

UNIVERSITY OF ARTS IN BELGRADE
POSTGRADUATE STUDIES OF INTERCULTURALISM, CULTURAL MANAGEMENT AND
CULTURAL POLICIES IN THE BALKANS

Course title: Reading the Image of the Balkans

Paper work: **Imaginative Space: [www.dust over dust](http://www.dustoverdust.com)**
by Biljana Tanurovska

(Review over reviews and discussions)
Professor: Dr Nevena Dakovic

30/08/2005

CONTENT:

- Introduction
- [www.intro_on_perception](#)
- [www.reading_of_films.com](#)
- [www.me_on_dust](#)
- [www.critics_on_dust](#)
- [www.vizard_from_macedonia](#)
- [www.west_on_balkans](#)
- [www.help_on_balkan_films](#)
- Real time – Milco Mancevski on Dust
- [www.theend](#)

Introduction

In this text I will try to read different perception over the critical and public reception of the film *Dust* by Macedonian film director Milco Mancevski. As an author, I take a multiple positions: that of a movie goer, person that works in arts field in Macedonia for the last 7 years, and finally, a professional collaborator of Mancevski on some of his earlier productions. I also engage with the positions of other authors to manifest a credible position so that a reading of *Dust* through various critical responses – both positive and negative, artistically and politically provoked could establish a response, at once personal and objective.

I will try to analyze the “space” understood as field of multiple opinions regarding *Dust* in the context of the “imagined” and “objective” information and contexts in which the field exists as a provocation and reality, created by a forum of many people – the author himself, film and cultural critics, movie goers, academic researchers, and others.

I will establish my opinion of film engaging the above mentioned sources and create an objective space where *Dust* belongs as a cultural and artistic product.

Imaginative space: [www.dust over dust](http://www.dust_over_dust)

[www.intro on perception](http://www.intro_on_perception)

There are virtual worlds around us. Starting from the most common one - the all mighty internet – continuing to imagining the worlds within the sphere of perception provoked by one’s own position within the information overloaded societies - we understand something about establishing opinion and understanding others. I take the reference to the World Wide Web (www) as a metaphor for place/space of infinitive possibilities of archiving interpretations of everything that exists and is documented especially in this particular context, where a film such as *Dust* has been a subject of so many interpretations making the archive of response impossible to contain. This impossibility of the limitless space and continual effort to either credit or discredit the achievement of Manchevski, insist of a parallel between the boundless internet and the individually understood interpretation of freedom.

Imagining is inevitable part of our existence. Humanity is based on the power of imagination: negative - regressive and positive - progressive. Imagination to address a context one may not necessarily understand nor agree with, makes one wonder where the imagination comes

from? Or where the need to respond and criticize derived from? It comes not only from individual experience, but also as a provoked emotion of a collective understanding of history. Are the spaces that we create imaginative or real? Those spaces are created by our voices, agendas and ideology, and they are limited by us by the same attributes that provide our freedom. They can be infinite as limited as we want. I'm trying to establish the notion that we create context around us in coordination with the information we are fed involuntarily by the media, and it's up to us how we will perceive it. All depends on knowledge we engage and experience, and the emotions provoked while we are creating opinion, texts, spaces, worlds.

www.reading_of_films.com

In one study made by researchers at the HEC Montréal, a Université de Montréal I read that according to the research it has been concluded that consumers of cultural products with low self esteem read film reviews more than people whose self esteem is better. As a result, the reviews have a greater influence on what kind of films they decided to see. This is one of the conclusions of a study by Alain d'Astous and François Colbert, two HEC Montréal researchers, on the reading of film reviews and its impact on consumption, the results of which appeared in *Gestion* (Volume 28, Number 1, Spring 2003). The study also shows that, among moviegoers, reading reviews is more a way of comparing their points of view to the views of other persons. People who describe themselves as non-moviegoers are much more influenced by a specialist's judgment.

This study actually is an attempt to shed light on the influence of specialist movie reviews on consumers of cultural products, arts. "In all areas of the arts," the introduction says, "we ascribe tremendous power to reviews, the ability to make or break a launch based on a simple newspaper article. We believe that potential spectators wait to read the reviews so they can make an informed choice. But what is really happening?" The researchers made a survey of 120 students whose ages correspond to the target audience of a large segment of the movie industry. They could either recommend or advise against a feature film based on a reading of a review. To do this, the researchers invented 96 film scripts and published six film reviews. Why did they decide to base the study on fictitious films and reviews? "So we could control all the variables," Mr. d'Astous answers. "If we had used films by Steven Spielberg or texts of known reviews, we would have had a built-in bias."

