

The Netflix Effect?

On updating the cinematic apparatus theory



Djoeke Hannah Vielen

3513173 University of Utrecht

Guidance Counselor: Ingrid Hoofd

Date: 29-4-2018

Abstract

This thesis speculates about the possible ways in which Netflix may influence Hollywood blockbusters. Whereas journalistic media focus on the competition between Hollywood and Netflix, academic writings primarily focus on the relation between Netflix and television. Missing from this academic discussion are the stories each medium tells and how they influence each other's content. In this thesis I ask that question.

To research 'the Netflix effect', a term already used to describe its effect on the television production landscape (McDonald et al. 2016), I use the cinematic apparatus theory as a theoretical framework to compare the environments that host the screens of both Netflix and the cinema.

The cinematic apparatus theory has a controversial position within film and cultural studies. While also addressing the criticism the theory received, I argue in my thesis that one of the biggest problems with the theory is its assertion that the cinema is the superior way of experiencing movies. This argumentative thesis is in large part a response to Elsaesser's essay '*What Is Left of the Cinematic Apparatus, or Why We Should Retain (and Return to) It*' (Elsaesser, 2011). In this essay he argues that the theory could allow for new insights in how other screen based media work. Taking his cue, I constructed an updated version of the theory following Scott C. Richmond update on the theory, supplemented by Elsaesser and Metz's interpretations. By doing this, more insight and understanding is given in how the environment influences the stories of the screen and gives possible hints in how Netflix has the ability –or already has– influenced cinematic storytelling in Hollywood blockbusters.

Inhoud

- Abstract 1
- 1. Introduction..... 4
 - 1.1 Netflix and Hollywood Blockbusters 6
 - 1.2 The Cinematic Apparatus Theory 6
- 2 Introducing Netflix, Hollywood Blockbusters, and the Cinematic Apparatus Theory..... 9
 - 2.1 Netflix’s Ways of Telling Stories 9
 - 2.2 The Environments of the Movies We Watch 11
 - 2.3 The Theoretical Framework of the Cinematic Apparatus Theory 14
 - 2.3.1 A New Understanding of the Cinematic Apparatus Theory. 15
- 3 Comparing the Netflix and Cinematic Narrative Environments..... 18
 - 3.1 Cinema of Attractions..... 18
 - 3.2 Cinema of Illinx 19
 - 3.3 The Marvel Cinematic Universe, the Subjective Extension 21
 - 3.4 The Spatial Extensions and the Temporal register of the Cinema and Netflix..... 22
- 4. Conclusion, Outside the Apparatus..... 24
- Bibliography..... 27

1. Introduction

Netflix is an online, video-on-demand, streaming company that produces its own audio-visual stories. This puts the company at odds with traditional film producers, as evidenced by the booing incident at the 2017 Cannes Film Festival. During this event, Netflix screened its own produced film *Okja* (Bong Joon-Jo 2017). It was reported that the audience at the screening were booing at the screen as soon as the Netflix logo was shown (Castillo 2017). Though some time later, news outlets reported that the audiences heckles were because of technical issues. Initially, the story was reported as another incident that showed the strained relation between Netflix and cinema filmmakers. What made this incident stand out is that it followed weeks of discussion between Netflix, the Cannes Festival, and the Federation of French Cinemas about the legitimacy of Netflix-produced works. After Netflix entered the film *Okja* (Bong Joon-jo 2017) to the festival, the festival changed its rules for participants: to be eligible for awards, films must have a theatrical release (Castillo 2017). This was considered to slight Netflix, as they present all their produced content directly on their website. This incident was used as another example of the tense relationship between the film industry and Netflix.

While the booing incident happened in France, most examples of incidents that portray the tense relationship between traditional filmmakers and Netflix happen in Hollywood. There are several reasons for this strained relationship. The first is that Netflix is prepared to pay far more for talent. A traditional Hollywood contract includes, in addition to a regular payment, a 'back end fee'. A back-end fee is where the studio makes specific deals with the talent. These can include, for example how much an actor receives based on box-office sales. Netflix does not offer back-end fees, but compensates for this by offering higher salaries to their actors. Whereas the final sum for an actor in a traditional Hollywood film is not clear from the start, with Netflix it is (Master 2016). The second reason is that Netflix fights the 'theatrical window'. This term refers to the time that movie theatres have the exclusive right to show a film. Netflix has released movies in theatres, but launches them on their site simultaneously. Viewers can watch Netflix movies at the cinema or at home. This choice nullifies the theatrical window (Master 2016). The third and last reason Netflix irks Hollywood is that they do not disclose their ratings to the public, because their business model does not rely on advertisement (Lev-Ram 2016)¹. The Hollywood Reporter reports that little, if any, mention was made about the launch of *Stranger Things* (2016). The creators of this show have reported that Netflix did not tell the makers how the show was perceived or how well it did (Master 2016).

The reasons above are found in journalistic media, which have mainly focused on how Netflix disrupts Hollywood on an economic and production level. What I miss here is how these tensions and

¹ Although they frequently have 'product placements' (Bennet 2018).

disruptions will eventually show on the big screen. This is what I also miss in academic literature, that discusses Netflix mostly in context in how it disrupts television which is called 'the Netflix effect'. This term refers to changing viewer expectations and a technological shift that changes the production processes in the entertainment industry (McDonald et al. 2016, 1-2). The book *The Netflix effect* (2016) elaborates on the influence of Netflix on the production process, as well as the economic and political decisions made in the television industry (McDonald et al. 2016). So where is Hollywood in this discussion? If news articles mention how Netflix disrupts the normal ways a movie is produced in Hollywood, then surely it also influences the Hollywood film itself.

That new media influences the 'old' media is a statement one should be careful with. Jan Simons explains that much of the new things that new (digital) media bring are not that new after all (Simons 2002, 178). Simons first example is that of the Sensorama, a machine which was thought of in the 1950's. It was an immersive environment who would speak to all the senses of the human body, and was called 'The Cinema of the Future'. Virtual reality is thus a variation of this concept where the concept of virtual reality already existed before the invention of the computer (Simons 2002, 155). To further build on this; the Sensorama is also a variation on the Renaissance perspective, a painting technique to represent reality as much as possible.

Yet Simons also points out that digital technology certainly changes how we experience former media. For example, film shows wear and tear over time, while digital moving images do not have this problem. However, in exchange there is a loss of certainty. While with film there is a certain degree of assurance that what was filmed once existed, with computer generated images that assurance has become a lot less. In return, digital film gives filmmakers more freedom to decide what they want to happen on the screen (Simons 2002, 160-168). Another example Simons gives in how the experience of going to the movies changed, is that where in classic Hollywood style the audience was 'tucked away' and not addressed, in the current Hollywood style the audience is put in a roller-coaster and flung head-first in what is happening on the screen (Simons 2002, 176). Yet, Simons is careful to call the roller-coaster aspect something new as the attraction of the film always was used to lure in the audience (Simons 2002, 177).

His main point is that the new technologies are not a break with the past, but a continuity, was already there, or exist in a larger pattern. However, that does not mean that these new technologies do not offer new experiences. I agree with this and want to take a closer look at how a new digital medium influences the cinema experience. Instead of examining how Netflix influences the production processes or is part of a cultural/political/economic landscape in the film industry, I am more interested in how this will influence the stories that are told in the cinema. Because in the end, the way a story is told will have the biggest impact in how a movie is experienced.

