



## THE CAUSES OF THE COMMERCIAL CINEMA POPULARITY IN THE CONTEXT OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

Eivina STANIULYTĖ

Vilnius Gediminas Technical University,  
Faculty of Creative Industries,  
Department of Philosophy and Communication  
Trakų g. 1, LT-01132 Vilnius, Lithuania  
E-mails: eivina.staniulyte@vgtu.lt; eivina.staniulyte@yahoo.com

*Received 02 November 2015; accepted 09 November 2015*

This article deals with the phenomenon of the commercial cinema. The main aim is to analyze one of the creative industries' products (films) in a perspective of different sociological and philosophical theories in order to answer the question what causes such a rapid growth and popularity of the cinema industry. In other words, the article tries to find out what relation is between the cinema industry and the culture of consumerism. It leads to assumption that the commercial cinema is capable of creating needs, desires or longings and can even enforce meanings and implications which subjects "consume". Such thesis is analyzed through the concepts of *leisure* and *boredom*, *society of makers* and *society of consumers*, *sequestration of experience* and *factual/contra-factual levels*.

Keywords: commercial cinema, consumerism, construction of needs/demands, cultural industry, viewers.

### Introduction

Current processes of the film creation can be named as one of the biggest, rapidly expanding, best-known and most profitable field of the creative industries. Such tendencies note and validate John Howkins who can be identified as a cultivator and developer of the term *industries*. The author states that these days we can see a tendency for film budgets to increase enormously and bring profits of impressive size (Howkins 2001). Such a tendency can be explained by the amount or broadness of the cinema industry, which incorporates advertisement, fashion, music, literature, architecture and many other elements. That is why in this industry, as in many others, we can talk about twofold creativity: we have a necessity to create a new entertainment and most important a consumers' demand for it. At this point it means that creation and creativity are bound with marketing and economy because the result of the creative process,

i.e. a film, takes a shape of economic value and becomes a marketable product or service of the current market.

Still, the interest in the cinema industry does not finish with the concept of it as a creator of incomes and economic value. It is a self-evident involvement of the academic community in films, cinema theories or cinema philosophy. For instance, we can see a tendency according to which the traditional Lithuanian philosophy includes the following new trends in its field of interest: *philosophy of everyday world*, *philosophy of culture*, *philosophy of city*, *creative industries* and, of course, *philosophy of cinema*. All these different spheres of philosophy implicate in its field of research an analysis of the phenomenon of cinema. It is reflected in the growing number of works in Lithuania which concentrate on the analysis of cinema: Nerijus Milerius' monograph *Apocalypse in Cinema: Philosophical Premises* (2013), Milerius, Audronė Žukauskaitė, Jūratė Baranova, Kristupas Sabolius and Lukas Brašiškis' collective monograph *Cinema and Philosophy* (2013), Sabolius' *Hard-Fought Sleep: Imagination and Phenomenology* (2012), *The Imaginability* (2013), Algis Mickūnas' articles *Film as Modern Medium and Ontology* (2015) or Basia Nikiforova's *Philosophy of Matter Manipulation in Brothers Quay' Metaphorical Animation World* (2015). Also, we can see an increasing number of texts of such authors as Zygmunt Bauman, Jean Baudrillard, Gilles Deleuze and others whose texts are translated into Lithuanian language. Of course, these works do not bypass direct and/or indirect analysis of the cinema.

We cannot forget that cinema can be analyzed not only in the perspective of philosophy. The Lithuanian academic community attempts to start talking about the cinema industry in the aspects of the creative and cultural industries or through the access of sociological and economic prospects (Kačerauskas 2013). We can find abstract considerations of the cinema industry in a global light of the creative industries where cultural products (in our case films) are discussed as a commodity, which can be sold and becomes a part of the mass communication (Kačerauskas 2014: 80–81). Also, there are works that treat the creative industries' results as the products of the mass production, new type of services (Černevičiūtė, Strazdas 2014: 144) or industry of entertainment (Pruskus 2013: 6). It provides the background for deeper and fuller analyzes of the cinema industry.