The study showed that a very special relationship is established between a person who reads a review and the writer. "The person who reads a film review looks beyond the published text," explains Alain d'Astous, who has been interested in the impact of reviews on consumption of cultural products for the past 15 years. "The reader analyzes the information in the review in

light of the reputation the critic, the director, the quality of the actors, etc. In addition, he reads the review with different aspects of his personality.”

The hit movies such as— *Hulk*, *The Matrix* —were accompanied by major advertising campaigns. But they were also characterized as either good or bad films in the reviews. The article in *Gestion* describes the phenomenon of film reviews in a way that can help managers reduce the adverse effects of negative reviews or maximize the impact of a positive review.

This study actually explains how the reviews are affecting the viewers and that directly affects the film sale and film accepting. Bad film reviews can build a gap between the viewers and the film.

By this we can actually see that film critics have a strong impact in establishing the public opinion and the reputation of the film, building up or ruining the film reputation. At the end it is always the viewer that can read (if so) between the lines and make his/her own judgement.

Textualisation of the art work sometimes goes in the opposite direction then the work. Sometimes interpretations do not deal with the aesthetics and the films visual aspects; they mostly are leading to political debates that open other spaces where the film did not have the intention to go.

Those debates are mostly political influenced by the burden of the political connotations of everyday living. I believe that this is happening especially for the films that are Western and they are coming from the countries with fragile political contexts. Critics dare to put the films in the political not in the cultural, artistic or aesthetic context.

Nevertheless, film can be seen through different perceptions. The most dangerous are the film reviews with political eye trying to mark the movies through a political context of the social environment where they have been produced.

I do not say that some of the films are not explicitly or less, political in their backgrounds, that not all of them do and should not be seen as they actually have a political agenda.

In the 90's most of the ex- Yugoslavian films were treating war or post war conflicts as a subject. At the beginning, that was a personal statement but then it became a model of presentation of the Balkan as such.

Nevertheless not all the films are made with that intention. There are others that are created with the intention to be autonomous art, dealing with aesthetic issues that were treated, read as apart of the experienced model.

I wouldn't say that the reviewers, especially western are influenced by the political situation and context but also by the images that they have been seeing over the past 10 years. They do have those information- media that describes political situation and films from the Balkans describing the wars.

I'm not trying to excuse the critics, only underline that they have been influenced by the media and the films. But in most cases and they haven't didn't scratch the surface to go deeper in

the analyses, readings the films, or maybe they did because they have that experience and emotions produced from the experience before.

Also I would like to say that none of the art works should be considered in the same way. Art is autonomous form of expression as prior and after it has (if) any other purposes to fulfil.

[www.me on dust](#)

People sometimes are very influenced by the external matters and experiences a priori when they interpret arts. They are misunderstanding the art pieces, having misspends opinions. But sometimes people look for candour and see the arts as space of liberation, space where they can search for it and for new.

Dust by Mancevski is place of aesthetical liberation. For me is also is a visual and narrative charisma, collage of many parallel stories, emotions, desires, destinies. Key points are visual complexity of each cadre as well as the narrative reconstruction of Balkan history through imaginative spaces. It is subverting of the Western Genre in Balkan context. It is a parallel of different histories and spaces - Wild East and Wild West – somewhere in the beginning of the 20th century and nowadays. No matter spaces are distant they always meet each other through people. Spaces are people. Wild West collides with the Wild East.

Mancevski is an exceptional story teller. In *Dust* he tells the story about people- people's destinies, love, hate, misery, happiness, wealth and shamefulness. It is a film that has function on several levels as Mancevski is presenting it. It is describing culture, history, environment, all connected with people. Their destinies, relations, strivings, struggle are making the history, culture and the environment itself. People are the most essential to Mancevski in his film.

Dust is a masterpiece of Mancevski that critically engages with the dual history of East-West patriotism, heroism, morality, humanism and myths. It is a post-modern visual and narrative reinterpretation and reconstruction of film in both Eastern and Western cinema.

