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1 INTRODUCTION

The structure of the dissertation starts with a literature review exploring the necessary background concepts, followed by methodology, which introduces the Modscapes project research methods and describes how data was collected and processed. The research questions and discussion chapter introduces the information revealed by analysis and reflects upon other researches in the field. The summary is presented in both English and Estonian and followed by bibliography and appendixes.

This master’s thesis is a case study carried out according to principles and methods of the Modscapes project, to which it also contributes. The focus of this research is to capture, understand and bring to attention the heritage created by modernisation of rural landscape. ‘At first sight, there is a contradiction between ‘modernist’ and ‘rural’. Yet throughout the 20th century, many European States imagined, adopted and implemented large scale development and agricultural schemes to modernise the countryside: parliamentary as well as fascist regimes, socialist republics or colonial powers (Modscapes.eu 2018’).

In Estonia, Soviet rule was established in June 1940, when the Bolshevik movement rose to power and the country took the name Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic. This order only lasted for about a year, until the German occupation in 1941, followed by the re-establishment of Soviet rule in 1944. The Estonian Republic would regain its independence 47 years later, in 1991. Along this timeline, the case study, “Avangard” kolkhoz, operated from 1949 to 1992.

The three Baltic countries were assigned with similar collectivization plans and agendas. After World War 2, the area was subjected to a land reform nationalizing the land, but also granting peasants permanent rights for land use. Farms larger than 30ha were made smaller and small land owners were given more land to use. The aim for such a reform was to gain support on the local scale and to punish potential enemies of the Soviet regime. Later, the existing agricultural cooperatives were collectivised, while, at least initially, leaving the smaller private farms untouched. In 1947, the order to form collective farms was sent from Moscow. This was not met
with much success, as rumours of troubles with hunger and dysfunctional methods had already reached Estonia from older Soviet states and Russia, where collectivization was established earlier in time. Moreover, even though taxes had been placed on farmers, they were not harsh enough yet to make having an independent farm impossible. In 1949 the kulak-class liquidation plans went into action and mass deportations took place. The list of kulaks was compiled based on a person’s economic and social state before the establishment of Soviet power. After the second wave (March of 1949, the first wave was in June 1941) of deportation the collectivisation process completed with speed that was unseen in any other part of the Soviet Union (Taagepera 1980).

It is important to research this because the policies and schemes of agricultural development and collectivization used, still have an impact on the lives of individuals and communities. While it is part of history, its legacy is still tangible, although perishing as the people connected to the process die and the buildings and changes in land use are demolished and changed. ‘Europe’s countryside, and the people who live in it, are a highly valued and varied asset for the whole population of the continent: the largest part of rural Europe is covered by agricultural land and forests, which have a strong influence on the character of European landscapes (Council of Europe 2002).’ Although ‘landscape’ is not only defined through the spectrum of agriculture and ‘The discussion of ADCS\(^1\) as a form of ‘rural urbanism’ also enriches the current debate on sustainable urbanisation, while a better knowledge of MRL\(^2\) is likely to influence current European rural development, cultural landscape, and heritage policies (Modscapes.eu 2018).’

The methodology used in this thesis is derived from the Modscapes project, which it is a part of. Data for map analysis is from the freely accessible online Estonian Land Board server (Estonian Land Board public WMS). For memories and perceptions, three qualitative interviews were conducted. A collected book of memoirs (Sepp 2001) and interviews recorded with the chairman of the kolkhoz (Kaljo, Beek and Pohla 1984; Kaljo and Beek 1989) were additionally used.

\(^1\) Agricultural development and colonization schemes
\(^2\) Modernist rural landscape
Search objectives for the Modscapes project are acknowledging MRL as cultural heritage, considering MRL as transnational shared cultural heritage across Europe and beyond, and developing a reflective approach to ADCP and ADCS and MRL. The project provides citizens, decision-makers, practitioners, as well as present and future generations of actors in the field with tools to envisage the future development of MRL, develop sustainable and inclusive landscapes, offer an opportunity for public debating and discussing the past narratives and ADCS against present-day EU policies, make new contributions to different academic fields (nation-building theory; modern and contemporary history of Europe; modern architectural, planning and landscape history; theory, epistemology and research methods in the design-related disciplines) (Modscapes.eu 2018).

There have been case studies carried out, which study the modernisation of rural landscapes in several countries in Europe, northern America, northern Africa etc., yet not all of them are complete and need further research and a unified perspective on the topic. Many of those mentioned regions are part of the Modscapes project, altogether 17 countries: Italy, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Estonia and Latvia, British Palestine/Israel, Libya, Morocco, Greece, Ukraine. In every just listed country, there are several case study areas, one of which is also the “Avangard” kolkhoz, researched in this thesis.

This topic was, and is fascinating to me; first, because there is not a lot of research done in this field in Estonia, although it is evident the remnants of reforms that took place in Soviet times are dominant in our landscapes (Ojasoo 2014; Enina and Krastinš 2016). Second, having grown up among this heritage and has experienced the deep-seated public negativity towards the Soviet era, it was intriguing how the Modscapes project approaches this topic with a completely different viewpoint. It challenges the idea of collectivisation as a tangible historic heritage of Europe and a valuable learning opportunity for the future, whilst not denying the crimes committed in the Soviet period, especially in the beginning of the regime.

This thesis seeks to identify the changes in land use that were typical to the period. Exploration of the human factor of landscape is as important as the cartographic analysis, according to the ELC\(^3\). The two topics are initially explored separately and

\(^3\) European Landscape Convention
then joined to fully understand the changes in landscape. After the defence of the thesis I will continue to build upon this to further understand and contribute to the Modscapes cause.

The research questions are as follows:

1. What are the changes in settlement and land use that took place in „Avangard“ kolkhoz (1949-1992) in before (1930s), during (1980s) and after (2010s)?

   To understand how the results of implemented ADCP which translated to ADCS changed the landscape, historic maps of three times (before, during and after) are analysed and then compared, trends are defined and compared with results of other previous researches.

2. What changed in the lives of the people in those periods? Changes at joining, during and after the collapse.

   Memories and perceptions of the every day life were gathered through different interviewing techniques. Analysis reveals the connections people had with their surrounding environment, their opinions of the system and how they were affected by the changes in political and agricultural field.

3. How does the landscape portray the changes in the built and social-cultural environment during those periods?

   The combination of the results by map analysis and interviews are combined to reveal the spatial connections that form the landscape of the period.
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2 LITERATURE REVIEW

In the literature review, an overview of background topics that are important for understanding the relevance of modernising rural landscapes. First the meaning of ‘landscape’ is explained through history and its relevance to current research, this also from the perspective of landscape archaeology and the perception of landscape as a palimpsest. Further, the core idea of modernism in landscape is explored, the means of implementations explained. For a political-historic background, an overview of collectivization of Estonia and the case study are given.

2.1 Landscape

Landscape is traditionally studied by dividing it by land use categories and physical boundaries. Data is sourced from map registries, servers, archives; depending on the period at hand and presented in similar categorisation groups. (McHarg 1969; Mander and Palang 1994; Palang, Mander and Luud 1998). However, a decade later Palang (2010) has explored a new approach from the perspective of time, using the change of political power as a boundary between different landscapes. He explains how the political power shapes the face of the landscape as it sets up how a landscape should be perceived, understood and used. In his article, Antrop also speaks of landscapes created after WWII. Those new landscapes were not integrated as those that came before, rather superimposed the previous one(s), creating a visible break in continuity (Antrop 2005: 25). In the post-Socialist period, the perception and understanding of landscape, in Europe, is best explained through the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe 2000) and the Dobris Assessment (European Environmental Agency 1995). The congress of local and regional authorities of Europe considers, that Europe’s countryside, and the people who live in it, are a highly valued and varied asset for the whole population of the continent: the largest part of rural Europe is covered by agricultural land and forests, which
have a strong influence on the character of European landscapes (European Environmental Agency 1995). ELC states that "Landscape" means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors. It covers natural, rural, urban and peri-urban areas, including land, inland water and marine areas, while not leaving out landscapes that might be considered outstanding as well as everyday or degraded landscapes (Council of Europe 2000).

History can be read from landscape, and it was in 1995 that international interest was turned towards identifying traditional landscapes, their cultural heritage and sustainability with The Dobris Assessment. ‘The richness and diversity of rural landscapes in Europe is a distinctive feature of the continent. There is probably nowhere else where the signs of human interaction with nature in are so varied, contrasting and localised (European Environmental Agency 1995).’ Determining and preserving traditional landscape values has also become a topic of interest for researchers (Kristensen 1999; Meeks and Vos 1999; Moss 2000; Holdaway and Smart 2001; Nohl 2001; Palang et al. 2005)

2.1.1 Landscape archaeology and Palimpsests

LAR, although traditionally a field leaning towards geography and history, has become significantly more perception-based in its approach in the last 50 years, which is considered young in world of research disciplines. Through researching, mapping and analysing the landscape, LAR\(^4\) builds a great base for monitoring the effects of interaction of human and nature. Parts of the theoretical background used in LAR are also used in conducting analysis for LAH\(^5\) and this thesis. The idea of landscape as palimpsests, that will be further explained here, is essential to a modern approach to landscape. Older schools see landscape more as a material thing providing valuable, but sparsely located items from excavations. Connections

\(^4\) Landscape Archaeology
\(^5\) Landscape Architecture
between the origin and result is not clearly linear and many – even contradicting – events can lead to the same conclusion (Johnson 2007: 72). In the core of newer schools of LAR, especially those originating from France and Germany, is the understanding of landscape as a *palimpsest*. That happens through some of the features being removed from the landscape through change and being replaced by new ones while existing together and separately at once. This enables the researcher to treat time as a space on its own, not just a linear guide for placing findings. The connections and combinations create complex layered and multi-temporal entities that disrupt conventional views of temporal sequence (Bailey 2007: 203).