Recent involvement of the Lithuanian thinkers in the cinema is mostly pointed to the general analysis, ontology of the cinema or phenomenology and hermeneutics causing a necessity to find out the conditions of understanding of the new art forms. Nevertheless, there we should mark the newest Milerius' contribution, which constricted the field of the cinema problems and focused on the analysis of the apocalyptic films. In the field of this work, only the cases of the commercial cinema will be involved. Such a decision let us exclude our work from other present researches. Also, this research can be segregated from others by its attempt to collate commercial cinema with the culture of consumerism due to the wish to find out and locate the influence over a viewer as a consumer. In such a way we will try to find out which communication channels, scenarios and contents are most suggestive to a viewer or consumer of the cinema.

In the widest sense, the problem of this work can be formulated by raising such questions: what is the connection between the cinema and its viewer? Is the effect mutual? Which side has a bigger influence? In this manner we will proceed to another problem, which will lead to the analysis of the subject identity. It raises another problematic question of this work: what kind of people/subjects/consumers suggests us to be cinema creators, scenario writers or heroes? Finally, it lets us formulate the last question: what kind of relation is between the cinema industry and culture of consumerism, capitalism or economy and also how it affects our sovereignty and autonomy when it is more and more often affirmed that commercial cinema as a fabric of “dreams” and “desires” is one of the motors of capitalism system (Milerius 2013: 20)? As a result, the object of this work becomes the relation between a consumer or viewer and the cinema industry or the importance of the commercial films for a viewer routine, identity and sovereignty.

In this work we will try to argue the thesis according to which the cinema will be treated as capable of creating and defining a subject or viewer, routine, understanding of the surrounding world, habits, needs, aspirations, desires and others. When we agree that films suppose some kind of the cinematographic space, which is physical and discursive (besides, in such a space film meets a viewer or cinema meets a body of the subject (Elsaesser, Hagener 2010)), we also affirm that the cinema is capable of smashing in physical and non-physical space the subject – cinema suggests or, in other words, enforces the meanings and implications which we “consume”. The cinema industry offers the “right” models of our behavior, roles, understanding of the surrounding world, creates new forms of living or profiles of consumers. Likewise, this work will try to show that the cinema does not have a significant distance from the form of advertisement because both of them propose demands, creates wishes and desires and in this way such an industry suggests to understand and to perceive ourselves and others or even the whole world through consumption, in our case through the consumption of the cinema.

### The analysis of the causes determining the choice of the cinema as entertainment

In the first part of this work we will try to answer the question why do people watch films. Such a question needs a full-scale analysis, which consists of a review of the society tendencies about its changes. It becomes important at this point when we see a rowing mass of the commercial cinema. But firstly we have to define the main concept of this work *commercial cinema* and the field of its use.

The term *commercial cinema/mainstream* (Elsaesser, Hagener 2010)/*Hollywood cinema* emerged as an antonym to a term *noncommercial cinema/art cinema* or *art-house films*. It establishes two poles enabling us to exclude more precisely the districts of each side’s interests and to avoid confusion. *Noncommercial cinema* will be treated as a sum of films, which are made primarily for aesthetic reasons rather than commercial profit; it is also independent movies, which are typically aimed at a limited

and specific audience instead of wholesale market; attributes films of an experimental nature or unconventional and highly symbolic content (Dictionary.com 2015). According to such characterization of *noncommercial cinema*, we will approach the term *commercial cinema* or *mainstream* as an industry, which, according to Milerius, fabricates serial products. Besides, products appeal to the same scheme or *cliché*, which is transferred and reproduced from one film to another (Milerius 2013: 12). By the term *commercial cinema*, we will mean Hollywood film production – seven companies located in Los Angeles<sup>1</sup> (Howkins 2001). Howkins confirms such a decision when he states that our mentioned companies determine the course of the world entertainment industries because it rules and controls stories, heroes and stars loved by the whole world (Howkins 2001).

### Leisure and boredom as the preconditions for the cinema existence

Besides his interest in culture critique and politics, Slavoj Žižek, who is considered as one of the most scandalous and controversial thinkers of our days, also pays his attention to the film theories that originate a film about films *The Pervert's Guide to Cinema* (2006). The main idea of the film gives easier access to the origins of the commercial cinema consumption. According to Žižek, “Cinema is the ultimate pervert art. It doesn't give you what you desire, it tells you how to desire” (ThePerverts-Guide.com 2006). This thought let us look at the cinema as an industry, which can be characterized by the term *consumerism* (Bauman 1998, 2006). Moreover, in this logic, the act of film viewing can be analyzed as a case of visual consumption leading to the identification and analysis of the birth of the consumerist society or cultural industries.