Mancevski besides being a filmmaker is a writer, photographer and person that knows and engages arts history in his works.

His first full length film *Before the rain* won a Golden Lion at Venice and more then thirty world prizes, and it was nominated for an Oscar. Film was very warmly received by audience and reviewed from the critics very positively. It is a film that created a romantic picture in the people's minds about Macedonia.

His second length film is *Dust*. *Dust* was not received and reviewed as positively as the first one. Somehow the romanticism expected did not come. Actually I would say did not meet the expectations. For this film instead to be reviewed as a brilliant interpretation of the human destinies through the vibrant images exploring different backgrounds, he was attacked and accused that he made a political statement. He was accused that he was violent, and projected nationalism in his film ...

www.critics_on_dust

New world in the 21st century is a world of fear as prior! It is a dark age where created fear is ruling. Fear from the unknown. Politically inquisitional approach and you must fear because there is a war everywhere and even arts are dangerous provoking the violence.

Dust scared some of the critics that do not know...Actually, provoked their frustrations and fears. They don't know much about Macedonia, about its history, cultural background; they do not know the whole presence as well the past. They know partially. Partially picked up pieces from the media tables that created them a fear-from not known.

They got the bites and pieces from the media. The film had completely autonomous purpose. But they didn't read, see that.

After the film screening for the press, on the press conference at the Venice Film Festival, Alexander Walker from the London Evening Standard said to Manchevski that he had made a racist film, showing the Turks "as herd of a corrupt people who gibber like apes in red fezes, and are more violent and far less responsible than Macedonians". Walker then asked Manchevski: "I wonder what you think the effect will be upon contemporary Turkey which is at the present moment trying to enter the European Union. Do you have a political agenda by this film?" .Manchevski only said: "Thank you for your statement."

Is it possible that someone can think that film can block Turkey admission in EU? What a perception!!

Critics at the film's premiere in the opening night slot at the Venice Film Festival did not find the movie funny or exotic. Most of them wrote reviews from political perspective. "Like 'Titanic,' the whole thing takes on a misty rose-tinted view of the past -- and by uncomfortable proxy, the present Balkan crisis," wrote James Christopher in the Times of London. "Having placed his film in the teeth of a deadly serious conflict, can (Manchevski) really shrug off the responsibility?"

Mancevski does not take the Venice reviews at face value. "In Europe, politics substitutes for gossip. I guess Macedonia was the bad guy at the time. And I think there was hostility (to the film), which had nothing to do with politics. The way the film plays with structure is in your face."

The German Der Tagespiegel declared the film anti-Albanian and Neo-Fascist, saying: "Instead of the Albanian Muslims we have here the Ottomans as the ,untermenschen' and the Macedonians are as innocent as lambs, which are slaughtered during the film numerously. And the black boy whom the old woman explains the Balkans to, is nobody else than the West, who has to be waken up by the sounds of the fanfare and fight against the everlasting Osmanic Islam."

David Stratton, the critic for Hollywood Variety implies that "Dust" is replete with violence, so that it's hardly believable that the western audience will accept it.

After all these and several others, opposite reactions emerged. Alessandro Baricco did react on this such as many movie goers that were writing on the web sites statements, and I will quote just one of the many: "Ok, obviously some of the people writing the reviews here don't know a thing about the history of the Balkan region, and most of them don't care, so they condemn the movie as a bad, bloody or nuisance, but in fact, this people have no clue what they are talking about.

I can say this movie is full of emotions, full of realistic facts and real scenes... As far as I can see some people asked where is the movie happening?!? I mean, c'mon... if you give this movie a chance to take you places, you should know where it's taking you: The great little country Macedonia. And if you want to see a part of Macedonian history from the turn of the century, well this is it, and it's as real as it gets, although there are things even more horrible than what is shown in this movie that the Ottoman Empire soldiers were doing to the people. So enjoy the agony (as some people called the horrific scenes) and learn from the history... I would say you need to watch this movie not with a bag of popcorn in your lap, nor with a bunch of buddies around trying to make themselves interesting, you need to see this movie with an open mind."

But the story of the reviews -violence is equivalent to Balkans went on. Do we own the copy rights for violence? Do all coming from Balkans including arts have the rights reserved on violence?