European Landscape Convention has had great influence on LAR. The view of landscapes as a *thing* has shifted to perception-based understanding. More precisely, the definition of landscapes being the production of action and interaction between humans and nature as perceived by people (Council of Europe 2000) is what drives LAR to find connections between perceptions in different periods of time. Archaeology of present landscapes focuses on researching how layers of change are presented in the current landscape. The idea of *palimpsest* is the most dominant here. Yoffee (2007) has written that one must look towards how space really consists of stories about events, personalities, identities and their overlapping dynamics, contributing to the idea of landscape as a version of *palimpsest*.

2.2 Modernism in landscape

Rural landscape has not been in the focus of attention for many disciplines. Design-based disciplines have started to develop in that direction only recently (Duany 2011). Also the known Modern Movement’s masters, such as Le Corbusier, Gaston Bardet, Ludwig Hilbersheimer (Hays 1995) and Frank Lloyd Wright (Wright 1958), although briefly brushing upon the topic, did not get involved with the agrarian landscape. Similarly, there have been case studies carried out in the direction of Modscapes in several countries in Europe, northern America, northern Africa etc.,

---

6 Palimpsest is a manuscript or piece of writing material on which later writing has been superimposed on effaced earlier writing.
not all of them are complete, needing further research and a unified perspective on the topic. Many of those mentioned regions are part of the Modscapes project as 17 case studies: Italy, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Estonia and Latvia, British Palestine/Israel, Libya, Morocco, Greece, Ukraine.

In the case of collectivisation of rural landscapes in the Soviet Union on 1940-1991, the central concepts to implementing modernisation were ADCP and ADCS. ADCP stands for agricultural development and colonization policies, embodying agrarian ideologies, social and political utopias. They spoke of large scale and substantial land reforms to modernize the agricultural sector to foster economic growth by supplying national markets. To enforce those policies, ADCS - agricultural development and colonization schemes were used. These schemes are what are more known to us, as they produced the results that changed the lives of people and the shape of land. Not all ADCS were carried out, but some that were include deportation of groups that were seen as problematic, construction of national identities and cultures, establishing norms, institutions and scientific agendas. The ADCP were often a testing ground to find new and improved agricultural, scientific and environmental approaches. These approaches were not always successful, and people of the system were subjected to a lot of trial and error (Lipton 2009).

2.3 Collectivisation in Estonia

The Bolsheviks established Soviet power in Estonia in June 1940. This was followed, a year later, by a German occupation that lasted for 3 years. This brought changes for rural societies by changing the traditions, implementing a new agricultural system and using mass deportations to force collectivisation upon the peasants. Estonian Republic regained its independence in 1991.

The three Baltic countries were assigned with similar collectivization plans and agendas. Yet, after the war, the plans for full collectivisation were not immediately pushed into action. This was due to small households and farms being able to restart producing sooner than large farms would and their products were necessary for the Red Army. Additionally, illustrative experience existed regarding the time it would
take for a newly established collective farm\(^7\) to become profitable. After the WW2, the area was subjected to a land reform nationalizing the land, but also granting permanent rights for land use. Farms larger than 30ha were made smaller and small land owners were given more land to use. The aim for such a reform was to gain support on the local scale and to punish potential enemies of the Soviet regime (Feest 2014).

Rumours of troubles with hunger and dysfunctional methods had already reached Estonia from older Soviet states and Russia, where collectivization was established earlier in time. More than that, in 1946 refugees from other republics, where drought and hunger had struck, flocked here to buy potatoes and grain. This did not exactly encourage the Baltic peasants to collectivise. Even though taxes had been placed on farmers, they were not harsh enough to make having an independent farm impossible. The dislike towards the system, that was deepened by the meeting with refugees, discouraged the local party workers from pushing forward (Feest 2014).

There were several other problems as well that the Soviet regime had to face in the Baltic Republics. This region served as an example of the complex dynamics between politics, economics, and ideology in the Soviet system (Feest 2014). There were also social bonds and traditions between the locals that were difficult to follow and work against. The commonly used methods to secure power did not work efficiently here, people could not be worked up against each other based on class differences, as they had not had time to fully set in the culture. Not many believed in the longevity of the Soviet power (Feest 2014).

In 1947 started the collectivisation of existing agricultural cooperatives. Of those, a network was formed that the regime started to centralize and change. Private farms were initially left out of this. Yet the order to form collective farms was sent from Moscow. However in the Baltic republics, compared to the situation of 1920s and 1930s of the Soviet Russia and the older Soviet states, the terms like the “Lenin cooperative plan,” the “class struggle in the countryside” or the “voluntary path to

---

\(^7\) A common term for the cooperatives created with collectivization. This is used to address both kolkhozes and sovhozes in language and literature, while both have differences. Kolkhoz - coming from a word in Russian ‘колхоз’ and means a collective farm. Sovhoz - coming from a word in Russian ‘совхоз’ (abbreviated from: советское хозяйство) meaning a state farm.
"collectivization" did not describe how collectivization had eventually been accomplished in the old Soviet republics (Feest 2014).

In 1949 the *kulak*

\(^8\)class liquidation plans went into action and mass deportations took place. The list of *kulaks* was compiled based on a person's economic and social state before the establishment of Soviet power. Sometimes the person did not have

\(^8\)Kulak was originally a word for an independent farmer, but during Soviet time acquired the nuance of being richer and having larger farms than other peasants around.
to have clear connections to previously mentioned assets. The quota set by higher powers needed to be met. Since the notion of systemic errors was a taboo, enemy activity was the only acceptable explanation for collectivization’s shortcomings (Feest 2014).

When on the list, the whole family was deported. After the second wave (March of 1949, the first wave was in June 1941) of deportation the collectivisation process completed with speed that was unseen in any other part of the Soviet Union. Within less than two months, 69% of the farms had been collectivised (Taagepera 1980) (Figure 1).

Only one year later, the recently formed kolkhozes were amalgamated. This was due to a general decision influenced by units in other Soviet Republics portraying traces of some privatisation and was completely nationalized by 1947 (Taagepera and Misiunas 1993). The restrictions placed upon the people were so harsh that they struggled to even get food and survive, but this seemed to turn towards better since 1947. Along with some goods becoming available in the stores, also some sense of communality started to arise on both Baltic level and regional level (Taagepera and Misiunas 1993).

In 1955, Khrushchev declared that his ideas of agriculture had been implemented wrongly and ordered to subdivide larger kolkhozes. The breakthrough of 1958 brought a change in the way machinery was handled. This used to be based on machine parks, a central cooperation to provide devices for nearby collective farms. Since this year those could be bought by the kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

The 1950s and 1960s were good for culture, however. The number of productions rose quickly in both quality and quantity. More artistic freedom and individualism was allowed. Although the heads of the Union started to see the results of this as something that should be cut back, more and more elements of national unity of Estonians started to emerge. By 1968 the industrialization was in full force. The lessening of state interference translated into improvement in agriculture. A pension system was introduced in 1965. High taxes and compulsory deliveries by private farm owners were eradicated in 1959 (Taagepera and Misiunas, 1993). Private land had been the core aspect of survival through the entire Soviet period, enabling to grown one’s own potatoes and a few animals. After 1965 the improvements in
agriculture started to show and the collective farms were able to pay their workers significantly more than previously, equalizing with the average urban incomes and only 7 years later exceeding it. In 1967, farm industry was declared legal once again and the kolkhozes and sovkhozes started to process their own produce, previously illegal (Taagepera and Misiunas 1993).

The nation’s ideas of their independence and loyalty started to change. By the end of 1970s, demonstrations and strikes demanding freedom were happening by both students and workers alike. The 1980s brought stagnation followed by the national renaissance in 1990s. Open oppositions were quite common where people voiced their dislike towards the regime and its decisions. The gathering of power to strive for autonomy started in 1987 and engaged in 1988. National symbolism reappeared, local leaders were changed, and the indigenous language of each country was restored as official state language. Public speeches and publications on this topic were a commonplace. In 1990, the restoration of independence was declared at last (Taagepera and Misiunas 1993).

2.3.1 “Avangard” kolkhoz

There is not a lot of literature about this collective farm, mostly small articles in the local newspaper Tartu Valla Kuukiri, a few in the Tartu Postimees, interviews by Eesti Raadio, however these are very topic-specific and do not provide a comprehensive overview. There is just one book that gathers manuscripts and memoirs about Tartu municipality. While it is not academic or scientific, it is an important collection of human perception of history and landscape, therefore central to this research. The following overview of the kolkhoz is based on the book Tartu vald. Ma tahaksin kodus olla., compiled by Heino Sepp (2001).