The concept *cultural industry* formulated by Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer (Adorno, Horkheimer 1979) expresses the price of such a society or system the measure of which becomes economic principles or relations. With the rise of the middle class, the mass/serial production emerges and art loses its aura and moves to the form based on repetition, standardization or reduplication. In the cultural industry cultural products are produced in an industrial way and serial art works emerge. In other words, culture is a set on economical rail because people start talking about cultural things in the terms of production or technique – art and creation become cultural industry, which is strongly related to the entertainment business (Adorno, Horkheimer 1979). Of course, it can be applied to the cinema or its product, i.e. film, because according to Inga Bartkuvienė, the cinema and radio are controlled by the capital and political power. Moreover, they declare themselves as business but not as art and dictate the tendencies of the mass culture (Bartkuvienė 2015). One of those tendencies which emerged when people started going to the cinema is the *standardization and colonization of the ways of spending free time*. According to Adorno

---

<sup>1</sup> Warner Bros., The Walt Disney Company, Paramount Pictures, Universal Pictures, Columbia Pictures, Fox, DreamWorks.

and Horkheimer, at first sight it looks like the standards emerged from the consumers' needs and that is why all the standards are accepted without any resistance but actually between manipulation and reaction to its demand we can see vicious circle, which strengthens systems unity (Adorno, Horkheimer 1979). It looks like the cultural industry cranks up *circulus vitiosus* from which a subject cannot escape: *work*→*leisure*→*work*→*leisure* endlessly. On the one hand, we work in order to get paid and on the other hand, we return earned money by spending them at a bar, concert or cinema. It is worth mentioning Hannah Arendt's accurate remark, which points out that in the consumerist society work and consumption are two stages of the same constrained process – this process is indispensable (Arendt 1991). We can talk about movement or move from work leading to leisure. It can be said that leisure and entertainment becomes the extension of work time but it often brings boredom. The same happens to entertainment – it faster and faster becomes boredom. However, boredom was the thing we wanted to eliminate. Cultural industry manipulates people by taking advantage of boredom and their wish to experience pleasure and enjoyment. That is why industries produce entertainment (Bartkuvienė 2015). Commercial cinema becomes a perfect way for a subject to get rid of boredom or to fill in free time sphere/the time when we do not work but have to spend money. We make money for capitalism through our free time – we work for consumption and consume in order for others to produce/work. In other words, it resembles a squirrel-in-a-running-wheel situation (Kavaliauskas 2008). A consumer keeps on trying to eliminate boredom, while the commercial cinema *keeps on trying to help him* perpetually because people cannot stop going to the cinema. According to Adorno and Horkheimer, the cultural industry is constantly fooling its consumers by continually promising, i.e. the vector of pleasure is extended to infinity, the promise, which actually is a show/view/event, craftily means that no one will see it and a visitor will have to come over and over again to try again. As we will see later and as Milerius notes, going to the cinema economy or leisure are incorporated in each other. It means that leisure in capitalism must be conceived as work extension: Hollywood cinema as a factory of *dreams* and *fantasies* is one of the capitalism system movers (Milerius 2013: 20).

### The society of makers *versus* the society of consumers, or how we move from meeting the needs to the construction of demands

When discussing the change of the society or two stages of modernity, Bauman also notices the aspects of free time and permanent boredom, which are strongly connected with our new demands, desires and behavior. One of these new interests is the commercial cinema or intensification of its consumption. According to the author, when we analyze culture or record its alterations we have to talk about the past type of the modern society, i.e. the society of makers, and the new one, which can be called late modernity, second modernity, post-modernity, above-modernity or the society of consumers (Bauman 1998). Industrial revolution determines the transition from production (making) to consumption, however, it is not true that there were no

consumption in the society of makers. Neither in the past, nor today the stages of modern society can stop producing necessary things for consumption (Bauman 1998). It has always existed, but earlier consumption did not play the main role of subjects because, firstly, they were massed for the workforce in the industrial factories. Yet due to the technical development and constant progress in the production field, masses are released – emerges the sphere of services. It can be grounded by Bauman’s thought that industry today is more and more harnessed to generate amusements and temptations (Bauman 1998). A short review of the chapter “To Be Consumer in Society of Consumerism” in Bauman’s book *Globalization* allows us to organize a two-part table which will simply reflect different conceptions, elements and aspects of two societies (see Table 1). Later, the distinction between those two stages of modern society will help us to find the main reasons which caused the rise of the cinema industry.