Todorova analyse this in one chapter in her book imagining the Balkans starting with the thoughts of Roger Coen. He is astonished with the thought that people can kill each other over some things that happened maybe in the 1495, claiming that this is unbelievable to the west. But it is not to the Balkan. (Balkan refers to Barbarian). She is saying that he is right – people on the Balkans are killing themselves because something that happened 500 years ago but person should ask himself is it Holocaust consequence of excessively or moderately ruling barbarism. What about the Gulf war? What about the war that Jean Boudriard calls "usual television event", where American technology for 17 days succeeded in killing at least half of the amount of the human victims in the two Balkan Wars?

If that is very recent, let's remember, reminds Todorova, the Vietnam war: according the book of Robert McNamara [...] "a scenery of the greatest superpower that kills or wounds thousands of the civilians weekl...it is not attractive." Because of the ease by which American journalists predicate the accusations for genocide in Bosnia, where the numbers of the human losses are between 25000 and 250000, it would be interesting to know which would be the phrase which they will use for over three million dead Vietnamese. Whether the Balkanians are Europeans

or not, it is a question for the academic and political debates, but they mainly do not have a monopoly on the barbarism ... [Barbarians (at ancient Greeks – everyone that didn't speak Greek, meaning foreigner, stranger; at Romans: those that didn't have any adequate education nor Greek, nor roman; nowadays uneducated, violent person, aggressive, brutal..)] And violence in films? Violence in *Dust*? 10 min. I can list at least five American films that have at least 30 minutes of violence in the film. Let me see: *War of the worlds*, *Saving Private Ryan*, *Seven*, *Fight club*, *Pulp fiction*, *Terminators* all parts and many, many more.

Double standards for violence– one set for west and another set for the films from other countries, i.e. "Balkan films."

Mancevski says he had no intention of making a straight genre film. "They read the fact that '*Dust*' goes against expectations on purpose as if it fails to fit in within their expectations. If you're making a living quickly analyzing and putting a film into categories, then it's probably going to rub you the wrong way. If it pisses off a lot of petite bourgeois, the gatekeepers, then great."

[www.vizard from macedonia](http://www.vizard.from.macedonia)

Shouldn't the film critics be occupied with the film aesthetics and fracture of narration? If they are not then are not at the right profession. Maybe they should have been to some political mission or some commissioners and political analytics? In one of Mancevski interviews I found the answers for these questions.

He explained that Iris Kronauer writes a book on the reactions upon *Dust*. Iris has found a text in Germany, a review, where critic claims that two days before they see the film, they were consulting in what way to review it. Other reviews say that the film is just an illustration of Mancevski's journalistic text where he attacks and accuse NATO for its mistakes in Macedonia in his text "Just a Moral Obligation".

"By this hypothetical situation that is claimed by some people, "*Dust*" is made in a period of one month. I'm sorry that I realized that a whole segment of the culture - the critics, for which I thought that is pure aesthetic matter, actually manipulates with politics. I saw that for the European film critics the politics is equivalent to the Hollywood gossip. It isn't important who sleeps with whom (as in Hollywood), but who has this or that political opinion."

And Mancevski has mentioned in the interview above I will have to mention again. Script writing and the film making are not a process that can be done in one day, month, even one year sometimes is not enough.

He placed a film in the teeth of serious conflict?? He wrote the story in 1995- re-telling the situation in Macedonia?! That was not happening then there. Well ...at that time I was living in Macedonia. Or maybe he is a wizard from Macedonia, alchemic that stories from the mind projects in reality!!! He wrote the story back in 1995 and he shoots the film before any clashes in Macedonia. That was not a statement of some time it was a complex mix of the stories put out of the time frame.

Here again picked bits and pieces. They eat fast, write fast and think politically.

www.west_on_balkans

Balkans. Different interpretations. Do we refer when we say Balkan on a territory, land, area, country, place, space, region? Who has the authorisation to refer to it or to read memories, history, borders of off its surface? How do we living there are imagining it, and how does those on a distance from it? Very different perceptions, interpretations and imaginations. But for sure it is consisted from different and similar languages, literature, arts, and memories.

Through researching the reviews and texts for Dust I have found one interesting introduction of film screenings of Balkan films on the Yale European Studies Council, Hellenic Studies, Film on Balkans.

