester: Manchester University Press: 2016), pp 1-40.

Willoughby, Ian, 'Vojtěch Jasný – Venerable Film Director and Font of Remarkable Stories', *Czech Radio*, June 7, 2008. [Online] Available at: https://english.radio.cz/vojtech-jasny-venerable-film-director-and-font-remarkable-stories-8594461.

Wojcik-Andrews, Ian, *Children's Films: History, Ideology and Pedagogy and Theory* (New York: Garland, 2000).

Žižek, Slavoj, *The Sublime Objects of Ideology* (London; New York: Verso, 2008, c1989).