Firstly, it is specific to the early modernity to construct things because they are central, contrary to the post-modernity or second modernity that are concentrated on demands and needs and things are pushed out by services, which fill up our free time or time after work. In the society of workers it is an essential competence in order to make anything. That is why for this stage of modernity long-lasting rhythms are specific because, for instance, to gain a competence of a good house builder you need many years and several generations of experience. It means that the competence often surpasses personal life. Still, long-term rhythms in the society of makers also manifest through the use or consumption of things as they serve for a long time and their loss is accompanied by a hit or slash because of the memory, which is given by the subjects for those things. For example, in a family which is from the society of makers a new bike was used by a father, later by a son and there is a big chance that it was transferred to a cousin. On the contrary, in the society of consumers things are used for a short period of time, e.g. we dress for one occasion, trends change every season, computer software needs to be updated every year and new mobile phone models appear before we even master the one we bought a month ago. According to Tomas Kavaliauskas, the culture, economy and politics of consumerism stimulate our endless desire to purchase new products, such as high technologies, clothes or entertainment industry items (Kavaliauskas 2008). It is impossible to get the newest, best and most advanced mobile phone, computer, car or TV set because every day

Table 1. The difference between the *society of makers* and *society of consumers* according to Zygmunt Bauman

<b>Society of makers</b>	<b>Society of consumers</b>
Things are central	Needs are central
Required competence in order to make a thing	Required skills for consuming
Long-term rhythms	Short-term rhythms
Memory	Oblivion
The need → fulfillment of the need	Promise to fulfill the need → the need

Source: created by author according to Bauman (1998).



new and better products are produced (Kavaliauskas 2008). In other words, it can be said that products and services have short-term rhythms *inscribed* and it is connected with *voluntary oblivion* (Friedrich Nietzsche). It means that if a subject wants to function properly in the society of consumers, he/she has to learn to forget past stages (although they can return as *retro* or *vintage* and be sold again). Bauman points out that the most important is to force the society or the culture of consumers to forget the past because in an ideal case consumers cannot claw hold of anything; no demand can be fully satisfied, no desire can be ultimate (Bauman 1998). The last and one of the main changes provoked by the shift from the society of makers to the society of consumers is the reversal of traditional relation between the needs and its fulfillment. We can say that in the society of makers such basic needs as food, home, health protection, schools and others were the goals of the system according to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Social system functions to satisfy basic needs. In the case of the consumers' society, Bauman talks about reverse process when the needs, desires and pleasures are aroused and suggests how subjects can satisfy those needs through consumption: a promise to satisfy a need comes before the need (Bauman 1998).

This review of the chapter and its conception of the present society give us a possibility to interpret and explain generally all commercial cinema industry and consumption or popularity of its separate films. Firstly, the cinema promises to fill free time, eliminate boredom from everyday life and show what a consumer has never seen. A good consumer is racked not by a wish to satisfy present needs but by desires, which are still inexperienced or unknown (Bauman 1998). In such a way, a subject is forced to wait for the films by his/her choice because these cinema products promise to send a consumer to the outer space where good and evil fight (*Star Wars*), to the world of magic (*Harry Potter*) or propose to see real reality (*The Matrix*). The latest films can even suggest settling for a couple of hours on another planet, materializing in a different body and communicating with unknown species (*Avatar*). Commercial cinema tempts its viewers with more and more unbelievable and strange contents. It also keeps on promising something different and better even if it is the fifth part of the same movie; however, it does not matter because today a consumer wants and likes to *travel*, to *seek* and to *wait*. Such cinema viewers do not want to *arrive* or to *find* because it would mean boredom they try to escape from. In the society of consumers, to travel, to hunt, to seek, not to find or to be precise is not sickness, rather a hope for blessing or even a blessing itself (Bauman 1998). The mainstream or even all cinema industry can be understood as a desire formulated by the society of consumers.