In 16th of February 1949, before the March deportation, in the rooms of Äksi church (see Appendix 1, photo 1) the founding meeting of “Avangard” kolkhoz was held. 42 farms joined the collective farm with 49 horses, 48 cows, 3 bulls, 24 heifers, 4 sheep and 3 pigs, from Põltsamaa (now Äksi), Puhtaleiva, Äksi and Kukulinna villages. Concurrently Kukulinna, Vanakubja and Saluküla villages formed the “Komsomol” kolkhoz with 57 horses, 39 cows, 1 bull, 25 heifers, 24 sheep, 52
chicken and 2 hives. Nearly two years later, in December of 1950, these two collective farms joined.

The first few years were difficult due to the recent war, deportation, and general fear regarding survival. The people of the kolkhoz thought that the reasons for difficulties was the fewness of workers, low pay, lack of belief in a brighter future, heavy taxes, absence of machinery and unskilled leadership. The turning point was the general meeting on 10th of March 1953, when Edgar Beek was selected to be the chairman. At that time, there were 107 horses and 1 car, cattle was kept in farm barns. E. Beek involved himself with every aspect of the kolkhoz, gaining the trust of the workers. In 3 years the amount of milk produced tripled. It was decided to start focusing on culture and given a suggestion by the government to start creating a kolkhoz centre. Work day minimum was established, first harvesters were obtained and the building of the kolkhoz centre settlement (see Appendix 1, photo 7, 17 and 18) begun with assigning the first plot in Põltsamaa küla (now known as Äksi) to L. Aruoja (see Appendix 1, photo 28). 1957 passed with the same energy of modernising the collective farm with the addition of new animals of better breed, more machinery and the beginning of culture house construction (see Appendix 1, photo 13 and 14). By 1959, using horses as a work force had switched to machinery and the number of cows had grown from 99 to 243. In 1960 the henhouse (see Appendix 1, photo 21) was built along with modern culture house-office building and a piggery (see Appendix 1, photo 19), lot of new specialists were brought in due to the rise in production.

In 1963 a decision was received at to increase work efficiency, which was implemented through the reduction of private farming. For instance, instead of 2 bovines, the worker was permitted to own only one. Also increased were the norms regarding work day length. To counterweight this, vacation pay was given to all who filled the minimum requirements, pensions, free trips to sanatoriums and vacation homes were implemented.

1964 brought a lot of construction. The kolkhoz provided free transport for construction materials if one was building in the centre. Soon after, additional facilities were built, including the 6 henhouses (see Appendix 1, photo 21), which made up one third of the collective farm’s income and also became its.In 1968 the
kolkhoz opened a cake factory (see Appendix 1, photo 11) and in 1970 a store-canteen (see Appendix 1, photo 15). A year later “Rahu” kolkhoz was joined with “Avangard”, and “Tulevik” kolkhoz in 1973. These mergers were done according to higher orders and were not very liked by locals, as the amount of people (681 workers) and land (7561ha) to oversee was too much. Yet, “Avangard” continued to work successfully and was one of the best in the region both economically and by cultural assets. In 1988 the new sports centre (see Appendix 1, photo 7) near the lake Saadjärv was opened with a grand celebration. This was the last big building object for the collective farm, which’s most successful time was the 1980s.

The long-time chairman E. Beek retired in 1988 and R. Jurs was appointed for the position. This was also the time when hardships started to have their effect. Animal feed was getting too expensive, weather wasn’t kind, buildings and technology needed upgrading. In 1989, the plan of self-sufficient Estonia was introduced and lands and farms could be reprivatized. Meetings where questions of discipline and infringement were discussed were frequent. Due to the difficulties of acquiring feed for animals and birds production efficiency dropped and some died.

On 17th of April 1990, an inventory committee was formed to account for all the property of the kolkhoz. At the time, applications for reclaiming the land kept coming in. Everything was prepared for the ending and fair division of the collective farm. The independence of the Republic of Estonia brought great changes. The sudden increase in prices and limits in production and the weight of new taxes didn’t enable for the kolkhoz to provide food and work for its people. In 1991 it was decided to form departments that would operate independently, yet it was clear that due to the largeness of those, they would not live long. In 1992, 3rd of July, the kolkhoz was eliminated. Some of the animals were refunded to families based on the contribution at joining. The rest of the property was divided as whole assets and given away or rented to former members who applied for them.
3 METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION

3.1 Overview of Modscapes methodology

Modscapes provides a method for carrying out research about modernisation of rural landscapes. In each region that has joined the programme, the policies and schemes have been implemented in a different way dependant on political power and culture that changed the landscape. Thus, each case study differs from one another and the final result is not a collection of copies. Since every area is different, they complement each other with different focus points. There are 5 work packages (WP) developed that lead the research of each individual project, and are phrased as follows (Modscapes.eu 2018):

What was debated and planned? >> WP1: Documenting adcp/adcs
What was realized and what remains? >> WP2: Physical legacies of adcp/adcs
What were adcp/adcs/mrl’s broader impacts? >> WP3: Sociocultural impacts of adcp/adcs
How do people see adcp/adcs/mrl today? >> WP4: Memories and reception of adcp/adcs/mrl
What do we do about it? >> WP5: Change and challenges in mrl

This thesis is focuses on WP2: Physical legacies of ADCP/ADCS. The research methods have been developed for this WP, however they are unpublished. The following will be an overview of that document.

3.1.1 Methodological development

To capture the tangible results of ADCS, extensive survey of landscapes and settlement is carried out through fieldwork and comparative analysis of period and current maps. The collection, documenting and inventorying of cartographic data,
photographs, the state of conservation of built, urban and landscape heritage elements during fieldwork (Figure 2).

The timescales that are looked across are from the 1930s through 1980s to see the political systems changed and fixated, to see modernism and modernisation processes as a part of the 20th century history. The second timescale is from the 1980s to 2000s to see the changes that the collapse of the collective farming and the restructuring of the entire economic and agriculture field brought, and understand what remains of the ACDS.

The result is to be able to relate physical patterns and processes to memories and immaterial culture. With this, it is possible to look at trends and possible policies for retaining, conserving, protecting samples of physical remains (Kuhlmann, Bell and Veldi, 2017).
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**Figure 2. Methodological development.**

3.1.2 Theoretical approach

The research methods developed for Modscapes (Kuhlmann, Bell and Veldi, 2017) suggest the use of two complementary approaches.

The first one works within the context of ELC, which sees the landscape comprising of three interacting aspects (Figure 3.):

- **Image** - the perception of the landscape and its sensory impact
- **Action** - the human actions which created the landscape of the case study area
- **Structure** - the area and its layout patterns
Structure is assessed with historical maps, recent maps and GIS research. These are analysed by graphical representations of comparing the planned or built landscape and building structures with remains today.

Image is surveyed with photographs, video outtakes or sound samples to be perceived first-hand. With the continuation of site visits these samples get additional recorded comments for further adaption.

Action that has formed and still forms the case study area is identified and assessed by different kinds of qualitative interviews with representative stakeholders.

These are then looked at as linked, redundant to allow for a complete picture of the landscape to form. The characters of each individual project are difference, hence the focus on these three assets varies slightly. With “Avangard”, the most attention is on structure and image, and less on the action. For structure, historical map analysis is carried out where the built landscape and structures are revealed and compared with what remains of them today. For image, memories and perceptions are collected through qualitative interviews. For action, the approach is not so direct as described above. Instead of interviews with stakeholders, the results of ADCS and ADCP embedded in the maps are drawn out.
3.1.3 The interviews

To understand the image and perception part of the landscape, interviews were carried out. It is important for Modscapes to also collect information about the perception of the landscape and the best way to experience it is to move through it. For this, Modscapes Work Package2 provides several steps to recover people’s attachment to a place. There are 8 steps in total, each communicating with the area in a different way, three of which include conversing with the locals. The two chosen steps used for this thesis were chosen due to their intensity and richness in the diversity of information they enable to gather.

While the map analysis focuses on the entire area of the former kolkhoz, the interviews grasp a much smaller scale. This is due to the people chosen for this process, whose living and working arrangements were in close proximity to the heart of the collective farm. Due to the nature of everyday life, long working days and little free time to fill with activities of one’s choosing, people didn’t travel around too much and the connection even with other sections of the kolkhoz was rather shallow. However, this gives three different translations of the same time period and area, resulting in a more varied perception.

The interviews were carried out using two steps used in Modscapes project called the “Talk-About” step and the “Go-Along” step.