1.1 Netflix and Hollywood Blockbusters

I argue that Netflix already has an influence on the Hollywood film simply because of the tensions earlier described. Still that influence will be limited. First, there is a reason I focus on Hollywood and not, say, Japanese or Singaporean cinema, as the culture and history of the cinema is vastly different than that of Hollywood. Although I am not from Hollywood, I still grew up with Hollywood movies and with its conventions. Secondly, Hollywood is known for its many genres and, as a result, offers many modes of receiving and experiencing an audio-visual story. In this thesis, the kind of films I will mostly discuss is that of the Hollywood blockbuster. I propose that the Hollywood blockbuster is the most influenced by other type of media, or at least the most visibly influenced.

The original meaning of the term 'blockbuster' was to indicate that a movie did extremely well at the box office (Shone 2004b). This is one of the reasons why I choose to focus on this type of film. Hollywood blockbusters are the type of films that keep the economy of the Hollywood industry going. Thomas Elsaesser describes that this type of movies come with such a big budget, that the marketing campaigns are organised like a military operation, concluding that this is the main reason why Blockbusters are so expensive to make (Elsaesser 2002, 16-17). As such these films are in direct competition with new media that offer an alternative to going to the movies.

Another reason on why I focus on the Hollywood blockbuster is because they also have become a genre. Both Thomas Shone, a film journalist and Elsaesser, a film academic, have described the Hollywood blockbuster in similar ways. Shone writes that a blockbuster is now 'Often science-fiction, but not necessarily, something to do with action movies although not always' (Shone 2004b, 28). According to Elsaesser a blockbuster is usually about grand subjects, like the end of the world, a world war, monsters from another planet, or a galactic battle. A blockbuster usually features a young male hero² with great powers, facing an impossible task (Elsaesser 2002, 16-17). As I shall demonstrate the conventions of the genre have not changed that much yet. How these conventions are told did change. I argue that this is in large part due to the influence from other audio-visual media, including Netflix.

1.2 The Cinematic Apparatus Theory

One of Simons conclusions was that the verb 'digital' was not a signalling function, but an analytical one. The verb could be used to re-think old notions on audio-visual media (Simons 2002, 179). This is what Elsaesser wanted to with his proposal to use the cinematic apparatus theory to research the influence of new media on cinema. The cinematic apparatus theory became popular in the seventies,

² There are of course blockbusters with female leads, so the emphasises of this sentence lies on the word; usually.

but ended up being thoroughly discredited in film studies, as well as psychology and cultural studies (Elsaesser 2011, 34). While the theory is now out of favour, it had been popular with film scholars in its beginning stage. It is this initial popularity that piqued Elsaesser's interest. Instead of disregarding the theory altogether, the theory could be contextualised in what demand it was supplying (Elsaesser 2011, 34). It seemed to answer the question on what exactly happened to an audience that is watching a film in the cinema.

Elsaesser gives a short summary of the cinematic apparatus theory:

[T]he fixed geometrical arrangement of the three main elements: screen, projector, spectator; and finally, the metaphoric association of this arrangement with Freud's (or Lacan's) concept of mis-recognition, a founding moment of psychic identity, a philosophical analogy with Plato's parable of the cave, a founding moment of Western idealism (Elsaesser 2011, 34).

The first part of the quote refers to the cinematic setting and the association between Plato's cave and the cinema. As a historical construct, it assumes that the cinematic environment was destined to be a narrative medium (Elsaesser 2011, 35). However, if it is regarded as a theoretical construct, the theory can be used to analyse other settings where audio-visual stories are experienced. This means that it can also be used to analyse audio-visual objects (Elsaesser 2011, 38-42). The second part of the quote, about mis-recognition, is under-explored in his essay, and causes the first challenge to use the theory as a theoretical construction to analyse other media besides the cinema. Christopher Metz, one of the contributors to the theory calls the cinema screen a dream or hallucination happening right in front of you (Metz 1982). When an audience is so entranced with what is happening on the screen they will reside in what I call a dream-like state. According to the theory this state can only happen in the dark setting of the cinema where you are forced to stay still and watch the big screen³. Nonetheless, I want to move away from this notion since I agree with Elsaesser and want to use it to analyse Netflix.

Fortunately, I am not the first to use the theory on other settings besides the interior of the cinema. Sue Morris uses the theory to analyse first person shooter gamers. Games can offer the same conditions as the cinema. Morris describes a situation in which a gamer is in a dark-lit room, stuck in one position in relation to the screen. Unlike with film, the gamer is put in a dream-like state by giving her an amount of control over what happens on the screen (Morris 2002, 89). Morris's article shows that a dream-like state can be achieved outside cinema as well. Anne Friedberg uses the theory as well to draw comparisons between similar situations. She describes the history of the

³ Which incidentally is a western convention of watching a film, according to my supervisor who told me about her Singaporean cinema experience.

shopping mall where shops developed windows to that showcased objects to buy, and the movie theatres developed windows that showcased the subconscious (Friedberg 130-132).

My main reason to use this theory is because it takes the environment where a story is shown into consideration. This allows one to analyse and compare different environments with each other. However, films and series are designed to be shown in a specific environment. How is it then possible to compare the stories each medium tells? First by using a theoretical framework that gives the right tools for this comparison. Although the cinematic apparatus theory has been used on other environments than the cinematic one, it needs to be updated for it to be used to compare the Netflix and cinematic environment. In the second chapter, together with introducing the objects of study, I will write up an updated version of the theory using arguments and new interpretations of Scot C. Richmond and Elsaesser. Secondly, which Netflix stories and which cinematic stories can be compared with each other? In the third chapter I introduce the Marvel Cinematic Universe story that not shows on the cinematic screen, but on the Netflix screen as well. Because of the same build-up in narrative structure, the Marvel Netflix series and the Marvel film series provide a good case-study to test out the updated version of the cinematic apparatus theory as well as answer the question on how Netflix might influence the Hollywood blockbuster. As it turns out, the historical context of the theory gives the answer to the main question.

2 Introducing Netflix, Hollywood Blockbusters, and the Cinematic Apparatus Theory

Before discussing the theoretical framework, let's first introduce Netflix itself. Netflix is a video-on-demand streaming service. What makes the company notable is the way it produces and presents its audio-visual content. An example of this is that it encourages its audience to stay and watch the next episode. It does this by automatically playing the next episode in a series, or suggesting other films based on earlier viewing behaviour. By comparison to the streaming companies Hulu and Amazon Prime, Netflix presents a unique viewing experience. Both Hulu and Amazon Prime have a similar target audience, and –like Netflix– released original content between 2011 and 2013 (Sharma 2016, 12-14).

2.1 Netflix's Ways of Telling Stories

At the beginning of the millennium, American television networks began to sell television episodes online through services such as iTunes. In 2006, the company Amazon also offered films and television episodes for sale through their own service, and offering free content to those who subscribed to the service. While Netflix started its streaming service in 2007, a joint venture between television networks NBC, FOX and ABC, started Hulu as a free video-on-demand website. In 2010, Hulu shifted to a paid-subscription model. Whereas Netflix and Amazon do not have commercial breaks, Hulu maintained them. This was because of its business model and affiliation with television networks.