### Consequences of the sequestration of experience and its influence upon the commercial cinema industry

The remarks mentioned above allow us formulating a new problematic question: what makes our daily life/world so boring that we want to compensate it by invoking film scenarios? Anthony Giddens tries to answer the question in his work *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Firstly, he stresses that in everyday life a subject suspends philosophical questions. It means that a subject does not raise questions about time, space

and identity naturally. According to Giddens, natural attitude brackets question about ourselves, others and the world of the objects, which have to be treated as self-explanatory in order to continue our everyday practices; there are questions about time, succession of space and identity (Giddens 2004). These three aspects of daily routine are unquestioned and accepted as basic assumptions, which are not taken in consideration when a subject performs an action. It leads to the formation of the mechanism of trust (later it will be discussed as *protective cocoon* (Giddens 2004)). The reliance on everyday order of the world, succession of things etc., comes from the habit formed in childhood. A subject brackets time and space with regard to the food he/she eats, medication he/she takes, house where he/she lives and alike as it is natural to have trust. The multitude of daily decisions is based on different forms and levels of trust but it is not always a result of conscious decision-making. Mostly, trust is a common state of mind, which grounds a subject's decisions (Giddens 2004). The screenwriters of the commercial cinema take advantage by incorporating elements, which reject or deny the succession of time and space or stability of identity in a film plot. It becomes a perfect instrument to draw the attention of a bored viewer allowing us to see daily routine in different perspectives. For instance, time in a film goes not only forward, it can change several times and go backwards (*Back to the Future*); a film hero can wake up one morning and realize that he is no more a student but a spider-man (*Spider-Man*) or he can have a cup of tea with a rabbit in its cave under a huge mushroom and only with the power of thoughts have an ability to travel to the Queen of Hearts (*Alice in Wonderland*).

As we go deeper into Giddens' theory of modernity to find out other reasons, which can explain the popularity of commercial cinema, we find the term *sequestration* and its impact upon the construction of film plots. In modernity, we can see that some parameters or elements are separated from everyday world or daily routine. Here comes a term *sequestration of experience*, which indicates some hidden processes separating subject's routine from such phenomena as insanity, criminality, diseases, death, eroticism and nature (Giddens 2004). Milerius notices the relevance of Giddens' ideas to the film industry when it is stated that *separate parameters of everyday (as death or natural disasters) are nevertheless re-integrated back to the routine of everyday life through visual media* (Milerius 2013: 44). In other words, the creators of cinema use cleverly what subjects of modern society eliminated or rejected. The film directors took it and transformed it into a highly requested product of a great economic value. According to Milerius, on the one hand, sequestration ensures the feeling of security; however, on the other hand, it pushes us to the situation where we lack radical experience. This deficiency is compensated with TV products, videos, computers and films (Milerius 2013: 44). Once again, we confirm our statement that a *modern* subject is bored and seeks for entertainment or, to be more precise, a subject pursues goods and services to overcome boredom. Here comes commercial cinema, which constructs its own content from sequestered elements of our everyday experience.

The cinema brings back all the elements Giddens was talking about and which we abandoned in the name of security and stability of identity or succession of space and time. Accordingly, current everyday world is a sterile rhythm of repetitive events



(Milerius 2013: 105). It is worth discussing at least a few sequestered elements mentioned by Giddens which return to a subject's routine through cinema and start functioning in a new way. For instance, by our current understanding, nature is incorporated into everyday world under our control. We talk only about things we can foresee or which do not change our routine, such as temperature, rainfall, wind and other. However, tsunami, typhoon or earthquake is understood as a catastrophe. As these natural occurrences cannot be controlled, they become segregated and excluded. For this reason, any intrusion to our routine by the mentioned phenomena is understood as a catastrophic event disturbing daily practices (Albert Camus). In this case, films about the cities washed by tsunamis or destroyed by earthquakes give viewers thrill or sensation that they lack in everyday life. That is why the consumers of cinema pay for seeing it.