The “Talk-About” step
In the Talk-About interview step the interviewer sits or stands with one or more interviewees around a map to collect information about the case study area in general and more specific places of interest identified by the interviewees. This step seeks to formulate an understanding of the spatial character of the area as part of people’s lives. The entire interview is recorded using a camera set up in a way which allows to record both the participants and the map. The combination of talking and pointing to places on the map builds up spatial connections (Kuhlmann, Bell and Veldi 2017).
The "Go-Along" step
At the Go-Along interview the interviewer moves together with one or more interviewees to collect information simultaneously about the case study area and its actors, and explores the relationships between both now and in the past. The “go-along” is a qualitative method, first used by Evans and Jones to study health problems in 2011. They found that the data gathered during walking interviews was more location specific and spoke of the local connections to place (Evans and Jones 2011).

During the interview the interviewer asks questions about the area and how the interviewee is related to it, recording their explanations and comments throughout the whole interview (Kuhlmann, Bell and Veldi 2017). The interviewees are preferably former settlers or workers in the area and moving through space builds a continuous spatial connection to the area. The route triggers responses and memories of the places seen. The connection that the interviewees have with it encourages them to talk about it. The entire duration of the process is filmed with a handheld camera together with a microphone to ensure the best quality of recording. During the interview, the camera can be pointed at the objects of interest or to pan and record the entire surrounding scenery. To move about the area, both walking and driving a car can be used.

3.1.4 Historical GIS

The methodology of mapping can be characterised as historical GIS. Historical GIS combines various historical spatial data (mostly derived from archival maps) with contemporary landscape situation and enables to analyse long term landscape change (Kuhlmann, Bell and Veldi 2017). Historical GIS is not about space on its own, but about interrelations between people set in space and time, which create places in the landscape (Kemp 2009).

Geographic Information System (GIS) is a set of methods and practices to analyse spatial information. It uses specialised hardware and software (e.g. ArcGIS, Qgis, MapInfo etc.) to layer spatial information (e.g. historic maps, orthophotography) in
both raster and vector format. Using those interactive layers, the information can be analysed according to research needs. GIS is useful to many disciplines due to its flexibility, such as geography, archaeology, history, geology and spatial planning. Geographical location is the connecting factor associating otherwise seemingly accidental incidents. Historical GIS is able to layer these features and highlight the relationships within spatial categories (Gordon 2011). For this thesis the program used for analysis of historic maps was ArcGIS.

The origin of GIS is heavily connected to the landscape architect Ian McHarg. In his book Design with Nature (1969) he introduces and bring an example of his new method “overlay”. The scenario he chooses to work with is planning an interstate highway with the most optimal route considering its impact on the landscape it would pass through. He divided the area into zones of three based on their value. Some of the factors he worked with include: foundation, susceptibility to erosion, historic and wildlife values. After drawing all of the zones on transparent paper, each topic on a separate paper, he overlapped them on a light table to find the best possible route with the least impact. This approach was what would later evolve into GIS software. The use of software was what made this method (Knowles 2002; Antrop and Sevenant 2007).

Maps of the case study area from before, during and after the collectivisation period should be obtained from relevant sources. These may be in different scales and projections, but this can be equalized when vectorising old raster maps (Kuhlmann, Bell and Veldi 2017). To begin the work of digitalizing a map, first georeferencing is necessary. Sometimes manipulation with the shape of the map is needed due to the inaccuracy of historic cartography. Then the work with vectorising the map can begin, where each line and polygon become geo-referenced and are given attributes to describe them. As a result, a database is created that can be used for analysis later.

3.2 Sources for historical GIS

The case study of “Avangard” kolkhoz focuses on analysing the land cover succession, understanding the changes by comparing maps from three periods of
time: before the establishment of collective farms and soviet power, in the midst of soviet power in Estonia, where most of the changes collectivisation had brought on had been enforced and the present, current state of the land where what is left of the changes in land use can be seen.

A map was chosen from each period that was the most relevant in resolution and the type of represented information.

Map nr.1 (Figure 4.) is from the year 1937 and is a Topographic map of the Estonian Republic. The map was compiled within the years 1935–1939 and it is in the scale of 1: 50 000. In 1919 a land reform was set into action and by the time this map was created, those actions had already taken place and can be seen. It illustrates how the manor centred landscape was turned into private farms between the two world wars. Since this is a raster map, it was digitalised by hand.

Figure 4. Topographic map of Estonian Republic from 1937 (Estonian Land Board public WMS).
Map nr. 2, (Figure 5) drawn in 1975, is the land usage plan of “Avangard” kolkhoz in Tartu district. The map is based on data collected in the years 1970-1971 and is in the scale of 1:10000. It shows the effects of modernisation of rural landscape, the excessive fields and extensive networks of drainage ditches. However, it must be kept in mind that the maps in the soviet era were often drawn slightly wrong deliberately to hide sensitive information. They were very difficult to access during the time but became easily obtainable after the collapse of the Soviet Union. This map, as well, is a raster map and was digitalised by hand.

Figure 5. land usage plan of “Avangard” kolkhoz of Tartu district from 1975 (Archive of the National Heritage Board, 1975).
Map nr. 3 (Figure 6) is Estonian Basic map and the digital version (Estonian Land Board public WMS) used in this thesis is in the scale of 1:10 000. When looking at accuracy then this is the most accurate map of these three. It can be easily used for comparing land use changes with, for example, the previous soviet map. The Estonian Basic map is both on paper and digital, all of the layers are vectorised and interactive. It can easily be worked with using a GIS software without prior vectorisation.

Digitalization of the maps was necessary on two out of three maps, specifically from 1937 and 1975. Both of those maps were available in very high quality, however there possibility of complete accuracy can be an issue due to several factors ranging from generalisation to the work habits of the map compilers (Palang, Mander and Luud, 1998). On each of those maps (Figure 7), the categorisation of land use was slightly different, but those could be generalised under common denominators, such as: fields, grasslands, bushes and brushwood, forests, marshy areas, settlements. Additionally, roads, rivers and drainage canals were digitalised as polylines.
Figure 7. Digitalised land use maps of periods 1937, 1975 and 2017. For full size maps see Appendix 5 Figures a, b and c).
3.3 The interviews

3.3.1 Finding interviewees

Although Estonians are often described as cold and introverted, it doesn’t usually take more than a few questions to get them to speak about the Soviet period. Occasionally this topic is overshadowed with negative connotations due to the well-known faults and crimes of the system, so carefulness must be applied when addressing the earlier days of the era.

During background research while preparing for the interviews, it was brought to attention how big of a role culture played in the kolkhoz, having close ties and regular events even with theatre Vanemuine. Keeping that in mind, it came to attention that the former culture house director is currently the director of the local library. That is where the first connection was made (Figure 8).
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Figure 8. Finding the interviewees.

The first visit to the project area was for making initial contact and gaining a first impression of the current landscape. In later steps, the locations visited during the short, around 20min drive. After that, the first contact person could be found from the library. She quickly warmed up to the idea of the interview and found the project
very fascinating. In the end of the conversation she gave suggestion for who else would be suitable for interviewing. Both she and the recommended person were members of the kolkhoz. She worked as a director of the culture house and he had been a farm engineer, construction specialist and metal-worker. The third person was found through an acquaintance and although she doubted in the value of her memories, as shyly as any true Estonian, she wanted to give all her help to this project. She had moved to “Avangard” from very far away, Valga, seeking work after graduation and she was an accountant and a dispatcher during her time.

A common factor joining the people interviewed in this case study is they all came to the kolkhoz as young adults looking to build a future for themselves. The most active and fascinating period of their life also overlapped with the most successful period of the kolkhoz. This synchronisation and mutual effects between the two sides is the core of this paper.

3.3.2 Preparing the questions

The questions and topics were chosen based on the guidelines and methods developed for the Modscapes project. To begin with, the character of the kolkhoz was defined using published newspaper articles (Kohler 2002; Handson 2011), radio interviews (Kaljo, Beek and Pohla 1984; Kaljo and Beek 1989) and a book with collected memoirs (Sepp 2001). A few keywords that stood out from the search would be: culture, cooperation, success, henhouse, cake factory, community. It was difficult to pass any source about the area without a mention to the high quality of culture activities there. The kolkhoz even had some decades long ‘contract of friendship’ with theatre Vanemuine from Tartu (Sepp 2001).

Modscapes guidelines for interview topics and suggested questions, while tailored to such a specific area of research, still allow for a narrower selection depending on the nature of the project area. The number of questions selected was 16, focusing on exploring the nature and changes of the community, culture and amenities of the period (see appendix 2 and appendix 3).
Before the interviews, every interviewee was met in person. The research concept and objectives of The Modscapes project were elaborated along with an explanation about what type of information and memories were important to collect. Additionally, interviewees were asked to bring any photographs of the “Avangard” period of their lives to the interview.

3.3.3 Conducting the interviews

During the interviews, a starting question was given to the person about something that could be seen around them. In case of both walk-along and drive-along interviews, we stopped if we passed an object of interest to speak about the location/building in more depth (for examples, see Appendix 1). Otherwise, passing into a new scenery sparked new stories. However, some guiding questions were needed for topics that weren’t directly inspired by the scene, such as about daily routines, general changes in the environment and details of their habits.

Interview nr1.

