

The Paradigm Shift of Sri Lankan Cinema: A Study of Reflections and Repercussions in the Cinema after Introducing the Open Economy in 1977

S.S.A. Senevirathne

Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka, Department of Languages, Faculty of Social Sciences and Languages, Belihuloya, Sri Lanka

ABSTRACT

While Sri Lankan cinema had originated in 1925, Sri Lankan *token* cinema which had commenced in 1947 completed its first paradigm in 1977. The era from 1978 to the present (2016) can be considered as its second paradigm. After introducing the policy of open economy in 1977, Sri Lankan social body was transformed along with its social, economic, and cultural dimensions. Sri Lanka, in its exposure to the post-industrial, global capital since 1977 when its gates were opened to the external world, underwent great structural and ideological changes which can be termed as a 'paradigm shift' (The Structure of the Scientific Revolutions 1964) as the structure itself was not what it was a decade ago. The paper hopes to articulate analytical approach to interpret post globalized Sri Lankan film industry and its repercussions. As the basic argumentation of re narrate the contemporary scenario is to be utilized the concept of Paradigm Shifting. During this period the parameters of producing, directing, distributing films and the industrial form in which the films are made have undergone dramatic and sweeping changes. The aesthetic and the realistic cinema of the pre-open market economy in Sri Lanka were mainly based on the restricted capital provided by local producers whose ideological basement was purely to produce entertaining works but a small number of filmmakers were interested in radical works but with a poor financial background and thereby could hardly reach a global esteem. In accordance with the knowledge of paradigm shift, in an attempt to understand the current situation in Sri Lankan film industry and art, the present paradigm has been re-contextualized painstakingly comparing it with the early paradigm which has clear economic and cultural marks of an era before the advent of economic globalization.

Keywords: Sri Lankan Cinema, Open Economy, Paradigm Shift, Post Globalized Cinema

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The Sri Lankan economy seems to be a complicated flux consisted with Buddhism, agriculture, irrigationary civilization, caste hierarchy and feudal characteristics. Amalgamating those complexities, the ideology of the Sinhalese society was constituted. One situation can be identified at the peasant context. The rural social classes normally do not utilize a same ideology for their relations of production. The researchers, who have done in depth studies on this entity, have pointed out few stratification layers in the pre capitalistic accumulation (Gunasinghe 2007, De Silva 1995, Jayawardhena 2000). Even though this study being focused on the cinema industry in Sri Lanka at a moment of post globalized, it is essential to examine thoroughly the parameters and background recommendations behind the picture. Discussing the 'paradigm shift' in the Sri Lankan film industry is consisted as the main objective of this study should attend to evaluate extendedly the pre capitalist society.

This study hopes to evaluate the liberal economic reformations implemented by the UNP regime in 1977, and this study hopes to interpreted the transition occurred as an 'interpellation'. After introducing the radical economic reformations, the whole Sri Lankan socio-political body has jumped into the next step with massive changes. Before 1977, Sri Lanka experienced the reformations constituted by Colebrook commission. It was also a highly influential change in the economic history. One can ask that where it does the proper interpellation or shift? Because of those reformations restructured whole the socio-political backgrounds of Sri Lanka in a pre-capitalist era. Actually these interferences of the commission in fact demarcated the first real attempt to examine the feasibility of the application of liberal ideal to the situation in Ceylon (Kannangara 1966). Colebrook and Cameron arrived Sri Lanka in 1929 and they took off the country in 1931. According to the commission for mostly resulted recommendation was the abolition of *Rajakariya* (Customary Service) on 12th April 1832 (Roberts 1995: 143).

The pre capitalist Sri Lankan society did not portray a clearly marked class classification as the European context. When it was 1978, that society was not in a condition to accommodate 'post globalized' aspects. In this regards, post globalized aspects

means the society which is highly engaged with computerized networks. As well as, there are consumer oriented people, transnational capital and its trading agents and mainly, the exchange value of goods is highlighted than the use value in this type of society. The most of perverted economic reasons that we are suffered are the results of those irrational production relations. In the 21st century, the liberal capitalism appears in Sri Lanka as the economic mechanism. Its major ambition is that the improving of a sophisticated consuming society which permits to be mercantilism maximally. This economic paradigm began 1978 in its existing meaning and it was clearly resulted to the total transformation of Sri Lankan cinema industry. After introducing so called liberal economic reformations, the role of film director and producer, film spectatorship or audience, actors and actresses, film critics, the situation of film distribution or circulations and most of production relations related to the local film industry have been significantly changed with higher index. The paper intends to explore this argument with the special reference to the country's cinematic reality.