Netflix was exceptional at that time because it released the episodes of each season at the same time. Amazon experimented with different release models, both following Netflix's example, as well as maintaining a weekly release model (Sharma 2016, 14). Ultimately Amazon decided to stick to a weekly release schedule. Amazon Studios Director Roy Price told that the weekly release model allows for more anticipation and conversation surrounding a new series (Lynch 2013). The Netflix release model is one of four features that set Netflix apart from other streaming companies and give its viewers a unique viewing experience. In addition, Netflix observes and collects its audience's watching behaviour, relies on paid-subscriptions, and has a global market. These four aspects influence the narratives of their original content (Sharma 2016). The first aspect, its data collection, contributed to the American remake of *House of Cards* (1990). Based on audience watching behaviour, Netflix predicted that audiences who watched the British version of *House of Cards* (1990) also liked the actor Kevin Spacey and director David Fincher (Vanhemert 2013). Thus in 2013 Netflix released its first original content, *House of Cards* (2013), starring Kevin Spacey and directed by David Fincher.

The second aspect, its sole reliance on paid subscriptions, ensures that Netflix does not use commercials. The lack of dependence on advertising money has two consequences for storytelling.

The first is that creators do not need to take commercial breaks into account. Normally an episode or show needs to be written with a short cliff-hanger. This is to make sure that the audience wants to continue watching after the commercials (Sharma 2016, 17). Because Netflix does not have commercial breaks, the tension of the story is divided differently over one episode. This leads to the second consequence, namely the 'hands off approach' of Netflix regarding the writing of original content. Television networks closely examine audience preferences because more viewers mean more ad revenue. This means that, instead of looking at what audience like to watch, they look at what advertisers like their brand to be associated with (Sharma 2016, 29). Networks give notes to content producers to make the story more suitable for advertisers. This can result in either a collaborative relationship, or an adversarial one. Television writer Allan Ball commented regarding these notes, that it always came down to making a character more likeable or the story less complicated. It is suggested that these kinds of stories are more suitable for advertisers. Because Netflix does not rely on paid subscription, it can pay more attention to audience preference (Sharma 2016, 29-30).

The third aspect is that Netflix orders by the season, instead of episodes for its series. Netflix decided this based on the company's experience as an online DVD-rental company. Their customers would order whole seasons of television series that were unlikely to re-run on television because of their complex storytelling, making them less advertising-friendly (McAlone 2016). Writers of Netflix shows planned their storylines over longer periods instead of episodes. This had the same effect as leaving out commercials in the middle of an episode. Writers still made sure that the audience wanted to watch the next episode, but could dispense with reminding the audience what happened on the last episode. Also, they could tell a story over the span of season, instead of calculating how many additional episodes the production crew was allotted to tell their story.

Finally, the fourth aspect is Netflix's ambition to be a global company. This ambition also influences the kind of narratives Netflix features (Sharma 2016, 68). For example, Netflix original content *Narcos* (2015) took advantage of the fact that Netflix also streamed in Latin America. The creators could hire actors from both the United States and Columbia and, hence, let actors speak their own language. Because of the documentary style of the series, it would not have come across as realistic if everyone had spoken English. While this might seem logical, film and television industry lore proclaims that American audiences do not like to read subtitles (Sharma 2016, 70). Because of Netflix's global ambitions, it can tell stories that appeal to an audience around the globe, not just for an American one.

The way Netflix bases its decisions on audience watching behaviour, its sole reliance on paid subscriptions, the immediate release of episodes, and its global ambitions makes Netflix way of telling stories a unique experience. However, these aspects mostly set Netflix apart from how

television and other streaming services tell stories. So, how does the way Netflix produce its own content, influence how the story in a movie is told, and how does this produce a different viewing experience than movies produced for the cinema?

I suggest that the biggest difference lies within the environment where Netflix portrays its movies. While Netflix movies can be portrayed on the big screen as seen in the introduction of this thesis, the movies are produced for environments in the private sphere. The private sphere does not necessarily reference the living room where the audience watches a movie. It can also reference the audience or viewer that is watching a movie in bed, or on their long commute to home. Netflix produces for flexible screens in different sizes. While television is getting more digital, I argue that it mainly produces for the audience on the couch in the living room for the screen that is not as flexible in moving its position in comparison to the mobile phones and tablets.

The cinema is set in a public setting where viewers are watching a movie at the same time with the rest of the audience. This audience is 'stuck' for a certain amount of time watching a screen that is hard to duplicate for a private setting. Another difference is that going to the cinema is an event that the audience must pay for and travel to. Therefore, it is harder to walk away during a movie because of the time and effort already put up on front to see this movie. Then there is also the fact that there is less choice in what the audience can watch at the cinema. Mostly only the newest films with can be watched in cinemas. This also counts for non-blockbuster films.

I argue that this aspect is key in how Netflix can influence storytelling in Hollywood blockbusters. Therefore, the cinematic apparatus theory is an important theory to address, because one of the main arguments of the theory is that the environment of where a movie is watched determines how a film is experienced and how it is told.

2.2 The Environments of the Movies We Watch

The cinematic apparatus theory has its origin in multiple essays written in the early seventies including writers such as Jean-Louis Baudry and Christian Metz. Baudry theorised that going to the movies entailed the same circumstances as dreaming. Just like laying down in bed every night for several hours and dreaming, attending movies involves voluntarily sitting still for the length of a film and only seeing what is on the screen. The audience is in an immobile state, in complete darkness, while watching a dream unfold (Verstraten 2008, 39). The elements of cinema that cause this dream-like state lay in the way the screen, projector and the audience are positioned. It can be compared to Plato's cave, a theoretical situation in which people are chained in a cave and can only see the shadows on the wall that are made by a fire behind them. These people do not realise how these shadows are made. For them, the shadows make up the world they live in (Verstraten 2008, 40). This allegory mirrors what happens to an audience in a cinema. However, the cave situation is more

fitting to the cinematic environment than for example, television. Analysing the history of cinematic apparatus theory, it can be argued that the theory was first and foremost designed to emphasize the differences between these two media (Verstraten 2008, 47).

The environment of television and cinema are different, in the way the audience is positioned and the rooms in which these media present their audio-visual content. Television for example, needs to constantly attract the attention of the viewers to make them watch the screen. This is because the television is often placed in an environment where the audience has more freedom to choose activities other than watching the screen. Meanwhile at the cinema, the environment is designed to keep the audience watching the entire film. The only thing meant to attract the audience's attention is the large screen in front of them. Metz argues that the dream-state where the viewer resides in during a film leaves him immobile. This effect is supposed to be so strong that even when the story of the film calls for action the audience remains immobile because the environment put them in this state (Metz 1982, 110-117).

Another element that is typical for television at that time is that it has the power to regulate its audience's life. The programmes aired on a regular schedule, and many are watched simultaneously by many people. Television gives its audience a shared experience (Verstraten 2008, 50)⁴. The stories that cinema told reacted to the new medium. Verstraten gives the examples of filmmakers Andrei Tarkovski and Michelangelo Antonioni. These filmmakers are well-known for making movies in which time passes slowly. These types of films are not suitable for television, because the environment of television allows for more distraction (Verstraten 2008, 55). The thought that 'if television was fast and "morally nonnutrient", the films in theatres had to be long, slow and good for you' (Shone 2004b, 30).