For this interview, the “talk-about” step was used and the interview was conducted at the interviewee’s home. A generic map was used to make reading easier for the interviewee, relying on a sense of familiarity. It was laid out in front of the interviewee on a table, around which the interviewers sat, as well (Figure 9). This was very helpful when she was talking about the construction of single family homes in her neighbourhood and the ownerships of said houses. Due to her advanced age, the interviewee found the map challenging to read at times, but it did not pose a significant problem. She had some old photos to share and to tell stories about, which can be seen in Appendix 1, part b).

Figure 9. "Talk-about" interview in Äksi.
Interviews nr2 and nr3.

Rest of the interviews were carried out using the “go-along” step, one by foot and one by car (Figure 10 and 11). The interviewees were met by a significant location of their choosing. This was great for sparking the conversation. Since they were talking about the place they lived in, not a lot of guiding questions were necessary. The interviewees were leading the walk themselves, wanting to show specific places and buildings. The only questions necessary to be asked were about topics not directly related to the surroundings, such as the daily routines, family history etc. On the way stops were made to discuss something in greater depth, this both when walking and when driving. The driving part allowed the stories to stretch over a much larger area, giving a more widespread connection to the large kolkhoz area. By walking, however, the perceptions stretched more in depth and details. It must be said that the two complement each other.

Figure 10. "go-along" interviews on foot in Äksi.
3.3.4 Interview analysis

Analysis of the interviews reveals a part of landscape which is not often studied very thoroughly: the human component. Work with the material gathered from the interview should start immediately after field work. The first and the most important step is to mark down the route of the interview (in case of “go-along”) and places that were stopped at for longer discussions. Furthermore, the interview recordings are processed to find reoccurring themes, keywords (see Appendix 4) and references to places (see Appendix 1). Maps are drawn to reflect the most important points from the interview (Kuhlmann, Bell and Veldi 2017).

Transcribing is not seen as a necessary step in the analysis process, however it seemed important for the speed of processing and navigating the information in later phases. When transcribing an interview, it is important to keep in mind to include small, but meaningful details expressed in speech: pauses, ironic speech, facial expressions, body language. These reveal hidden layers of information that, for example, is not wished to say out loud, or to express the interviewee’s true opinions on a subject. The interviews are then searched for reoccurring topics and keywords that will form a matrix (see appendix 4.). It is a table where the themes are noted on rows and interviewees marked across the columns. The transcribed text is then reorganised by themes, focusing on the most important information and important quotes (Kuhlmann, Bell and Veldi 2017).

This method of conducting interviews produces a lot of data. It is important to map entire interviews and attach text units, types of places and functions to it to reveal the important relationship between location, time and person.
4 Research results and discussion

4.1 What are the changes in settlement and land use that took place in „Avangard“ kolkhoz (1949-1992) in 1930s, 1980s and 2010s?

To understand the changes in settlement and land use, the digitized maps of 1937, 1975 and 2017 are used. Each map selected represents a very different period. In 1937, due to collectivization not having started yet, the landscape was still dominated by individual farms. 1975 can be included in the successful period of kolkhozes, with most of the influences ADCS having taken effect. By 2017, impact of the end of the Soviet regime, reforms in agriculture calmed down and the system had been restored, but the previous influences still being apparent in current landscape.

The maps and charts presented below express and represent the changes which swept the area of “Avangard” kolkhoz. The land use and settlement changes are dependant on several elements such as political changes, ADCS and ADCP. Special attention should be turned to the changes in forestation, drainage and settlement patterns.
4.1.1 Changes in settlement patterns between 1937 and 1975.
It must be noted that the map representing the year 1937 is of different scale, 1:50 000, from the map of 1975 and 2017, both 1:10 000. Due to this difference, the elements on the map, such as settlement units, are generalised slightly. When comparing the maps of 1937 and 1975 (Figure 12) side by side it would seem as the number of households dropped, while the number increased by a third. But, due to the scale of the map, they are represented using their true area and are less noticeable by size.

From the map of 1937, the sparse placement of individual farms is evident. Only in the north-western side of the area do the houses collect near the main roads. 40 years later, 3 decades of Soviet reforms have shaped new village centres. The households that are further from those centres have not exactly disappeared, but rather the 100 new buildings have been built to the new hearts of the kolkhozes.

Figure 13 Changes in building numbers between 1937 and 1975.
4.1.2 Changes in settlement patterns between 1975 and 2017.

Figure 14. Changes in settlement patterns between 1975 and 2017.
1975 was the time when the kolkhozes had worked their way out of hardships. More successful work brought the need for new agricultural and industrial buildings, and a more specialized work force, who, in turn needed structures to live in. During the 1975-2017 period, there has been a two-fold increase in the number of buildings (Figure 15) over the previous period, bringing even more houses into the centres (Figure 14). This is the period which most shaped the settlement, now known as Äksi, to how it’s known today.
4.1.3 Changes in land use between 1937 and 1975.

Figure 16. Land use change between 1937 and 1975.
The most drastic change taking place between years 1937 and 1975 (Figure 16) is the increase of forestation from 6% to 33% (Figure 17). There is smaller increase also noted in the grasslands and fields. This change is driven by the amelioration that was carried out and had already produced effective results by 1975. Although some drainage canals can be found in the area already in 1937, the extensive network that can be seen in (Figure 18), shows the extent of the process. The Soviet practice of land amelioration caused agriculture to be shifted from many formerly good lands to marginal lands such as natural grasslands and wetlands (Mander and Palang 1994).
Figure 18. Network of drainage canals in 1937 and 1975.
4.1.4 Changes in land use between 1975 and 2017.
Figure 20. Land use change between 1975 and 2017 shown as percentages of overall area of the kolkhoz.

The type “bushes and brushwood” is a land type that did not appear in the map of 2017 (Figure 19). This could be due to the change of principals by which the land is characterised. The amount of land that is forested increased in this period (Figure 20). The added area seems to be grasslands that have started to undergo afforestation due to the abandonment of fields and grasslands. Reasons for such actions can be found from the collapse of Communism and the restitution of land to the original landowners, many of whom are old, non-resident or not interested in agriculture, land abandonment started and has continued to the present day (Bell et al. 2009). It can be expected that most of the land characterised as “bushes and brushwood” has become a full grown forest by 2017.
Looking at the changes that have taken place in land use throughout the entire period in discussion (see Figure 21 and Appendix 5) some generalisations can be drawn and compared with relevant research concerning the same era.

Earlier studies (Mander and Palang 1994, Mander et al. 1994) have found the land use changes in Estonia during the 20th century to have been significant. During this period, the proportion of forests has increased three-fold (from 14% to 42%), and the portion of agricultural land dropped from 65% to 30% (Palang, Mander and Luud, 1998). The earlier research by Ü. Mander and H. Palang (1994), while presenting the numbers of agricultural land as the same, have assessed the amount of forest to increase from 14% to 42%. Those researches were carried out using a much larger test area, the entire Estonia (using test case studies). The results of the map analysis of this thesis, however, concentrates on a very specific area, hence the numbers are expected to vary slightly due to the character of the location. Another reason for such a significant difference in agricultural land in the post-Soviet period data is the different time of making conclusions. For Mander and Palang that was data compiled in early 1990s, for this thesis it was late 2010s. The situation of agriculture has changed radically within that timeframe, being at a very low point after the restructuring of the agricultural sector in the 1990s, and having been revitalized by today.
Respectively, the proportion of forested areas has increased from 6% to 33%. This places below the average of the results discussed previously, however in both cases the amount has increased equally. For agricultural land, the area before collectivisation featured 55% fields, and after, 53%. The significant reduction of land in agricultural use, that was found by previous researches, does not appear in this case study area.

4.2 What changed in the lives of the people in those periods?

4.2.1 Changes of joining the collective farm.

The process towards and during collectivisation in the case study are did not differ from the rest of Estonia, or the Baltic States (Taagepera 1980). “In Salu village, in 1944 all the men in the village were deported and nobody knows exactly why (Aruoja 2018)”. The confusion and haziness of the period was unsettling for many, the new power was not welcomed with open hands. It was difficult to give away your animals to the collective barn. In the evenings, after work, some people would go and see their former animals there. A household could keep 2 cows in the beginning and some smaller animals. “I remember from when I was a child that after work my parents went to gather hay for our cow in the evenings, after work. But we did not have a grassland of our own, so they needed to cut the grass from ditches, roadsides, forest edges and somehow, we managed (Priks 2018). She speaks of living in the farm that she now lives in after her parents, located near the recently mentioned Salu village. Her grandfather was among the men who were deported from there, leaving the women of the house to manage the household alone. The other interviewee moved to Äksi later, growing up in a rather cramped living condition. “We lived in a henhouse of a farm on the other side of the lake, there were five of us (Aruoja 2018)”.

The people who were interviewed were children at the time when the kolkhoz was established. Hence their main memories are of going to school, but not about the
reordering a whole agriculture sector. The stories that their parents had told them are characterised by hardships and disbelief in the system. The did, however, grown up with the kolkhoz, becoming young adults at the same period as when the kolkhoz was doing best, economically. Jääts (2004) describes that if a kolkhoz found a chairman who was in touch with the area he was managing and was a person of character and charisma, then the collective farm would do well. That was the case in Oisu, and a similarity can also be seen with “Avangard” kolkhoz, as the time of E. Beek aligns with the time of progress (Sepp 2001).

