

ident that what used to be cinema or film is now enfolded by visual media, which this generation takes for granted. Still, this change is far from any finished revolution: “The screen of a laptop computer – which itself opens like a book – mimics the page, and Thumbelina still writes on the screen with ten fingers, or with two thumbs on her smart phone” (Ibid, 23). In view of cinema as the art of the age of mass culture, the screen could be related to a (painted) picture frame. We cannot imagine exactly what would be a deliverance from the screen format, but “The new technologies are forcing us to leave the spatial format implied by the book and the page” (Ibid: 24), and I would add the “screen”. However, a result, which will mean transcending displays, which “Thumbelinas” – for example smart phones – carry around as if they were organs of their bodies, will depend on much more than just technology. One should bear in mind that the effect of immediacy is at work: “Thumbelinas” do not think much about technology, but they communicate with a multiplicity of “contents”, they live in a constant visually expanded inter-textuality, which includes even physical objects into the field of subjectivity. Therefore, the above-mentioned transition from epistemology to ontology is inscribed into this movement. This is reflected in the efforts to define, describe and understand what in some discourses acquires a categorisation of “new reality”. For the time being, existing technology has reached the level on which it causes the effect of immediacy. The leap, which can be indicated for now, is a fundamental democratisation of, metaphorically speaking, film-making, which becomes a mode of life transforming the very meaning of the individuality of human subjectivity. Ontology and aesthetics merge in an inseparable assemblage.