I will quote some of the text especially because it is in the relation of interpretation of the Balkans through films and points one point of view how do those being distance from Balkan are interpreting it through films coming from the context.

"Fredric Jameson's keynote address, "Balkan Cinema and the Geopolitical Imaginary," will likely point to the region as political allegory for the rest of the world, an absolute cautionary tale about the motives and consequences of neo-nationalism. Allegory is signalled in the titles of several films: No Man's Land (last year's Academy Award winner); Underground (Emir Kusturica's 1995 epic that triggered a major philosophical debate in Le Monde); Balkan Cabaret (a/k/a, Powderkeg); and the Greek road film Valkanisateur. Today the very word "Balkan" still tolls with a deeply ominous tone. Even before the horrors of the 90s, this region often disturbed the West. Unlike the "orient," pictured so long as exotic and now vigilantly protected against Orientalism, the Balkans lie unprotected, fair game, since they are undeniably part of Western geography and history. Situated on the fringe, indeed at the bottom of the West, they have often been characterized as uncivilized, anarchic, abject. Despite venerable traditions of literature and popular art, Western universities have paid the region scant respect. The dictionary conspires here: To Balkanize is "to divide (groups, areas, etc.) into contending and usually ineffectual factions.... often characterized by threatened

hostilities." But a robust cinema has brought this region and its politics forcefully to our attention. Ravaged by conflict and dangerously mined, this "Powderkeg of Europe" has served as a charged movie set for off-shore and local productions that are able to exploit its spectacularly varied topography (the Adriatic coastline, fields and villages astride the Danube, dark forested mountains) and its diverse languages, religions, and folk rituals."

As to summarize, the reading of the cinema is in the political contexts trying to mark up again the region, no matter diverse, as one that produce neo-Nationalism. Films are read as political allegory, no matter that the films are perceived as robust. Films are underlined as coming from the Balkans- violent place, ominous one, diverse, that brought the region to attention again. Even if the films are good aesthetic artistic art forms there is always suspicion and cautiousness:

"Yet the West must beware its fascination with these films, being itself the unmarked partner-trope of "Balkan as metaphor," the title of a recent anthology. Many believe the West to have turned "its past into the Balkan present," projecting its own violence eastward. Such "self-othering" seems replicated in the lyrical yet disturbing Balkan films on Roma peoples (gypsies), the group taken to represent both the abjection and the primal energy at the heart of civilization. The moral stakes of the powerful psycho-social films set in the Balkans have been identified by another conference participant, Dina Iordanova, in her fearsomely titled book, Cinema of Flames.

As Iordanova, Daniel Goulding, Andrew Horton and others will show, the region and its cinema are older and broader than recent politics. Several Greek scholars and films address the Balkans from beneath Macedonia, where a different history of the region seems to apply and a different account of the cinema is remembered...should we worry that history shifts by nation and by political moment? [...]Unquestionably, the conference topics risk essentialism on one side, factionalism on the other. But is this not just what the films to be screened have risked? Have they---and can we---come to envision the Balkans geographically, demographically and most of all morally?"

Can we all come to envision of Balkan and the arts coming from the context with out prejudices?

[www.europenidentityonfilms](http://www.europenidentityonfilms.com)

European cinematography is obviously in perplexing position. There are different views what is the European cinematography mainly when it comes to the Eastern European countries, mostly Balkan's.

There is an example of research called Screening Identities project that was initiated to look for a different position of European cinematography nowadays. The European demography has been changed a lot over the past century with that also the European notion of identity as positions of many other European domains as the film.

It is obvious that there are European crises- political, identity, financial.. After the vote no on the referendum in France and Germany, we can see political crises and mistrust? Is it some pressure in the air because the 'Eastern' European states are longing for membership of the European Union? Balkan conflicts of the 1990s, the flood of immigration from North Africa, South America and the Caribbean into Spain and that from ex-colonies, African, Caribbean and Pacific, into France, Turks in Germany, meant that notions of European identity have become increasingly contested during the latter third of the 20th Century.