4.2.2 Changes during the period.

“Avangard” wasn’t socially as united, as one would assume. The kolkhoz was made up from three departments, two of which had joined later in time. They worked together but kept to themselves as social groups. Every one of the interviewees were from the original “Avangard” department. Within that area, people were close. “By the 1980s, a kind of family had developed. Old problems were a bygone. Things could be acquired, we had an apartment, we got paid. There was a unity between people and everyone was friendly and knew each other. It’s not like that anymore.” (Priks 2018).

“I feel that the tightest bond was formed when the kolkhoz was successful because that’s when a lot of events were organised”(Priks 2018). And the heart of those events was the culture centre (Appendix 1 Photo 12 and 14). For a place as large as Äksi was, the amount of services and happenings was remarkable. They had regular movie nights twice a week, held concerts that also featured the stars of that era such as Anne Veski and Vello Orumets, nearly all the theatres in Estonia performed there at least once. There were also evening dances, a hobby orchestra, a mixed choir, a mixed ensemble, children’s ballet group, real ballet, ladies’ gymnastics group, folk dancing, and drama club. The stage in the building was no less remarkable. Rudolf Sepp dedicated his life to handcraft the entire wooden and metal construction of the stage, curtains and panels used on it. It was one of the finest in the whole State (Alanen 1999). The kolkhoz had special ties with theatre Vanemuine. Both would
help each other: “Avangard” would offer an escape and accommodation for the actors and theatre’s foreign guests; the theatre offered to teach kids acting, ballet and singing. Each year they would organise sporting events together and give awards to each other. When theatre Vanemuine had a huge birthday, the cake factory made them a cake in the shape of the theatre house in Tartu.

The cake factory was initially located in the same house with the culture club since 1968. The need behind such a facility was to use the cracked eggs from the henhouse so nothing would go to waste. They made every kind of pastry and confectionery known in the region at the time, nevertheless, fancier cakes were only made on order. Later the factory and the dispatchers moved to a new building across the road (Appendix 1, Photos 11 and 12) due to the ever-increasing number of employees and work needing to get done. The culture house itself also got an extension in the year 1984. “This is just a simple extension to give more space to the office workers. Also the club downstairs will get a new room so we could have something like a bar, so when a person comes to the cinema or a party, it would be more modern (Kaljo, Beek and Pohla 1984).

During two decades of 70s and 80s was when most of the settlement we now know as Äksi, was built. Overall, this period was when the collective farms were the most prosperous and expansion of accommodation, facilities and infrastructure was possible and necessary. “At first they built the terraced house (Appendix 1 Photo 2), then the block housing (Appendix 1 Photo 3) and the single-family homes last. All houses had warm water and central heating. The rent for an apartment was 5 ruble and the water was free (Aruoja 2018)”: “For those who desired to live in a house of their own, plots were given to all who applied and in addition to that, 5000 ruble of loan to build it. If the family lived and worked in the kolkhoz for at least 10 years, they would not need to pay it back (Kaljo, Beek and Pohla 1984)”. One of the interviewees whose house was the first to be built in Äksi, said, that before they moved to the new house in 1956, the five of them were living on the shore of Soitsjärv, in a henhouse of another family.
4.2.3 Changes brought by the collapse of the kolkhoz.

With the reestablishment of the Republic of Estonia, the collective farms were closed and private farming, a process that started before the end of the Soviet regime, was restored. In 1992 a committee was formed to decide on how to divide the kolkhoz’ common assets. “Different units started to work independently. After a while, they started to close down. The Igavere department was the only one that continued working as a whole because the manager took it all over. Larger units could have worked as a cooperative and perhaps would have survived (Priks 2018)”. Most of the people kept living where they were before, as they could buy the apartments given to them with privatization vouchers. Some would become entrepreneurs in the former field of work. Some would go into politics, for example the former agronomist became the municipality mayor.

“We stopped having a vegetable garden when our friend who drove a tractor died. After the end of the collective farm there were no more places to find someone like that. Everybody has stopped having a vegetable garden because of that (Priks 2018)”. Alanen (1999) has found that the machines used in the kolkhoz were too powerful, and too few, to be used by a single family for a small farm. Often, they ended up in the hands of one or a group of people as a result of secret agreements, thus becoming unavailable for family farms that emerged from the restructuring of land. During a committee meeting in the end, Virve Ramm said “Don’t take to yourselves more than you can love” (Sepp 2001). Every person interviewed shared the same opinion that people got greedy and didn’t keep a sustainable future in mind when diving the properties.

“I feel sorry for all of that ending, there was a lot of positive. The trips, the events. The second half of the 1980s wasn’t at all bad, just the red part of my job. But all the systems were working, and people had a job, and everyone cared for each other (Priks 2018)”. “Think of what the collective farms would be by now! We started to build such huge facilities in the end, grand plans for new productions (Aruoja 2018)”. “Now everybody just keeps to themselves (Kuul 2018)”.
The detachment from the land, in the agricultural sense, from the people, from the buildings and the melancholy derived from that is what characterises the memories about the kolkhoz coming to an end and the period which came after that.
4.3 How does the landscape portray the changes in the built and social-cultural environment during those periods?

When collecting the perceptions of the people of the case study area, the focus was on everyday activities, relations and connections. The importance of the historic map analysis is to show how ADCS and ADCP changed the landscape. Going beyond acknowledging the increase of forested areas, there was also more land to use agriculturally. Those changes tell a story about how the lives of local settlers changed. That means they influenced the lives of the people by offering jobs, creating new areas to live, new houses to build, restructuring the land they lived and used in their everyday lives. New traditions of how to live were created that were more centralised and collaborative. Combining the information gathered from the interviews with maps as illustration, reveals the spatial connections of the period (Figure 22, 23 and 24).

To understand why this is important, one must connect with the perceptions of the respective era. However, the current period must be seized and utilized. The people who created modernist rural landscapes with their work, are still alive and their children who grew up completely during the time of the kolkhozes and now live in the materialistic landscape are still active. The landscape those people created for themselves, be it in the form of their home garden or the houses they built, fields they worked in, even human relations they shared, can still be reconstructed in memories and on maps. From the interviews, the change of political system can be detected with a sharp change of perception of the landscape. The connection between the actors and the environment has been mostly severed. This is due to changed priorities of ruling political power, turning attention away from the diversity of rural life.

There was a joke told by one of the interviewees that really captured the essence of that time. “For capitalism, it is competition that provided success, for socialism, it was connections (Aruoja, 2018)”. Although the ‘socialist competition/emulation’ was a strong motivator in the last decades, the main driving force was the bond between people who worked together. This also includes the need to ‘know the right people’ if something needed to get done. There is a sense of longing for this intense connection between people. When observing how the interviewees speak of the
landscape in the present and in the 1970s and 1980s, there is a strong difference in positive words used and the amount of connections expressed.

The buildings that once were the centre of work and leisure time now stand empty as their functions have been centralised to a larger settlement, new companies or the need has altogether disappeared. While most of the block of flats are still inhabited, the once important and unique cultural and administrative buildings have lost their initial status and become controversial (Ingerpuu 2018). The buildings suffered this fate due to the division of the property of the kolkhoz between individuals. There was no longer a central body guiding the work of all the people. The sudden increase in prices, limits in production and the weight of new taxes (Sepp 2001) eventually put a halt to the work of kolkhoz and this tendency carried on into the Republic time, when new companies struggled to survive and slowly died out. The example of the culture house of Äksi is not one of the worst ones in Estonia, but certainly not one of the better ones as well (Ingerpuu 2018). Currently the house stands mostly alone, with only the front half of the building inhabited by a single family.

Figure 22. Analysis of the interview nr1, which was a "go-along" interview. During this, both walking and driving were used, hence the long route.
Figure 23. Analysis of the interview nr2, which was a "talk-about" interview.

Figure 24. Analysis of the interview nr3, which was a "go-along" type, done completely on foot.
5 SUMMARY

The aim of the Modscapes project is to find an understanding about the development of rural landscape in the modernisation process. It examines two ways of interpreting a landscape: cartographical and perceptive. These two combined form a comprehensive understanding of a landscape in the concept set by European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe 2000). When collecting the perceptions of the people of the case study area, the focus was on everyday activities, relations and connections. Parallelly, a historic map analysis was carried out to understand the large-scale changes that the land went through as a result of ADCS and ADCP. Those influenced the lives of the people by offering jobs, creating new areas to live, building new houses, restructuring the land they lived on and used in their everyday lives. The actions of the actors were then connected to the maps to reveal the spatial connections of the period.