The theory became in disuse and cinema began to show features previously only prescribed to television. While movies can be attended with a group of friends, the way the cinema is built still makes going to the movies a solitary experience. Every member of the audience sits in the dark and only watches the screen. In the west, social protocol dictates that talking about the film is only allowed after the movie is over. However, when a new generation of directors began to make movies, this solitary experience became a more shared one. Shone explains what a different experience the film *Jaws* (Spielberg 1975) brought to the audience of cinema.

Movies used to be a solitary experience. You sat in the dark alone, no matter how many people surrounded you. (...) The *Godfather*, which was essentially a study in collective isolation; you left the theatre eyeing your fellow moviegoers with new unease, uncertain

⁴ At least this is what television used to be before the introduction of digital television where watching missed programs became easier.

whether you would care to share a theatre with them again. But *Jaws* united its audience in common cause— a shared unwillingness to be served up as lunch—and you came out delivering high-fives to the three hundred or so new best friends you’d just narrowly avoided death with (Shone 2004b, 36-37).

Bob Gale, co-writer on *Back to the Future* (Zemeckis, 1985), says that ‘[t]he seventies were the last decade where movies were being made by people who did not grow up on television’ (Shone 2004a, 6). While the cinema itself had not changed much in the way it presented its stories, there was still a change in the kind of stories told after the introduction of television.

One of the reasons why the cinematic apparatus theory became in disuse was because television and cinema developed a relation that benefited each other. Television gave old movies a second life and aired advertisements for new movies (Verstraten 2008, 47). Also, the theory asserted an inactive audience whereas the new kind of Hollywood films proved that an audience can indeed react to a screen and enjoy a movie together. Simons even recalls films that put their audience in a roller-coaster. However, not all films put their audience in a roller-coaster. As I discussed in the introduction, the movies I will be using as examples belong to the Hollywood blockbuster genre.

The blockbuster genre is a genre about grand stories with larger than life people quoting Shone and Elsaesser. Still genres are difficult to define. A crime film is quickly recognised, but the elements that makes a film a crime film can be debated. If blockbusters are indeed an independent genre, then this problematizes writing about it. It requires a determination of which movies are taken into consideration and compared. However, both Elsaesser and Shone name two other elements that can help with this. Shone names the reception and financial success of a film and Elsaesser names the marketing campaign and budget that accompanies the film. The movies I will discuss have had either success at the box office, which indicates a large audience, or have had an expensive marketing campaign pre-ceding its release in theatres. Because of these requirements, the Hollywood blockbuster is the genre that is most influenced with new technologies. They have the budget to make use of new technologies and because of their large audience they also have more competition from other media with the ability to show movies. This is why I ask if Netflix has a potential influence on Hollywood blockbusters.

So now Netflix has been introduced, the theory and what kind of movies are taken into consideration, the question remains is how to analyse how Netflix could influence Hollywood blockbusters. The next paragraph will go further in-depth in how the cinematic apparatus theory created and how it became a controversial theory. Then I will argue how it could be used to contextualise the blockbusters portrayed in theatres with the arrival of Netflix.

2.3 The Theoretical Framework of the Cinematic Apparatus Theory

Christian Metz focuses on what happens between the screen and the audience in the dream-like state which an audience resides in when watching a film in the theatre. He calls this the identification process. Metz bases this process on Lacan's mirror theory, a stage in the development of a child, when it begins to form a sense of self. In this stage, the child's motor skills are behind its physical ambitions. The image a child sees in the mirror does seem to have the psychological abilities the child desires. Thus, the child imagines that the body in the mirror is more perfect than its experience of its own body (Reich, Richmond 2014, 8). The child does not yet recognise itself in the mirror, but does see an image of a better self. Metz likens the mirror to the screen. The audience, who theoretically remain motionless in the cinema, see characters on the screen who have the freedom to move. The audience recognises the characters on the screen, but these characters have the freedom to move and are, at the time of the screening, the better version of the audience (Metz 1982, 101-129). Metz uses Freudian psychoanalysis to describe the catatonic state the spectator resides in during a film. The ego, id and super-ego pass by as he explains what happens inside the spectator's mind but these terms might as easily be used to explain what happens inside the spectator's mind in front of a television. The id represents the urges the person wants whereas the super-ego the conventions and norms that society puts upon a person that s/he grows up in. The ego is the state that mediates between these two extremes. Dreaming is then said where the urges of the id come forward, but can instantly be gratified by the ego without conflicting the super-ego (Metz 1982, 57, 104). This is why the projections on the screen, and the conditions of the cinema are compared with voluntarily putting oneself into a dream-like state.

There are a couple of things that are problematic with Metz his assertion on the theoretical framework of the cinematic apparatus. Many of them are already addressed by other researchers who wanted to dust off the theory, but for my use one problematic aspect has to be more thoroughly addressed. The theory was designed to only apply to the cinematic environment. While I mentioned other researchers applying the theory to other settings, and respond to Elsaesser his suggestion to apply the theory on other media settings as well, there is a fundamental problem with the assertion that the theory can only be used in a cinematic setting. It came to my attention that while reading the *Imaginary Signifier* where Metz explains his point of view on the cinematic apparatus theory, the only time he mentions television is when he states that the cinema along with television is the only art that is also an industry (Metz 1982, 75). Instead of focusing on the meaning of this comment I want to bring attention to the fact that it is the only time television is mentioned in his book. He does not mention a reason where the state of the spectator in the cinema that he

describes would not be applicable on the state of a spectator watching television. Metz mentions that the projector of the cinematic setting is set behind the audience point of view (Metz 1982, 49). The projector is thus figurally speaking in the back of the spectator's mind and project thoughts and desires on a big screen in front of him. With television, there is no projector positions behind the spectator, but instead the images are thrown to the spectator's face. My suggestion is that there is no difference between a spectator who is in a dream-like state in the cinema, or a couch-potato who is in a dream-like state in front of a television. Sue Morris describes a gamer who is intensely focuses on a screen. The conditions that are met in the room can be explained by Metz description of this dream-like state. I must once again conclude that the theory was meant to elevate cinema above television. Despite the intent of the theory it is nonetheless still applicable to other media environments.

2.3.1 A New Understanding of the Cinematic Apparatus Theory.

Elisabeth Reich and Scot C. Richmond react to Metz his vision on the apparatus theory in their introduction of the theory. They assess that one of the reasons why the theory was so whole heartedly rejected is because it implied a monolithic bloc of audience (Reich, Richmond 2014, 3). Going by the descriptions of Metz it can be assumed that this monolithic bloc of audience is Caucasian male. This problematises the theory further. It matters who the viewer is because it influences how s/he experiences a film. There is a difference in how Neil de Grasse Tyson watches a sci-fi movie and how someone with another educational background experiences the same film. Yet, it is certainly possible that each can identify with, or engross themselves in what is happening on the screen, be it on their own terms. Reich and Richmond propose to see the cinema as a playground where people can play with various identities (Reich, Richmond 2014, 10-11).

Reich and Richmond's main argument hangs on the framework of Metz's use of primary identification and secondary identification (Reich, Richmond 2014, 5). Primary identification is supposed to be the process of the audience sitting in the theatre and identifying with the camera's eye. Secondary identification is where the audience identifies with the actual story that the film portrays. This schematic is an oversimplified version of what I understood from both Metz his book *The Imaginary Signifier*, and the explanation of Reich and Richmond. These concepts were not all that present in Metz his book as Reich and Richmond portrayed in their article. The concepts were put in use to explain how an audience goes from one state into the next (Metz 1982, 154-167). Metz relies more on Freud's concept of the ego and id, and explains this psychological process with the help of the academic field of linguistics (Metz 1982, 17-41). Richmond proposes another take, namely that of play.

