

Eessõna

21. ja 22. mail 2007. a tähistas Eesti Vabaõhumuuseum suurejooneliselt oma asutamise 50. aastapäeva. See oli aeg teha kokkuvõtteid möödunust, tunnustada muuseumi ajaloo seisukohalt tähtsaid isikuid ning teadvustada laiemale ringkonnale juubilar-institutsiooni uusi suundi. On ju selge, et muuseum on pidevalt arenev organism ja 50 aastat pole vanus, kus võiks jääda loorberitele saavutusi nautima. Seega oli nii juubeli raames toimunud rahvusvaheline teaduskonverents „Miljööväärtuslikud piirkonnad, nende uurimine, hoidmine ja vahendamine“ kui ka EVMi viimaste aastate väliuuringute põhjal tehtud näituse „Kolm kohtumist – Rebala, Kareda, Esna“ avamine koos vastavate ettekannetega just sissejuhatus tulevikku.¹

Muidugi tuleb nentida, et iga uus on tegelikult uuesti leitud ja ümbermõtestatud vana. Juba 1960. aastatel oli vabaõhumuuseumi edukas ülesehitamine ja sellega seotud spetsialistide huvi maa-arhitektuuri paremate näidete muuseumisse koondamise vastu pannud aluse muinsuskaitseliste arusaamade levikule kogu Eesti tasandil.² 21. sajandi alguseks oli taas kujunenud välja olukord, kus ühiskonnas tekkis vajadus hakata pöörama suuremat rõhku maa-arhitektuuri säilimisele. Nõukogude ühismajandite ekstensiivse kasvu tingimustes tühjenedu talude taastamise vastu tekkis huvi nii vanade omanike järeltulijail kui ka täiesti uutel maale

1 Käesolev kogumik koondab ühtsete kaante vahele nimetatud üritustel esitatud ettekanded.

2 Vt. Lang, M. 50 aastat Eesti Vabaõhumuuseumi loometööd. – *Suitsutare 4. Valitud artiklid*. Tallinn 2007: 13.

minna soovijatel. Just viimased kuulusid nn romantikute hulka, kes linnamelust põgenedes tahtsid oma uues kodus tugineda võimalikult vanale ja väärtuslikule. Paraku jäi puudu teadmistest ja oskustest varandusega midagi peale hakata. Üha rohkem pöörduiti vabaõhumuuseumisse palvega aidata oma vara hinnata ja anda soovitusi edasisteks töödeks. Kahjuks ei olnud muuseum võimeline suurele hulgale abivajajatele vastuseid andma, sest siinne uurimistöo oli traditsiooniliselt muuseumlik: huvi pakkusid vaid need objektid, mida saaks ekspositsiooni üle tuua. Miljööväärtuse kui terviku säilitamine nõuab aga hoopis teistsugust mõtlemist. Soovitude jagamiseks on vaja korralikku ülevaadet olemasolevast olukorrast. Selliseks tööks jäi vabaõhumuuseumil jõudu väheseks.³

Õnneks tekkis entusiastide rühmitusi, kes kõik püüdsid maal säilinud pärandi nimel midagi ära teha. Üleriiklikul tasandil oli nende tegevus aga koordineerimata. Selle asemel, et tugineda teiste kogemustele, alustas iga seltskond oma meetodika väljatöötamisest. Aeg-ajalt kokku kutsutud nõupidamised ei suutnud kuidagi panna huvilisi ühiskasu saamise nimel ühte jalga käima. Vajadused aga kasvasid. Hoogsa kinnisvaraarenduse tingimustes lisandus surve omavalitsuste poolt, kes vajasisid põhjendatud lähteandmeid oma miljöötundlike alade arengukavade, detail- ja teemaplaneeringute koostamiseks.

Nii viiski loomulik areng kultuuriministeeriumi otsusele hakata pärandihoidlikku tegevust juhtima. Eesti Vabaõhumuuseumi poole pöörduiti küsimusega, kas me poleks nõus koostama vastavat arengukava ning siis ka seda kureerima. Muuseumi direktorina ei mõelnud ma minutitki vastates jaatavalt. Tundsin siirast heameelt, et ammune veendumus vastava töö vajalikkusest muuseumis leidis toetust kõrgema riikliku institutsiooni poolt. See tähendas vastava töögrupi moodustamist, konstruktiivseid nõupidamisi ning mis kõige tähtsam – valminud dokumendile⁴ riiklikult rahastatava ametliku käigu andmist. Täna juba aasta praktilist tegevust on ilmekalt näidanud, kuivõrd vajalik on olnud EVMis programmi juhatava

3 Aastatel 2005–2006 osaleti või viidi iseseisvalt läbi vaid kolm pilootprojekti. Vt Suutsutare 4, 2007: 24–25 ja käesoleva kogumiku M. Tamjärve ja H. Talvingu artiklid.

4 „Maa-arhitektuur ja -maastik. Uurimine ja hoidmine. Valdkonna arengukava 2007–2010“ kinnitati kultuuriministri käskkirjaga nr 241, 29.08.2006. a.