Land-use structure dynamics are significant indicators of socio-economic and political changes in society. Each major change in the proportion of agricultural lands could and should be explained with certain new trends in society (Mander and Palang 1994). The changes in the landscape that are the results of collectivisation are quite large-scale and visible to the person observing them. To summarise: the fields were unified, the average area of a field rising while the overall proportion of agricultural land in the kolkhoz remained roughly the same; afforestation process started and the forest area when comparing 1937 to 2017 increased over fivefold. Extensive networks of drainage canals were dug in the process of land amelioration, which allowed to claim land for grasslands, forests and agriculture. The number of households increased and sparsely located farms were on occasions abandoned, which also happened due to deportations, and when former (Vedu manor and village) and new settlements (Äksi, formerly known as Põtsamaa village with just a few farms) densified. The last location being where all three of the interviewees worked and live. Their memories present a multilayered story of the heart of the kolkhoz, in both the meaning of location and spirit. They each spoke with pride in their
accomplishments, happiness in the friends and acquaintances they had, and some pity for it all being over. Their hard work brought the kolkhoz to the success that was foretold in its name, “Avangard”, with the Chairman Beek leading it with his modern ideas.

The methods used for memory collection produced a collection of information from various angles. This helped to recreate and see spatial connections between the environment and the people living within it. Memories are a way to discover invisible layers of information that is not possible to be read from cartographical analysis, while still being of great importance to comprehensively understand an area. There were two types of interviewing methods used: “go-along” and “talk-about”. Both of those are qualitative methods, which produce sound, video and picture material to work with.

The changes that took place in settlement patterns and land use were the concentration of new houses into kolkhoz centres, amelioration of land, increasing the forested areas and uniting field masses. The change that collectivisation brought on was difficult at first for both the people and the political power. However, the stabilisation of the system brought economic and cultural success and the feeling of family-like ties with other workers of the kolkhoz that last till the current day although the situation has changed. When viewing these two topics together, spatial connections that emerge show that the landscape these people live in is a creation of their life’s work due to higher orders from the Soviet Union and should therefore be treated as heritage.

For further research the options are several. The Modscapes research methodology expects a case study to go into more details and be more interdisciplinary than the scope of this master’s thesis has allowed. This would create a more comprehensive analysis, the results of which can influence decisions that are made about rural areas. These decisions would not only be usable in the former “Avangard” kolkhoz area, but also in the rest of Estonia and the Baltic States, as our history, influences and landscapes share a lot in common (Bell 2009).
6 KOKKUVÕTE


kahetsust, et see kõik on mõõdas. Nende suur töö aitas kolhoosil saavutada edu, mida ennustas ka kaasaegsete ideedega esimees Beeki juhitud kolhoosi nimi, Avangard.
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Appendix 1. Photos of key buildings and areas

a) Photos from a private collection ©Kaja Veddel

Photo nr1. Alleyway of a former farmhouse that was demolished to make room for new buildings.

Photo nr2. Terraced house.

Photo nr3. Two-story houses built after the terraced house.

Photo nr4. Location of the former central boiler houses.

Photo nr5. Allotments for people living in apartments.

Photo nr6. Former sauna, currently library.
Photo nr7. Former sports building, currently the Ice-Age Centre.

Photo nr8. Block of flats in Aksi.

Photo nr9. Workshop complex.

Photo nr10. Warehouse, specialists’ offices.

Photo nr11. Cake factory.

Photo nr12. Dispatcher office.

Photo nr13. Culture house side view.

Photo nr14. Culture house facade view
Photo nr15. Services building.

Photo nr16. Carpentry workshop

Photo nr17 and nr18. View to the fields and the new centre of Äksi from the kolkhoz centre.

Photo nr19. Piggery.

Photo nr20. Drying house

Photo nr21. Henhouses.

Photo nr22. Granary and drying house.
Photo nr23. Crossroad where the former gas station was.

Photo nr24. Graveyard and former garden plot area.

Photo nr25. Pioneer camp facilities near Kukulinna manor.

Photo nr26. Tref’s sauna.

Photo nr27. The church of Äksi.

Photo nr28. The first single family home built in “Avangard” kolkhoz.
b) Photos from a private collection of one of the interviewees.

Photo nr29: First central boiler house

Photo nr30: Building of the second central boiler house.

Photo nr31: Picnic on an outing with coworkers.

Photo nr32: A crane used in the kolkhoz.

Photo nr33. Emajõe winter games in 1982.
Appendix 2. Questionnaire form (in English)

1. Why and when did you move here?
2. Are your children living here?
3. Did you know other families in the region?
4. Did you live in a house? How was the ownership and the acquiring of the plot/house planned?
5. Did you cultivate vegetables on your own? Did you have animals?
6. What was happening in the outdoor spaces in the past?
7. How would you describe your typical day in the past?
8. How has the neighbourhood/street changed? When did the changes happen?
9. What kind of transportation did you use in the past?
10. What kind of recreational activities did you and your family do in the past?
   Where? Which institution offered them?
11. What was your main work in the past?
12. Which other types of economical subsistence, other than agriculture, existed in the settlement?
13. What was the land used for in the collective farm?
14. Could you acquire everything you needed from your garden and town/village?
15. What are your memories and/or the stories told by your parents about the forming of the kolkhoz?
16. What were the changes that took place with the closing of the kolkhoz?
Appendix 3. Questionnaire form (in Estonian)

1. Millal ja miks te siia kolisite?
2. Kas teie lapsed elavad ka siin?
3. Kas te teadsite teisi peresid naabruses?
4. Kas te elasite majas? Kuidas oli maja/krundi omandioõigus ja saamine korraldatud?
5. Kas te kasvatasite oma aedvilju/puuvilju? Kas teil oli loomi?
6. Mis toimus sel ajal väliruumides?
7. Milline oli teie tüüptiline päev tol ajal?
8. Kuidas on naabrus/teie tänava muutunud? Millal need muutused toimusid?
9. Millist transpordiviisi te kasutasite?
10. Kuidas veetsite (perega) vaba aega? Kus? Millised asutused pakkusid tegevusi?
11. Mis töökovalal te tol ajal töötasite?
12. Millised teised majanduslikud toimetulekuvõimalused peale põllumajanduse olid võimalikud siinkandis?
13. Mille jaoks kasutati majandis maad?
14. Kas teil oli võimalik saada/osta kõike vajalikku oma aiast ja oma asulast?
15. Mis on teie mälestused ja/või vanemate jutustatud lood kolhoosi loomisest?
16. Mis muutused toimusid seoses kolhoosi lõppemisega?
Appendix 4. Interview’s matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/topic</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When and why did you move here?</td>
<td>I grew up not far from here. I came here to work right after I graduated from school in 1980. I also took correspondence courses at the same time. My parents came here already during the first independence. And my maternal grandmother was also a founding member.</td>
<td>When I was young I lived in the henhouse of a farm by Soitsjärv, there were five of us in my family. We moved here when the Äksi house was built in 1956.</td>
<td>We moved here in the 70s from Valga. We came for work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are your children living here?</td>
<td>One of my sons still lives here. I have four sons and two daughters. Daughters are both married, one lives in Rakke, the other on the other side of the lake, both have three children. My older son lives in Kukulinn and the other lives in Vedu with his mother-in-law.</td>
<td></td>
<td>My children graduated from Lähte school and went on to study in Tartu. My daughter lives near here now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you know other people living in the region?</td>
<td>By the 80s, a kind of family had developed. Old problems were a bygone. Things could be acquired, we had an apartment, we got paid. There was a unity between people and everyone was friendly and knew each other. It’s not like that anymore. The kolkhoz consisted of three departments and I knew almost everyone from mine. That was probably a result of collective events. But the others remained distant. Even though everyone from around here went to school at Lähte, the regions are still different, and people did not interact.</td>
<td></td>
<td>When the kolkhoz still existed, people interacted more, now everyone keeps to themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Did you live in a house? How was the ownership and the acquiring of the plot/house planned? | Our house was the first one that was built in the Avangard kolkhoz. The old house was the smaller part and the rest I built so the children could have space. And this side was originally the barn because you could not get by without a barn.  
We moved in during Christmas of 1959. But at that time, the inside walls hadn’t been plastered yet.  
We were also the first ones to get three-phase power for our house because we were close to the threshing machine.  
At that time, all the land belonged to the kolkhoz and it wasn’t a problem like now.  
The kolkhoz gave us 2000 roubles to build the house. For that we built a roof and we spent 500 roubles to connect the hot water main. But we couldn’t get a heating pipeline to our house, so we have been living on stove heating from the beginning.  
The kolkhoz helped a lot with the construction. We got transport when we needed to bring materials from the city. If something was in stock, we could buy it in instalments.  
We knew they had plans to start construction by the lake. We went to see the chairman of the kolkhoz, so we could choose a place we liked.  
Later, during privatisation, we also got the piece of land next to us that extended to the lake.  
We grew our own potatoes, beets, turnips, and cabbages. Each year we had two pigs and a bull that we took to the slaughterhouse to get money for building the house.  
It all happened right here in this yard. Later, the kolkhoz gave everyone half a hectare of land next to the cemetery to grow whatever we wanted. |
| Did you cultivate vegetables on your own? Did you have animals?          | We raised turkeys for some time.  
We grew potatoes, cabbages, carrots, we had a greenhouse. But at that time, it was much easier, because you could ask a tractor driver to furrow the field in exchange for a bottle. We stopped growing vegetables when the tractor driver we knew died, because furrowing by hand is too hard.  
When I was young, we had a cow. But because we didn’t have a meadow, my parents cut grass from ditch banks and roadsides in the evenings. Only one cow was |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was happening in the outdoor spaces in the past?</th>
<th>People didn’t do much outside. Emajo games took place in winter, then people skied and went sledding. Picnics were usually had with your own friends, the drama club children organised outdoor games sometimes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe your typical day in the past?</td>
<td>I came to work in the morning. Work was different then. In the morning you could come to work and just think smart thoughts for a few hours, go to the upstairs office and chat. Then you came up with events and if you couldn’t think of anything you went to the café, drank a shot of brandy with your coffee and started writing at the counter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the neighbourhood/street changed? When did the changes happen?</td>
<td>At first, the dispatcher and the cake factory were in the next building, but in the end, they were built here. The cake factory paid off thanks to the henhouse. All broken eggs were brought here so a lot of cakes were made. And then there was a carpentry workshop. Everything made of wood the kolkhoz needed was made: ladders, pig throughs, veneered floors, cupboards. It is one of the few kolkhoz units that is still used, but now it makes dolls. But the hangars are new.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| allowed but it would have been impossible to feed more anyway. At one point we also raised a pig and chickens. | We have always had fishers. Now there are about 3-4 fishers who do it for a living. |