He bases his proposal on Roger Caillois's work in *Man Play, and Games* (1958), where he writes about the distinction between mimesis andilinx. Mimesis refers to playing pretend. An example of this is children playing house. Ilinx refers to the pursuit of vertigo, which can be compared to people going on roller coasters, or children who spin very fast to make themselves dizzy (Richmond 2012, 126). The reason for pairing these two concepts together is that both concepts are about making a person momentarily forget themselves. Mimesis is when one forgets oneself and becomes someone else. Ilinx is when one 'momentarily destroys the stability of perception and inflicts a kind of voluptuous panic upon an otherwise lucid mind' (Richmond 2012, 126-127). Ilinx is not simply about the pursuit of vertigo, but also that uncanny moment when the audience's eyes are replaced with the camera's lens. It is about the audience members themselves, their consciousness momentarily forgotten. According to Richmond, both concepts are needed and can happen at the same time. Mimesis and ilinx do not replace identification, but rather are the names of the processes that happen while an audience identifies with what is happening on the screen (Richmond 2012, 133).

Richmond wants to replace primary and secondary identification with the concepts of mimesis and ilinx. The concepts of primary and secondary identification were concepts of little importance to Metz anyway. Still, the framework Richmond presents provides a useful update on the theory. Film and play are related, and I propose that the concepts mimesis and ilinx can be used to analyse what happens to the audience in front of a screen. One element that is still missing is that Richmond's framework only addresses the screen and the audience. What I miss here is the apparatus itself, meaning that the environment of the screen is missing in this equation. Here Elsaesser proposal will provide complimentary analytical tools to Richmond's framework.

Elsaesser's builds his arguments around Baudry's interpretations of the theory. Where Metz is more focused on explaining the underlying workings of what happens in the spectator's mind, Baudry was more concerned to explain how the audience was trapped in the system of the apparatus, or the *dispositif*, as Baudry calls it. In his essay Elsaesser argues that the *dispositif* exists in three elements. The spatial extension, temporal register and the subjective dimension (Elsaesser 2011, 38-39). The spatial extension refers to the site where the screen resides. I will refer to this term as the environment of the screen. The temporal register refers to how long the screen shows its content. Finally, the subjective dimension is what the screen shows. Richmonds theoretical framework is most useful in analysing this last part. What I want to analyse is how the whole of these elements work together.

In the next chapter I will first use Richmond's own example to explain how his theoretical framework can be used. I will then use the same framework on a case-study, after this I will use the theoretical

framework of Elsaesser to further explain how the temporal and spatial elements influence the ilinctic and mimetic aspects. This will highlight how Netflix and the cinema utilise their environments to tell a story best suited for their respective medium.

3 Comparing the Netflix and Cinematic Narrative Environments

At the 2006 Oscars awards ceremony, Jake Gyllenhaal introduced a montage of some of the great 'epics' Hollywood has produced in history. The beginning of his speech goes as follows:

They are called epics, extravaganzas, spectacles. Films so big and powerful, they keep audiences spellbound from opening scene to closing credit. *West Side Story*, *Star Wars*, *Ben Hur*, you can't properly watch these on television sets and good luck trying to enjoy them on a portable DVD. (...) As you watch, it's pretty clear that if you are going to have a larger than life hero in story there is no place to see them except on the big screen (juanllamasrdz 2012).

Not only was this a statement against portable technologies, but also a warning that these portable technologies, like the iPod, were threatening the cinema. Portable media had the mantra 'anything, anytime, anywhere', leading film critics to predict the demise of the cinema (Tryon 2009, 59-69). This speech is another example of cinema supposedly being threatened by new media. In the second chapter I argued that one of the reactions the film-industry had on television was that it began making films that were less suitable to show on television. After the introduction of portable dvd-players and phones that can play movies as well, Hollywood blockbusters gave its audience the feeling of being in a roller-coaster ride. The big screens of the cinema are now fully utilised.

3.1 Cinema of Attractions

Jan Simons already likened modern Hollywood blockbusters with roller-coaster (Simons 2002, 176), but he was not the only media-scholar who noticed this tonal shift. Wheeler Winston Dixon observed that the new Hollywood films were 'a scattershot explosion of images with arbitrarily shifting colors, frame sizes, film stocks, video and film images intermixed, rapid cutting anything to keep the viewer momentarily dazzled' (Dixon 2002, 356). Dick Tomasovic analysed the camerawork of the *Spiderman* films (Raime 2002 and 2004), and comments that the title sequence of the film reminds the audience of being in a roller coaster (Tomasovic 2006, 313). 'The gaze is not allowed to linger: it's excited, provoked and exhausted: even before the beginning of the film' (Tomasovic 2006, 314). Reviews call the film 'Striking, surprising, stunning and awesome' (Tomasovic 2006, 312). These comments focus more on how the film looked than about the story it had to tell. Tomasovic's analytical review was written for the book *Cinema of Attractions Reloaded* (2006), which explains the context of Tomasovic's observations.

Cinema of attractions is a theoretical framework that originated from an essay written by Thomas Gunning. In this essay he states that the early period of cinema was more praised and advertised for its technological aspects than for its ability to tell stories. The theory was revisited in *Cinema of Attractions Reloaded* (2001). Gunning wrote his original essay to argue against writing a

narrative destiny into film history. According to him, film history was written as if film was meant to be a medium to depict stories. However, at the beginning stages of film, it was the medium itself that attracted the attention of its audience. With the tonal shift in Hollywood blockbusters it then only seems logical to revisit cinema of attractions. This is because in this new time-period the attraction, or action that the film depicts seems more important than the story it tells.

Elsaesser also contributed to this book, but mostly argued against the framework. He argues that dividing narrative immersion and the cinema of attractions will cause the same problems in writing about film history (Elsaesser 2006, 210-211). Writing about film history from a 'cinema of attractions' perspective causes the same teleological view. Elsaesser argues that both the narrative and attractions aspects are important to film history and film in general. To illustrate this point, he describes a film practice primarily associated with early cinema, which contains elements of both narrative and attraction. Elsaesser calls these the Rube films, named after simpletons or 'rubes' that seem to not know how to act during a film. These types of characters would physically interact with what was happening on the screen. For instance, running away from a train that seemingly is about to collide with the audience (Elsaesser 2006, 212). Rube films reference the performative nature of cinema that the 'cinema of attractions' is associated with. The story can be seen to educate the audience about how not to behave during a film, in the period of early cinema. However, this type of narrative can also be seen in newer films. In the film *Minority Report* (Spielberg 2002) Elsaesser describes how the actor Tom Cruise acts like a rube in a scene when he reaches out his hand to his missing son shown on a hologram projector. The main reason for explaining this type of narrative is that it is a film practice that says something about the process that happens to an audience watching a film. An audience knows that what is happening on the screen is not real, but cannot help but to imagine being present within the events of the screen (Elsaesser 2006, 216).

3.2 Ilinctic Cinema

Cinema of attractions –reloaded– is a theoretical framework that responds to a tonal shift in Hollywood blockbusters. However, this framework focuses only on the attraction part.

