

ological study on the position of immigrants to Slovenia from other parts of Yugoslavia at about the same time (Mežnarić, 1986), participated on the production crew of the film. Her study was helpful for the creator of the movie because (in addition to the usual sociological descriptions of the phenomena in question and a lot of well-collected data) it also contains extensive anthropologically marked sections, in which researchers interviewed immigrant workers. These dialogues exposed the nature of problems in the inter-ethnically determined framework.

The film represented a unique breakthrough in scriptwriting in Slovenian cinematic production, where critics found scenarios increasingly more “artificial.” The films that were shot on the basis of these scenarios were perceived as “hermetic” even by domestic audiences, let alone foreign viewers. At the beginning of the 1980s, one scriptwriter and film critic exclaimed that “writing scenarios is just like performing in a circus” (Rudolf, 1980: p. 54). In the case of Robar-Dorin’s film, the script is not a matter of “talent,” but a matter of exposing (social) problems in a manner that makes use of aesthetic means such as parody, irony, contrast, and deconstruction. The rather loose form of the script mentioned above also leaves a lot open for the filming itself and to the editing, which is another difference from the standard scripts of Slovenian films at the time. Robar-Dorin therefore shook the prevailing outlook that the origin of a script must be a piece of literature, which is coded differently than a film being shot. Instead of the rapport *literature* (artistic practice) – *script* (craft of writing) – *film* (mediated artistic practice) there is now a different rapport: *sociology* (science) – *script* (narrativisation) – *film* (reality within the imaginary).

The sociological profile of the film did not produce any kind of boredom effect because Robar-Dorin knew how to make use of cinematic “discourse” as a parallel to the sociological focus. The film did not expose just “any” sociology. In its aesthetic code it actually exposed the production of critical sociological research, contrary to legitimizing a particular system of power or merely practicing utilitarian research. This comes across through some documentary scenes that call attention to the “traditional” link between Slovenians and wine as one of the banal attributes of their identity. This link is presented through some documentary scenes of mass alcoholism. There is not space here for a deeper discussion of wine drinking in Slovenia, which is actually a wine-producing country.<sup>4</sup> However, it

4 The annually published Wine Guide listed “550 of the top Slovenian wines” for 2011. See: <http://vinskivodic.si/English.html> (accessed 9 December 2010).