It is the same case with such sequestered elements of experience as criminality and madness: they are separated from everyday life and can function only in a strictly defined way. These two Giddens' parameters violate margins of what is normal or tolerated in the society of consumers. Criminals or subjects regarded as mentally sick are separated from others and from daily life; they have their own places or institutions in which they are *placed*. These institutions are separated from the world and isolated: the buildings are moved or built outside of the city centers where they are hardly seen among trees or forests and enclosed by high fences. We can see that certain details of the life of a subject are understood as interferences, which require special control and isolation. Giddens stresses that prisons and mental institutions are treated in the same way as hospitals: they are the places for *sequestered* people who lost their rights to participate in traditional social practices (Giddens 2004). They similarly hide such fatal life moments as birth, death and illness from the public (Giddens 2004). Our great-grandfathers or grandparents who lived or still live in the villages remember that a couple of decades ago people gave births and held funeral ceremonies at home with the help from their family members or neighbors. Nowadays the beginning and end of life are separated from everyday practices; wounds are bandaged and medications are injected only at hospitals or clinics. Daily routine has become maximally cleared, calm, quite, predictable and controlled leading to increased curiosity of a subject. What happens beyond prison walls? What does a person with mental illness think about? What do people see before death? These questions foster the production of consumer goods because the cinema exploit eliminated practices and return them in a new form. It can be illustrated by many films, which have achieved a great success and popularity: *The Shawshank Redemption* shows the world of a prison and prisoner's life, *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* talks about everyday life of patients and personnel of mental hospital and *The Silence of the Lambs* involves the aspects of both mentioned films. The commercial cinema becomes the form of rehabilitation of extruded excesses. For instance, death is sequestered and deleted from everyday space and time but later is visualized with cinematographic views and produced to a mass scale (Milerius 2013: 167). In such a way the cinema industry stimulates a need for consuming and creates economic value from subject's desired events that let consumers return to a boring daily routine with new experiences.

### The role of the daily routine structure for the commercial cinema (*factual* and *contra-factual* levels)

Our analyzed commercial cinema industry takes its material for stories and plots not only from the sequestered experience but from everyday life structure of a subject as well. The previously mentioned Giddens' concept of *protective cocoon* is a feeling of invulnerability, which prevents from negative opportunities (Giddens 2004). This protective cocoon could be understood as a fundamental trust in a world, which functions as the feeling of impracticability of the abstract contra-factual opportunities. The feeling of trust is necessary for daily routine structure in order to function; it consists of two levels of events or situations. The first level is a *factual level*, for instance, I pick up a cup of coffee in the morning. The second level by Giddens is called a *contra-factual level* or a world of abstract contra-factual opportunities (Giddens 2004). Continuing our example, we can say that the second level is composed of all possible events, which can happen when we will be picking up the cup: it can slip and smash on the floor; I can spill it on my clothes; I can choke or stop breathing or the ceilings can fall and the house can collapse because of a storm or an earthquake while drinking coffee; there is a possibility of meteorite, atomic war or global warming at that particular moment. All possibilities that could happen at this moment (contra-factual possibilities) look abstract to a subject as something that is far away from daily routine. However, from the abstract level contra-factual possibilities can be *moved* to the concrete level. Giddens invokes the example of traffic accident and asks rhetorically which driver does not drive slower after seeing a huge car accident (Giddens 2004). Even after a news report on TV about a crime near our house we can become afraid to go out in the evening. When we see something in reality our *protective cocoon* is violated and we understand that contra-factual possibilities are real. Here we have to come back to the previously analyzed problems of the cinema industry and try to understand what commercial cinema does to contra-factual possibilities that can be easily moved to the factual level. Films exploit possibilities from the contra-factual level and it is specific not only to the apocalyptic cinema (which Milerius talks about) but also to the majority of the mainstream films. The cinema offers many different ways of seeing a monotonous daily routine in the new perspectives for a bored viewer. Boredom functions as a motor in a situation where we lack events because it generates a desire for shocks and incidents (Milerius 2013: 63). The commercial cinema satisfies the need for unseen events, which are known to the viewers but only in the abstract and unreflective levels. The cinema successfully takes advantage of it: for daily routine the directly invisible contra-factual plane, which has a need to be visualized or made into visible and later be neutralized is necessary because otherwise *daily routine could never get rid of the stigma of monotonous medium* (Milerius 2013: 69). In other words, we go to the cinema in order to change our relation with daily world, which is boring because it is predictable, monotonous and structured. Together with a ticket we buy an opportunity to see our daily life differently.

## Conclusions

The analysis of the cinema industry showed that going to the cinema can be understood as an extension of work because we return money and in this way we uphold the existence of the capitalistic system. It means that the cinema industry functions as a standardized model of free time. Moreover, a permanent need for new films is an outcome of desires formulated by the society of consumers. Also, oblivion and demand for novelty are inherent for these longings. Such parameters, which are specific for the society of consumers, are reflected in the works of the commercial cinema. That is why the main task of the mainstream films is a fulfillment of the absence of radical experiences (such as death, insanity, catastrophes and others) in the monotonous daily routine of a subject. The films bring back missing experiences by visualizing them and in this way give an opportunity for a viewer to come back to the routinized and monotonous life with a new and different attitude.