I would argue that it is counter-productive to separate 'narrative' from 'attraction'. They both serve a purpose in the experience of watching a film. Therefore, I attest that the cinematic apparatus theory, as explained by Richmond, would be an improvement on analysing the tonal shift as observed by media and film academics. Instead of calling it the cinema of attractions, I would rename it ilinctic cinema. Where the cinema of attractions framework has a historical context of complete focus on one aspect of storytelling in cinema, Richmonds updated version of the cinematic apparatus theory provides a more balanced framework where both narrative and attraction are of importance. The term ilinctic cinema emphasises a tonal shift without forgetting mimesis. The ilinctic aspect highlight

the thrill-seeking aspect, which audiences seem to get with current blockbusters. Yet without the mimetic aspect, namely to identify with the characters and story on screen, the thrill-seeking aspect would not be as strong.

Richmond's analysis of *Spider-Man* (Raimi 2002) explains how these two concepts work together. Spiderman is a story about Peter Parker, who is bitten by a radioactive spider and receives 'spider powers'. Richmond analyses a chase scene that is chuck-full of ilinctic elements. The carefully choreographed scene, where Peter uses his spider web to swing from one building to the next to hunt for his uncle's killer, is one of the important moments that defines the character growth of Peter Parker. Richmond chose this scene to analyse because of this character growth, and to illustrate how his interpretation of the cinematic apparatus theory works.

First the segment gives the audience point-of-view shots. Here the audience not only sees what Peter sees, but hears him breathing and grunting as well. In this stage the director purposely has the eyes of the mask open so that the audience can see the expression Peter makes (Richmond 2012, 123). This is the mimetic aspect. The audience sees that Peter is scared, but still determined to get the killer. Through Peter the audience experience the vertigo together with Peter. This mimetic aspect amplifies the ilinctic aspect. Because the audience identifies with Peter Parker, the pursuit of his uncle's killer, coinciding with how this pursuit is framed, becomes more urgent and more intense (Richmond 2012, 135).

In his reaction to Richmond's analysis of the Spiderman movies, Damon R. Young asks where the body of the superhero belongs. Spiderman's depicted body and his humanly impossible stunts are enhanced with computer generated images. Young states that the body of the superhero is something to be looked at, to be admired. According to him it does not belong with ilinx, the pursuit of vertigo, or mimesis, to play pretend (Young 2014, 124). As I already stated earlier, it depends on the identity of the viewer to which degree s/he identifies with the characters depicted on screen. The mistake that is being made here, is that one aspect of the film does not fit entirely with either mimesis or ilinx. I argued that both aspects are equally necessary to analyse the story as told. The emphasis of the Spiderman film is put on the ilinctic aspect, this has influence on how the character of Peter Parker is portrayed. The action and stunts Spiderman performs are physically impossible. Hence, he was given a body that suited the type of actions and stunts he performed. It is correct that Spiderman's body does not entirely fit with either ilinx or mimesis, however it is a result of the two aspects combined.

As already pointed out in the previous chapter this analyses only explains the interaction of the audience with the screen. So, while I find this analysis satisfying on a narratological level, for a media analysis its glosses over one important aspect. Spiderman is a movie produced for, and meant to be watched, in cinemas. By putting more emphasis on the ilinctic aspect the movie can become

more spectacular. As Gyllenhaal argues, these types of films come more into their own on the big screens in cinema's. Why is it that a Spiderman film is best suited for a big screen in the cinema, and not a screen that resides in the bedroom on the viewers lap? By answering this question, we can also answer what makes a Netflix show best suited for the Netflix screen, and further speculate on how Netflix influences the Hollywood blockbuster.

3.3 The Marvel Cinematic Universe, the Subjective Extension

My case study to apply the updated version of the cinematic apparatus theory is the portrayal of the Marvel Cinematic Universe. The Marvel Cinematic Universe is a film series that has over fifteen films, television series, and Netflix series. Both the Marvel Netflix series and the Marvel Cinematic Universe start with a similar narrative structure. In the Marvel Cinematic Universe, characters are introduced in their own films⁵, which take place in a shared universe. In the *Avengers* (Whedon 2012), the introduced character all fight together to fight a common enemy. The Marvel Netflix series introduce their characters in their own series⁶, which take place in a shared universe. In the *Defenders* (August 2017), they all appear in the series to fight a common enemy. Because of the same build-up in narrative structure, the Netflix series and film series offer a unique case-study to compare both media environments. It allows for a comparison in how the stories they tell diverse, while at the same time consider the different environments they are produced for.

As established, currently Hollywood blockbusters focus on the ilinctic aspect. This aspect can be seen in the Marvel film series as well. I quoted Tomasovic in the first paragraph, which stated that in the Spiderman films, 'The gaze is not allowed to linger'. This statement would be true with any action scene in the Marvel films series. What is interesting to note is that the mimetic aspect is also made ilinctic. For instance, the audience of the Marvel cinematic universe also get to see a bigger universe, compared to the Marvel Netflix series. Iron Man is captured in Afghanistan and the Incredible Hulk travels around the globe, while we get to see Thor in another world, called Asgard. In the Marvel movies the characters we meet, are larger than life superheroes, from rich geniuses to literal gods. Heroes from the Marvel Netflix series deal with handicap, racism, trauma and addiction, while handling the responsibility of their superpowers. Steven S. DeKnight, showrunner of *Daredevil* (2015), summarizes it as follows: 'Within the Marvel universe there are thousands of heroes of all shapes and sizes, but The Avengers are here to save the universe and Daredevil is here to save the neighbourhood' (Hibberd 2014).

⁵ In the following order: *Iron Man* (Favreau 2008), *The incredible Hulk* (Louis Leterrier 2008), *Iron Man 2* (Favreau 2010), *Thor* (Branagh 2011), *Captain America: The First Avenger* (Johnston 2011).

⁶ In the following order: *Dare Devil* (April 2015), *Jessica Jones* (November 2015), *Dare Devil* (March 2016), *Luke Cage* (September 2016), *Iron Fist* (March 2017).

When we compare the Netflix series with its cinematic counterparts the focus lies more on the mimetic aspect, even when there are action scenes the difference of emphasis can be seen. One big difference that is instantly noticeable is that the Netflix series tend to be more violent. In both seasons of *Daredevil* (2015) the viewers see characters being tortured on screen. Also, the audience gets to see more blood as to highlight the vulnerability and endurance of Matt Murdock, the main character of the *Daredevil* franchise. When we see a fight scene in *Daredevil*, the gaze is *meant* to linger. The focus of the fight scenes lies more with the consequences of the fight. Besides blood and other bodily fluids, viewers of the Marvel Netflix series get to see more harrowed looks of bystanders or characters when they witness, or have caused violence. Within the Marvel movies the focus lies more on the fight scenes themselves, letting the audience participate in the action. Within the Marvel series, the audience is more involved within the story these heroes tell.

3.4 The Spatial Extensions and the Temporal register of the Cinema and Netflix

When using Richmond's framework on the Marvel cinematic universe, the most obvious differences in storytelling become apparent. Netflix relies more on the mimetic aspect to tell the stories of its Marvel heroes, while the cinema relies more on the ilinctic aspect.