Elo Lutsepa igapäevane töö, kuivõrd soodsaid vastukajaid on leidnud erinevate pärandihuviliste koondamine ühte võrgustikku.

Programmi käivitamine on ikka ja jälle tõstatanud küsimuse maa-arhitektuuri ja maastikega tegelemise praktiliste ja teoreetiliste väljundite vahekorrast ning eriti viimaste vajalikkusest. On selge, et maa ootab eelkõige praktilist abi. Samas on töö näidanud üha selgemalt, milline tühimik valitseb sellealase teadustöö arengus ja spetsialistide ettevalmistuses. Teooria ja praktika peavad käima käsikäes. Rohke empiirilise materjali kuhjamine ilma teadusliku väljundita on ummiktee, mis ei vii kuhugi.

Merike Lang,
Eesti Vabaõhumuuseumi direktor

Foreword

On May 21–22, 2007, the Estonian Open Air Museum (EOAM) celebrated the 50th anniversary of its foundation on a larger scale. This was the time for looking back at the past years, giving recognition to the people important in the museum's history as well as making the general public aware of the new trends in the work of the jubilarian-institution. It is obvious that the museum is a constantly developing organism and that fifty years is not an age for resting on the laurels. Therefore, both the international scientific conference under the heading "Milieu-valuable regions, their study, maintenance and mediation" and the opening of the exhibition "Three encounters - Rebala, Kareda, Esna", which was staged on the basis of fieldwork carried out by the EOAM in the past few years with papers related to this topic read, could be treated as an introduction to the future.¹

It certainly has to be agreed that everything new is actually a freshly discovered and re-evaluated old. Already in the 1960s the successful building-up of the open air museum and the specialists' interest in gathering the best examples of rural architecture to the museum had laid the foundation to the dissemination of heritage protection ideas all over Estonia.² The beginning of the 21st century saw the situation where society became aware of the necessity to pay more attention

1 This collection comprises the papers presented on these occasions.

2 See: Lang, M. 50 years of creative work at the Estonian Open Air Museum. – *Suitsutare 4. Valitud artiklid*. Tallinn 2007: 32.

to the preservation of rural architecture. During the extensive growth of Soviet-time collective farms, farmsteads in the countryside had become derelict, and now both the descendents of former owners as well as other people keen on country life became interested in restoring them. It was the latter – the so-called romantics – who, fleeing from the hubbub of city life, were eager to found life in their new homes as much as possible on the old and the valuable. Unfortunately, they ran short of the skills and knowledge necessary for taking care of their treasures. Year after year a continuously increasing number of people turned to the open air museum with a request to help them value their property and give recommendations for further work. Regrettably, the museum was not able to give answers to the great number of individuals in need of help, as research here was traditionally museum-related: researchers were interested only in the objects that could be included in the exposition. However, the preservation of the local milieu-value in its entirety requires quite a different way of thinking. In order to give recommendations, a thorough overview of the current situation is necessary. Regrettably, the open air museum lacked resources for these volumes.³

Fortunately, local groups of enthusiasts were formed, and each one of them was trying to do something for the preserved heritage in the countryside. However, on national level their activity was rather uncoordinated. Instead of learning from others' experience, each group started to work out their own methodology. The round table discussion meetings convened from time to time failed to make the interested parties work in unison with each other for the common goal. However, the needs gradually increased. Under the conditions of dynamic real estate development pressure from local authorities was added as they needed grounded initial data for drawing up the development plans, as well as detailed and thematic planning for their milieu-valuable areas.

So, in the course of natural development, the Ministry of Culture of the Estonian Republic came to the conclusion that heritage-protection activities have to be supervised, and they turned to the Estonian Open Air Museum with a request

3 In the years 2005–2006 the museum participated in or carried out independently only three pilot projects. See: *Suitsutare* 4, 2007: 24–25 and articles by M. Tamjärv and H. Talving in this collection.

to render assistance in working out the national development plan in this sphere and later on also curate it. In the capacity of the director of the museum, I did not hesitate a minute before answering in the affirmative. I was sincerely delighted that the strengthening belief of the museum people about the necessity to start this kind of work had finally found response and was publicly declared by a higher authority. It meant the formation of a respective working group, constructive discussions, and, what is the most important – the completed document⁴ was officialized and granted financial support. The practical activities, which by today have lasted for a year, have proved how necessary the everyday work of Elo Lutsepp, the leader of the programme at the EOAM, has actually been and how favourable responses the joint network of different people interested in heritage protection has evoked.

However, the launch of the programme has time and again raised the question about the relation of practical and theoretical output in the sphere of rural architecture and landscapes, and especially the need for the theoretical one. It is obvious that, first and foremost, practical help is needed. At the same time, work in this field has proved more and more clearly that there is a great gap in the scientific development of the sphere as well as in the training of corresponding specialist. Theory and practice should still go hand in hand. The accumulation of abundant empirical material without any output for scientific development is a dead end without sustainability.

Merike Lang

Director of the Estonian Open Air Museum

4 „Rural Architecture and Rural Landscape. Study and Maintenance. Development Plan 2007–2010“ was authorized by the decree of the Minister of Culture No. 241, from August 29, 2006.