The screening identities have raised the following aspects. They identified that in the cultural sphere, and specifically in the realm of the mass media, the competing discourses initiated by these kinds of changes have raised significant questions about current notions of any 'European identity', even a multi-faceted one. Calls for a more fluid concept of 'Europeanness' have, however, been welcomed by the political elites of many European nation states, as well as (perhaps most crucially) by the European Union, with a more normative view of what membership of Europe means. Such contesting of conditions of identity as well as those of 'nationhood' has not yet been sufficiently examined, and certainly their prevalence in primary media modes such as cinema has not been widely deconstructed. They noticed that the film industry in Europe is both an important avenue of cultural exchange between European States and an industry well aware of its financial imperatives and needs—brought about by the dominance of the Hollywood film industry on the world scene. On the one hand, in order to obtain funding for film projects from the European Union, applicants are forced to fulfill certain criteria including those of a 'multi-language' production philosophy (the EU Commission media programme funding organisation requiring at least 3 'European' languages and 3 mainstream member States involved on an application for film funding for example). On the other, many film-makers from (or on behalf of) marginal and minority groups in Europe have challenged the EU's agenda, which they see as strictly vetting European identity, even positing as a virtue their difference from the criteria of 'Europeanness' that is upheld by the hegemony of Brussels. Films by 'minority' Europeans, particularly in Continental Europe, are thus often

made not *with* the support of founders, but *against* their film funding policies. Such a juxtaposition of a 'mainstream and 'margin', based on notions of Europeanness, has not been well considered by the EU Commission to date. The changing nature of Europe since the end of the Cold War clearly calls for a shift in focus to the films of those who challenge the concept of Europeanness from both within and beyond its eastern and southern borders. The need for this shift in focus is further underlined by the fact that the 1990s saw a growing number of films from national cinemas on the borders of the European Union finding international acclaim. Somewhat curiously, many of these films also have much in common with work emanating from minority voices within the EU, such as that of Basque and East German filmmakers, as well as the immigrant communities of new arrivals in Europe, communities that have struggled to assert their autonomy through a cultural discourse in order to compensate for a perceived lack of the same in the political arena.

The 'Screening Identities' Networks Project identified the need to reconfigure debates regarding the nature of European identity in the face of recent political events and to place this reconfiguration in the context of cinematic trends and film funding policies across Europe. Rather than exploring how European film-makers maintain a sense of European identity in the face of US-backed globalisation, the project would like to explore the work of those who consider themselves *outsiders* within the EU, as well as those people on its borders that look for inclusion in Europe from without. Exploring the paradox at the heart of the verb 'to screen', the project will ask how far EU funding models either exclude or facilitate the representation of minority voices? How far do western norms shape the thematic and aesthetic choices of the marginalized filmmakers of 21st Century Europe?

They have identified the political stream in the shaping of the cinematography trends through the search of the European Identity. But Balkan identity do not belong to the European one, and anything that is away from the notion that suppose to be European identity is marked and described as something not up to the European standards- not good enough or Balkaneese? How far do the western perception of Balkans can shape the choices of de(scripting) and recognition of the cinema in the frames of the current politics. The perceptions-when we perceive something we are putting it in schemes, regulations, forms, as Todorova explains, perception is not in that organ – of seeing, for example or listening- that passively allows to get from the outside ready impression [...] There is general consensus that our perceptions are as prior schematized. Received information we are organizing in matrixes for which are we as perceivers in great measure responsible.(prev 203-204)

Real time - Milco on Dust

"I wanted New York to be at least as important as the Ottoman Empire, probably more important," Manchevski explains. "I hoped that the emotional attachment of the viewer would be more to the New York portion. It is more intimate; it's about real people. Luke, Elijah, and Neda have an epic dimension. They are small humans in a big landscape, in a big historical event.

"They are also characters in another person's tale, so that takes them one step away from us," he continues. "It makes us care more for Angela and Edge. When you're in Macedonia you want to go back to the New York story. When you're in New York you're curious about the Macedonian story."

Dust is Mancevski personal story, existential story. Story of the essence, story of being and existing. Story of *fear and loathing* over Skopje and New York.

"Where does our voice go, when we are no more.

The film's message - the existential question: our voices live on in our stories and in those to whom we have told them, freely adapted and passed on by them in their turn."

www.theend

We all sometimes live in the projected situations of our lives. Sometimes we project memories, stories, reflecting them into new situations of our life. We do experience them as NOT REAL through the time realizing that those are virtual spaces that we are creating. We create them over the collective opinions and familiar models, understandings not liberating ourselves from them. We create those safe places, playgrounds where opt to live as from the memories. That creates prejudices over the new.