When I introduced Netflix, I argued that Netflix produces its stories for environments in the private sphere. A person can find a Netflix screen in its own home, on a long commute, or even the toilet⁷. The environment of Netflix is a highly flexible one, but a common theme these different environments have, is that they all take place in the private sphere. This counts for the viewer on the commute as well. Although there are other passengers in train, the viewer has her laptop or mobile phone often together with headphones. This means that often she can make a private bubble in a public sphere.

On the other hand, the cinema resides its screens in the public sphere, a sphere that increasingly extends outside the theatre. Trailers for anticipated blockbusters are discussed online, there are think pieces about the social impact of the films, and fans of various franchises organise conventions to hang out and discuss the content material with fellow fans and even the creators of the stories. If the current blockbusters are compared to roller-coasters, the cinema is the attraction people go to for the ride. Outside the theatre, people play pretend. The intensive talk about anticipated movies and following essays can be compared to sports commentators talking about a highly anticipated match. By seeing the cinematic sphere in this way, it becomes more logical for Richmond's decision to look in the field of play to update the cinematic apparatus theory.

By now I have analysed two of the three elements that make the dispostif according to

⁷ Yes, there are people who do this (Choiksi 2017).

Elsaesser. The subjective dimension –what happens on the screen– is analysed by using Richmond’s concepts of mimesis and ilinx. I have organised the spatial extension of both Netflix and the cinema by dividing and describing them into the public and the private. What remains now is the temporal register, namely the time it takes for a specific screen to tell its story to its audience. The question here is what happens to an audience that is confined within the spheres of the screen, watching said screen. It is here that I return to Metz.

Metz bases his arguments using Freuds concepts of the ego, id and super-ego to describe what happens in the dream-like state. In the dream the ego can provide instant gratification to the id, without compromising the super-ego. (Metz 1982, 57, 104). Looking at the temporal site of the dispositif, Netflix can provide prolonged extensions of these instant gratifications in the form of binge-watching. Within the context of the apparatus theory it would make sense to favour the series format. From this I can also deduct why the Marvel Netflix series emphasises mimesis more, and the cinema on ilinx more, if we take Metz interpretation of Lacan’s mirror to describe the immobilised state. Within the context of Lacan’s mirror, the audience sees characters on the screen who have the freedom to move. In the cinema this effect is strengthened because of environmental constraints the cinema puts upon its audience. The viewer is only allowed to sit in one place for the duration of the movie, thus the cinema now provides its audience with the illusion of a lot of movement. In the cinema the audience is compensated for its immobile state with more movement. In the Netflix environment the viewer is free to move, but has put herself in an immobile position to satisfy the id. If the narrative continues and the viewer has no other obligations, or distractions, the viewer can continue to stay in the dream-like state.

I do not argue that these media have to produce their stories in a certain way, or that both media are not suited to tell each other’s produced narratives. Netflix produces spectacular movies as well and, perhaps not entirely coincidental, cinema produces more and more serialised blockbusters. Filmmakers and producers will continue to make their own stories. Still these storytellers are always presented within the limitation of their chosen medium. As such, it is worth to study these limitations and work around them or be inspired by them.

4. Conclusion, Outside the Apparatus

In this thesis I argued that Netflix should be further studied on how it tells its stories and how it has a potential effect on Hollywood blockbusters. The reason why I choose to focus on Netflix, and not another streaming service like Hulu or Amazon Prime, is because Netflix has a unique way of presenting its content to their audience. There are four things that set Netflix apart from most streaming services. It collects data on audience watching behaviours, has a global market, orders most content by seasons and for its income relies on paid-subscriptions. These are the elements that influence the content Netflix makes and deliver a unique viewing experience. Another element discussed at length in this thesis is the environment Netflix produces its content for.

I used an updated version of the cinematic apparatus theory using Elsaesser's theoretical framework and Richmond's interpretation of the theory. This way I could show how the screens of both Netflix and the cinema present their narratives and what role the temporal sites and the environments of the screens play in this presentation. I used the Marvel movies and the Marvel Netflix series to explain how these elements work together. Two concepts argued for by Richmond were key in this explanation, namely the concepts of *ilinx* and *mimesis*.

When analysing the Marvel movies and Marvel Netflix series through Richmond's new interpretation of the cinematic apparatus theory, it becomes apparent that the Marvel movies relied more on the *ilinctic* aspect, while the Marvel Netflix series relied more on the *mimetic* aspect. The reason why becomes apparent when using Elsaesser's framework supplemented with Metz's interpretation of the theory, which he bases heavily on work by Freud and Lacan. An audience watching a cinema screen is more confined than an audience watching a Netflix screen. Following Metz reasoning based on Lacan's mirror theory the cinema screen tends to show more movement as compensation for this immobilisation, hence its emphasis on *ilinx*. Following Metz's reasoning based on Freud's concept of the ego, id and superego, the audience watching the Netflix screen stays in an immobilised position to satisfy the id.

These arguments are only logical when taking into account that; One, this for the most part applies to Hollywood blockbusters, and two; The screens –especially the cinematic screen– have a history of their content being influenced by other screen-based media. For instance, the increase in movement within Hollywood blockbusters happened around the same time when portable screens were deemed a threat to the cinema (Tryon 2009, 59-69). While comparing Netflix and cinema through a theoretical framework can answer how Netflix can potentially influence cinematic storytelling, the question *if* Netflix influences cinematic storytelling can be answered by looking at the historical context of the cinematic apparatus theory.

Reading about the cinematic apparatus theory, I came across some academics that found the

discredit of the theory a shame. Young compared the history of the theory with that of “*a child star whom puberty has suddenly stripped of his infantile charm*” (Young 2014, 1). Richmond puts a remark in between brackets proclaiming that there were “*a few babies in that bathwater*” (Richmond 2012, 116). Elsaesser simply calls his essay “*What Is Left of the Cinematic Apparatus, or Why We Should Retain (and Return to) It*” (Elsaesser 2011). I suggested that it could be used to study the connection between Netflix and the new kind of movies Hollywood produced. Comparing the new interest and historical context of the theory this might not be entirely coincidental. In this thesis I argued that the theory was first and foremost to highlight the differences between television and the cinema. Around the time the two media began –as Verstraten puts it – a more agreeable relationship, the theory was growing in disfavour and began to be hugely discredited.

Cinema’s reaction to television then, was to make films that emphasised the differences between television and cinema. When, the two media saw that they could benefit each other, television giving films a second live on its screen while promoting new films, the Hollywood blockbuster as a genre came to the stage. As for cinema’s reaction to Netflix, no direct link to cinema changing its storytelling style can be proven, for now. However, following Chuck Tryon’s arguments on new portable media in his book *Reinventing Cinema* (2009) the roller-coaster change in the Hollywood blockbuster genre could be linked to the new portable media. For this reason, I speculate that Netflix and cinema are still in the adversary’s phase. The booing incident described at the beginning of this thesis might be argued away as a blown out of proportions anecdote, but the reaction to Netflix entering the Oscars confirms that the tensions described in that incident were certainly there. In the *Adam ruins everything* podcast, the show host talks about awards for television and movies together with Peter Hammond, a former governor on the board of the television academy. In the podcast Hammond says that it was surprising that Netflix did not receive an Oscar for its own produced movie *Beast of no Nation* (Fukunaga, 2015). This, because Netflix held an aggressive and expensive campaign to even get an Oscar nomination.