## References

- Adorno, Th. W.; Horkheimer, M. 1979. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. London: Verso.
- Arendt, H. 1991. *The Human Condition*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Bartkuvienė, I. 2015. Kaip nušvinta Apšvieta, *Lietuvos literatūros vertėjų sąjunga* [online], [cited 5 October 2015]. Available from Internet: <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=272>
- Bauman, Z. 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bauman, Z. 2006. *Liquid Life*. Cambridge, Malden, MA: Polity.
- Černevičiūtė, J.; Strazdas, R. 2014. Kūrybingumo sampratų raida: nuo genijaus į kūrybines sistemas, *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 22(2): 145–152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/cpc.2014.10>
- Dictionary.com. 2015. *Art Film* [online], [cited 6 October 2015]. Available from Internet: <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/art-film>
- Elsaesser, Th.; Hagener, M. 2010. *Film Theory: An Introduction through the Senses*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Giddens, A. 2004. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Howkins, J. 2001. *The Creative Economy: How People Make Money from Ideas*. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.
- Kačerauskas, T. 2014. Kultūrinės industrijos kritika ir kūrybinių industrijų problemos, *Logos-Vilnius* 81: 80–90.
- Kačerauskas, T. 2013. Kūrybos ir kultūros industrijos: filosofiniai, sociologiniai ir komunikaciniai aspektai, *Filosofija. Sociologija* 24(3): 112–120.
- Kavaliauskas, T. 2008. Tapatybė ir vartotojiškos moralės iššūkiai, *Eurozine* [online], [cited 5 October 2015]. Available from Internet: <http://www.eurozine.com/pdf/2008-07-03-kavaliauskas-lt.pdf>
- Mickūnas, A. 2015. Film as Modern Medium and Ontology, *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 23(1): 44–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/cpc.2015.222>
- Milerius, N. 2013. *Apokaliptė kine: filosofinės prielaidos*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Milerius, N.; Žukauskaitė, A.; Baranova, J.; Sabolius, K.; Brašiškis, L. 2013. *Kinas ir filosofija*. Milerius, N. (Sud.). Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Nikiforova, B. 2015. Philosophy of Matter Manipulation in Brothers Quay's Metaphorical Animation World, *Creativity Studies* 8(1): 3–11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/23450479.2015.1015464>

Pruskus, V. 2013. Pramogos kaip komunikacijos forma: samprata ir socialinės funkcijos, *San-talka: filosofija, komunikacija* 21(1): 6–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/cpc.2013.01>

Sabolius, K. 2012. *Inirtingas miegas: vaizduotė ir fenomenologija*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Sabolius, K. 2013. *Įsivaizduojamybė*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

ThePervert'sGuide.com. 2006. *The Pervert's Guide to Cinema* [online], [cited 6 October 2015]. Parts 1–3. Available from Internet: <http://www.thepervertsguide.com/presskit.doc>

## KOMERCINIO KINO POPULIARUMO PRIEŽASTYS KŪRYBINIŲ INDUSTRIJŲ KONTEKSTE

Eivina STANIULYTĖ

### Santrauka

Šio darbo ašis – komercinio kino fenomenas. Darbo tikslas – skirtingų sociologinių ir filosofinių teorijų perspektyvoje išanalizuoti komercinį kiną (filmus) kaip vieną populiariausių kūrybinių industrijų produktų arba veiklos rezultatų. Tuo bus siekiama atsakyti į klausimą, kokios priežastys skatina ir lemia tokį greitą kino industrijos augimą ir populiarumą. Kitais žodžiais tariant, šiuo darbu bus siekiama rasti ryšį tarp kino industrijos ir vartotojiškosios kultūros. Visa tai verčia daryti prielaidą, kad komercinis kinas yra pajėgus kurti naujus žiūrovo troškimus, poreikius ar reikmes bei gali primesti prasmes ar reikšmes, kurias subjektas „vartoja“. Tokia straipsnio tezė analizuojama pasitelkiant šias sampratas: *laisvalaikis* ir *nuobodulys*, *gamintojų visuomenė* ir *vartotojų visuomenė*, *patirties sekvestracija* bei *faktinis / kontrafaktinis* kasdienybės lygmuo.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: komercinis kinas, vartojimas, troškimų/poreikių konstravimas, kultūros industrija, žiūrovai.