In the moment when we push another button, NEW, in the space, we can go further on. We will find new spaces, not known, different and we can experience them just when we stop projecting but filling and experiencing. We can go over the known playgrounds and prejudices. But it is very hard step. My grandfather was explaining to me when I was a child that he went through many places until he found his REAL one. And he said to me – Never stop searching the REAL space because just like that you MIGHT find it. Never stop SEARCHING. Through searching you can learn and experience new things. But you have to be open and smart to do that he said. I do not know still what is smart, but I learned what is open. Click on NEW, be that smart. I never stop searching, and going beyond the surface. Maybe I will not find, but I'm open to find out.

If we can start seeing the things as autonomous and new and if we do not stop searching we can find. We can create then subjective opinion and we can refer to other subjective and objective. We can learn what is *Dust* not just to us, but to the author, to the people working on it, to all the creators having in mind to make one new art work that can bring us to the button new, we can go there and look for new frontiers, spaces, destinies. We can experience visual and aesthetic hedonism enjoying all the senses overcoming the senseless.

In this moment I do think that by all analyzed, *Dust* was a film that provokes political debate from many reasons. Film lives after it is made. This film was living parallel lives, one with political burden and another one as artistic aesthetic form perceived in many different ways besides political. I believe that his real life, space where the film belongs is the second one.

I know that this is all very individual, personal, subjective opinion but this is the only position that I can take in this moment with the readings and analyses I made.

Maybe if I have possibility to go further and develop this opinion with deeper analyses I can put it in the form of re-thinking and making statements and conclusions on the research level.

Resources:

1. Marija Todorova, *Imaginarni Balkan*, Biblioteka XX vek, Beograd 1999
2. Iris Kronauer, *Dust - On Politics, War and Film*
3. Beatrice Kobow *The Living and the Dead - Masternarrative, Narrative Frames and Collective Identity in Dust*
4. Marina Kostova, *The "Dust" Files: One Example of How Macedonia Lost the War for Truth*
The West with a Skeleton in the Closet
5. Andrija Dimitrijevič, *The Kinesthetic of DUST – The End of Drama*
www.manchevski.com.mk
6. Svetlana Slapsak, *Luke Balkanwalker Shoots Down Corto Maltese: Milcho Manchevski's Dust As An Answer to the Western Cultural Colonialism* *Published in Identities, Journal for Politics, Gender and Culture, vol.1, no. 3, 2002*
7. Robert Alagozski, "Zal za Guernika", "Kinopsis", 23/24, Skopje 2001
8. Vladimir Lj. Angelov, "Prasina imame, kade e konjot", "Kinopsis", 23/24, Skopje 2001
9. Despina Angelovska "Vrakjanjeto kon prasinata", *Identiteti*, vol. I, no. 3, 2002
10. Zarko Kulundziski, *Zapadniot politiziran interpretativen konsenzus kako obid za toksikacija na umetnickoto delo/ politicka recepcija na filmot Prasina (2001) na Milco Mancevski*, www.manchevski.com.mk
11. Katerina Blazevska, *Koga Prasina bi bil makedonska Gernika jas bi imal prekrasen testament*", *Dnevnik*, 10 oktombri 2001
12. Zarko Kujundziski, "Trilogija postoi, tretiot film se uste ne se kazal", *Kinopsis*, 25, 2002

13. Blagoja Kunovski, "Razgovor so Milco Mancevski", Kinopis" 12, 1995
14. Howard Feinstein, "Epic and Personal in New York and Macedonia"; Milcho Manchevski's interview on "Dust", INDIEWIRE www.indiewire.com
15. Necati Sönmez, interview with Mancevski, "Kinoeye", 30 April, 2001
16. Daniel Kasman, Review on Dust <http://www.d-kaz.com>
17. Robin Gatto <http://www.filmfestivals.com>
18. Moira Sullivan, Special Report <http://www.movie-pages.com>
19. Vojislava Filipcevic, Historical Narrative and The East-West Leitmotif in Milcho Manchevski's Before the Rain and Dust <http://webpub.alleggheny.edu>
20. <http://www.yale.edu/filmstudiesprogram/Balkan.html>
21. <http://www.epinions.com>
22. www.rottentomatoes.com