It’s interesting to see that Netflix could not buy their way into the Oscars though, which they tried with *Beasts of no Nation*, which won a SAG award and a Golden Globe award, they had big ads and things. But one head of the studio, Paramount actually, told me that “If we fall for this we are stupider than we look (Maximum Fun 2017, 32:02).

Earlier on in the podcast Hammond himself speculates if they – the governors of the television academy– perhaps let the wolf into the henhouse (Maximum Fun 2017, 11:18).

I would suggest that the reason why television and cinema grew a more agreeable relation with each other was because the next generation of filmmakers grew up with television. Because of this, filmmakers might not have grown up with much adversity against television. They even might

have ingrained some of the elements that were seen as essentialist to television. The new filmmakers incorporated those elements into their films. For me, then the question is not if Netflix has an influence on the Hollywood blockbuster but rather when. While the next generation of filmmakers or storytellers rise, it would be interesting to see how the cinematic apparatus theory has evolved and what it has to say about the relation between Netflix and cinema at a later date.

Bibliography

- Bennet, L. 2017, May 3, 2018-last update, Netflix slammed for 'worst product placement ever' [Homepage of AdNews], [Online]. Available: <http://www.adnews.com.au/netflix-slammed-for-product-placement> [2018, April 14].
- Castillo, M. 2017, May 22, 2017-last update, 'Getting booed at Cannes shows Netflix that the movie theatre still matters' [Homepage of CNBC], [Online]. Available: <http://www.cnbc.com/2017/05/22/netflixs-movie-buisness-may-have-more-to-worry-about-than-a-few-boos-at-cannes.html> [2017, May 1].
- Choiksi, N. 2017, November 17, 2018-last update, 'Americans Are Watching Netflix at Work in the Bathroom' [Homepage of NYTimes], [Online]. Available: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/17/business/media/watch-netflix-at-work.html> [2018, April 14].
- Dixon, W.W. 2002, "Twenty-Five Reasons Why It's All Over" in *The End of Cinema as We Know it: American Film in the Nineties*, ed. J. Lew, 1st edn, Pluto Press, London, pp. 356-365.
- Elsaesser, T. 2011, "What is left of the Cinematic Apparatus, or Why We Should Retain (and Return to) It", *Semiotic Inquiry*, vol. 31, no. 1-2-3, pp. 33-44.
- Elsaesser, T. 2006, "Discipline through Diegesis: The Rube Film between 'Attractions' and 'Narrative Integration'" in *The cinema of attractions reloaded*, ed. W. Strauven, 1st edn, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, pp. 205-223.
- Elsaesser, T. 2002, "The Blockbuster: Everything Connects but Not Everything Goes" in *The End of Cinema as We Know it: American Film in the Nineties*, ed. J. Lewis, 1st edn, Pluto Press, London, pp. 11-22.
- Friedberg, A. 1994 *Window shopping, Cinema and the Postmodern*, 1 edn, University of California Press
- Hibberd, J. 2014, December 29, 2014-last update, 'Daredevil': 7 things we learned about Netflix's new series [Homepage of Entertainment Weekly], [Online]. Available: <http://ew.com/article/2014/12/29/daredevil-6/> [2017, May 28].
- juanllamasrdz 2012, November 21, 2012-last update, 78th Oscars Jake Gyllenhaal [Homepage of YouTube], [Online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1vspQ52gc6k> [2017, May 28].
- Lev-Ram, M. 2016, June 13, 2016-last update, Here's Why Netflix Is Driving Hollywood Crazy [Homepage of Fortune], [Online]. Available: <http://fortune.com/2016/06/13/netflix-disrupts-hollywood/> [2016, October 3].
- Lynch, J. 2013, November 14, 2013-last update, Why Amazon, bucking the Netflix strategy, won't release its original series all at once [Homepage of Quartz Media], [Online]. Available: <https://qz.com/146949/why-amazon-bucking-the-netflix-strategy-wont-release-its-original-series-all-at-once/> [2017, August 1].

- Master, K. 2016, September 14, 2016-last update, *The Netflix Backlash: Why Hollywood fears a Content Monopoly* [Homepage of The Hollywood Reporter], [Online]. Available: <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/features/netflix-backlash-why-hollywood-fears-928428> [2016, October 3].
- Maximum Fun 2017. *Adam Ruins Everything*. [podcast] Adam Ruins Everything Episode 29: Pete Hammond Pulls Back the Curtain on Awards Shows. Available at: <http://www.maximumfun.org/adam-ruins-everything/adam-ruins-everything-episode-29-0> [Accessed 14 Apr. 2018].
- McAlone, N. 2016, June 15, 2016-last update, *Netflix's streaming service exploded when it figured out a big weak spot in the TV business* [Homepage of Business Insider], [Online]. Available: <http://www.businessinsider.com/how-netflix-invented-binge-watching-2016-6?international=true&r=US&IR=T> [2017, August 1].
- Metz, C. 1982, *The Imaginary Signifier, Psychoanalysis and the Cinema*, 4th edn, Indiana University Press,
- Morris, S. 2002, "First-Person Shooters --- A Game Apparatus" in *Screenplay cinema/videogames/interfaces*, eds. G. King & T. Krzywinska, Wallflower, London, New York, pp. 81-97.
- Reich, E. & Richmond, S.C. 2014, "Introduction: cinematic identifications", *Film Criticism*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 3-25.
- Richmond, S.C. 2012, "The Exorbitant Lightness of Bodies, or How to Look at Superheroes: Ilinx, Identification, and Spider-Man", *Discourse*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 113-144.
- Sharma, R.A. 2016, *The Netflix Effect: Impacts of the Streaming Model on Television Storytelling*, 1st edn, Wesleyan University.
- Shaw, L. 2016, October 19th-last update, *Netflix Is Taking Over Hollywood, and Hollywood Isn't Thrilled* [Homepage of Bloomberg], [Online]. Available: <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-10-19/netflix-is-taking-over-hollywood-and-hollywood-isn-t-thrilled> [2017, May 28th].
- Shone, T. 2004a, "Introduction: The Boys of Summer" in *Blockbuster*, 1st edn, Simon & Schuster UK ltd, pp. 1-19.
- Shone, T. 2004b, "Panic on the 4th of July" in *Blockbuster*, 1st edn, Simon & Schuster, pp. 23-43.
- Simons, J. 2002, "Film en nieuwe media" in *Intrerface and cyberspace, Inleiding in de nieuwe media*, 1st edn, Simons, 155-180.
- Tomasovic, D. 2006, "The Hollywood Cobweb: New Laws of Attraction" in *Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, ed. W. Strauven, 1st edn, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, pp. 309-320.
- Tryon, C. 2009, "Wall-To-Wall Color, Moviegoing in the Age of Digital Projection" in *Reinventing cinema: Movies in the age of media convergence*, ed. C. Tryon, 1st edn, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey, London, pp. 59-92.

Vanhemert, K. 2013, February, 19, 2013-last update, *The Secret Sause Behing Netflix's Hit, "House of Cards": Big Data* [Homepage of Fast Co Design], [Online]. Available: <https://www.fastcodesign.com/1671893/the-secret-sauce-behind-netflixs-hit-house-of-cards-big-data> [2017, May 28].

Verstraten, P. 2008, *Kernthema's in de filmwetenschap*, Boom Academic, Amsterdam.

Young, D.R. 2014, "The vicarious look, or Andy Warhol's apparatus theory", *Film Criticism*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 25.