| When there were small children, we took them sledding on the lake. My husband also fished a little at one point. | At first all of us engineers were in the upstairs office of the clubhouse. Then we were given a lot of work, so you could not do it by yourself and we had to specialise. I became a farm engineer. Later I transferred to construction. I dealt with all the metalwork in farms and in construction. |

| I went to work, inputted all the accounting data. At the same time, I was a dispatcher at the radio station. I had a connection with 50 places. If something happened in a field, I was contacted, and I passed on the information to the workshop. | Even after the joining of Tuleviku and Rahu, all accounting and data came here, the data was compiled there and was sent to me and I did the accounting. When we were done, we sent all the accounting results to the counting house. |

| Originally, there was only one house and then over time more were built. | The sports hall was built in around 1988. And it was used for a very short time, after four years the floor was already worn out. The terraced house was the first to be built in Äksi centre. All others were built after that. And the one with 24 apartments was built last. Before the apartment buildings were built, there were only two houses. Many |
Life went on all around. That way were the barns, the piggeries. Here at the foot of the hill were the workshop complex, warehouses, car repair, a big warehouse. A lot of people worked in this centre.

The shop and the canteen were at the back of this building. These were later rebuilt for residential purposes.

Apartment buildings had small gardens all together in one place. Some small trees and bushes still grow there.

I don’t really remember the construction of the current centre because I rarely came here. But these apartments were first offered to specialists and then people who lived far and worked here. Building permits were also given to build private houses.

And that sports hall was one of the last big buildings of the kolkhoz.

old houses were demolished at the end of the 70s and the start of the 80s.

Before the houses were built, all this land was used as cattle paddocks.

The boiler house stood empty for 5-6 years before it was demolished. Those garages were for the cars of the people who lived in the terraced houses. Before that there was a barn here, but someone set it on fire and it was demolished.

And here used to be a farm, the alley of trees lining the driveway can still be seen.

Many buildings were built here and in Vedu. More than planned. And even then, there weren’t enough apartments. Those who lived in a house had animals and stayed where they were, but those who came from elsewhere, couldn’t do that and an apartment was perfect for them.

What kind of transportation did you use in the past?

I usually went to work on the kolkhoz bus. The bus came twice a day, brought people to work and took them home in the evening. If I came or went at some other time, I went on foot or someone came to get me. But all who passed by offered a lift because we all knew each other.

I went to work on foot, everything was nearby.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kind of recreational activities did you and your family do in the past? Where? Which institution offered them?</th>
<th>Films were shown twice a week in the community centre. They were very patriotic films but sometimes they managed to acquire American and Indian films. Big concerts were held: celebrated singers like Anne Veski, Vello Orumets, Heli Lääts. Or smaller theatre performances. There were also evening dances, a hobby orchestra, a mixed choir, a mixed ensemble, children’s ballet group, real ballet, ladies’ gymnastics group, folk dancing, and drama club. Sometimes, in collaboration with Vanemuine we had sports competitions: chess, football, basketball. My mother told that when she started working at the community centre, events were organised because of the excitement it brought. People drove lorries to outings, birches and benches loaded. When I was a child, we drove to Muuga where there was an outside screening of ‘The Sound of Music’. People went to Moscow to see a kolkhoz exhibition, to excursions to Russia, to Kiev. I went to Azov by bus. The union covered part of the costs and you had to pay a little yourself. You could easily get sanatorium permits to Toila, Pärnu, Värsk. Very rarely you could get permits to go abroad, for example, my father went to Cuba, Paris, and Morocco.</th>
<th>The community centre organised theatre performances and we also went to see theatre performances in Tartu and Tallinn. The bus ride was free of charge, we only had to buy the theatre ticket. You could get permits to take a trip by train to Zakarpattia. I’ve been to Leningrad twice like this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was your main work in the past?</td>
<td>Back then I was the artistic director at the club. I did everything that was needed. Sometimes I washed the floor, instructed the hobby groups, organised events, made advertisements, sold tickets. Later I was the director or the culture house.</td>
<td>I came here to work as a farmer engineer. I started work right after I graduated in autumn of 1971. I was a dispatcher and worked at the telephone exchange, in the workshop at the foot of the hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which other types of economical subsistence, other than agriculture, existed in the settlement?</td>
<td>The <strong>services building</strong> was next to the community centre and there was a tailor, a hairdresser, a cobbler, a cafeteria, a shop. Some trees were also planted.</td>
<td>There was a shop, a tailor, and a hairdresser in the <strong>services building</strong>. We had a cake factory, that way, over the road. They made biscuits, cakes, pastries, meringues. A bar and a petrol station were also close by.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the land used for in the collective farm?</td>
<td>People mostly grew grains, but sometimes also beets, potatoes, maize, etc. The kolkhoz also had turkeys and beehives in addition to everything else. The forest has taken over only very small fields. Those small bad strips of land or those below power lines.</td>
<td>Different grains were grown in the fields, and sometimes potatoes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you acquire everything you needed from your garden and town/village?</td>
<td>If you worked in the henhouse, you could buy eggs for a good price and sometimes you could get them for free. Those who worked with animals had good chances of getting meat and milk. During the final years it was also normal that you could buy pork. There were items in the shop from the <strong>city</strong> too, sweaters for example.</td>
<td>We bought food from the shop on very rare occasions. You bought herrings and sprats from the shop. But at that time, fish were sold from a barrel and wrapped in newspaper. You could get furniture or commodities in the city. At that time the shop manager was the wife of the chairman, and a member of the cooperative. If someone wanted a motorcycle, she got it from the city. And concentrated feed was also brought in. People also went to Latvia to buy goods. There was a wider selection of children’s clothes there. You could get eggs, milk, meat, margarine, etc. from the local shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your memories and/or the stories told by your parents about the forming of the kolkhoz?</td>
<td>During the <strong>beginning of the kolkhoz it was hard</strong>. People went to the barn to see their animals and it was thought that maybe it will all still end. You also didn’t have an income in the beginning, you didn’t get paid, you only got a few kilos of cereal or something like</td>
<td>My father was the principal of the school in Salu village for over 20 years. He was sent to Tartu concentration camp twice because someone informed against him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that. **Work was hard** because there were no machines yet.

My parents didn’t have much to give to the kolkhoz, only one cow, I think. My grandfather was taken to Siberia and my mother and grandmother couldn’t raise animals anymore. They lived off the land they still had.

The first time people got paid in money was in 1961. Before that you could only get cereal for the days you worked. Some could keep their cow. The only cash for the family came from delivering milk in the morning to someone who did the buying in.

Children’s clothes were made from the backs of adults’ shirts because those wore down the least.

Before a sauna was built, there was a low bank from where you could access the lake. You had to go to work right after school ended in the summer. We used horses to carry water from here to water the cabbages. I worked for the whole summer and earned 42 roubles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What were the changes that took place with the closing of the kolkhoz?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After the kolkhoz closed, <strong>people mostly stayed here</strong>. Different units started to work independently. They worked for quite a while and then, one by one, they <strong>started to close down</strong>. The Igavere department was the only one that continued working with the whole department because the manager took it all over and they kept working for a long time. But then people also went to the city to work independently. Some got a job in the municipality, for example our agronomist became the municipality mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Think of what great</strong> collective farms we would have by now. During the end we started to build an enormous greenhouse for growing flowers and vegetables. Before the end there were about 1000 milk cows, 1000 young bovines, 1000 pigs and 100,000 chickens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The biggest debate was over the principle on which to divide everything. I think that if everyone had gotten a little, not dividing everything in big chunks, there would have remained more people tending their own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fields. Larger units could have worked as a cooperative and perhaps would have survived. Now there are no cows in our village, the next village has two cows and there is great competition for their milk. If you look at relationships between people, some form of connection between old people who lived here during the kolkhoz time still remains. We recently had a big reunion.

Figure a25. Land use map of 1937.
Figure b. Land use map of 1975.
Figure b. Land use map of 2017.
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