Objectives

01. To understand the actual effectiveness of implementing liberal economic reformations in the entity of Sri Lankan Film Industry
02. To propose conceptually 'the concept of Paradigm Shift' to contextualize post globalized Sri Lankan Cinema
03. To furnish a wider discourse between early and second paradigms of Sri Lankan cinema for its uplifted and competitive tomorrow

Hypothesis

01. The contemporary Sri Lankan cinema is significantly changed from its early epoch before 1977
02. The existing transformed situation of Sri Lankan cinema is resulted of liberal economic reformations launched in 1977
03. The concept of Paradigm Shift can be successfully used to re-contextualize that transformation

THE LITERATURE SURVEY AND THE CONCEPTUAL INTERPRETATION

What is Paradigm Shift?

Before moving to the next phase of this paper, the concept of the 'paradigm shift' is needed to be interpreted theoretically. Such theoretical discussion is essential since the changes in Sri Lankan cinema after 1977 will be described as a paradigm shift, again as the main argument.

At first, let's look at the dictionary meanings of two main words. The New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary defines it as "an example serving as a pattern" (The New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary 1987). The Oxford English Reference Dictionary refers the word paradigm as "a representative example or pattern" (The Oxford English Reference Dictionary 1996). If we refer famous Longman Dictionary it describes a paradigm as "a very clear or typical example of something" (Longman Dictionary 1993). The Oxford Advanced Dictionary also defines that paradigm as a pattern, a model. And in linguistics, paradigm means a set of all the different forms of the words. (Oxford Advanced Dictionary 1996).

What is the meaning of the second word of the phrase, 'shift'? It is "a change of place, position, direction or tendency- to change the emphasis, direction or focus- to move from one place or position to another" (ibid:1086). Generally, different dictionaries provide similar definitions to the concept. In other words, there is a stable meaning of the term in dictionaries in linguistically. But by combining these separate two words, somewhat complex contextual meaning is denoted. When the concept used in natural science or social sciences and humanities, the analysis depends on its limitations. The concept of paradigm shift in natural science has been introduced to the world by Thomas Samuel Kuhn (1922-1996). The book titled 'The Structure of Scientific Revolution' initiated this new discourse of knowledge in 1962. Most of academics have considered Thomas Kuhn's 'The Structure of Scientific Revolution' as one of the most influential intellectual contributions of the second half of the twentieth century (Fuller 2000).

The dominant knowledge wave of a certain age of the world is recognized as a paradigm by Kuhn in this book. While the contemporary scientists and intellectuals' analysis the world articulating that knowledge, the world also is changing slowly. When the time passes, there are many new inventions, practices, ideologies and knowledge layers which gathered into that changing. Now it seems to be a new paradigm. "Thomas Kuhn famously updated this elitist myth of humanity's collective quest by associating the great paradigmatic thresholds in the history of science with the names of revolutionary geniuses who set the pace for lesser worthies. 'Newton' 'Lavoisier' and 'Einstein' appear in Kuhn's own text as the originators of paradigms"

(ibid:). Accordance with this perspective, the old Newtonian world has been transformed into Einsteinian world. If somebody applies the ancient knowledge to read the vastly changed new world, that structure faces a crisis. Kuhn explains this condition according to the general science.

We must examine that can it be used this theory which has been composed in respective to the science, for measuring the eco-political and cultural life of the man or social sciences and humanities? Kuhn begins his discourse introducing the 'paradigm'. "I shall henceforth refer to as 'paradigms', a term that relates closely to 'normal science'" (Kuhn1970). Kuhn's paradigmatic debate is a tool for clarifying the results and forms of science in long term. This theoretical knowledge furnished by Kuhn, as a condition of sciences, can be applied for understanding the social sciences in a theoretical frame work. If we measure very recent artworks using the old paradigmatic perspective, the new artwork would be seen as an absurd creation. If the critics do not accept the transition of paradigms and do not understand the crisis, in rationalizing the new artwork, they also might be gone to the crisis.

According to the most of film critics in Sri Lanka, its contemporary film art works cannot be interpreted by using the existing critical tools especially the hegemonic parameter called the aestheticism (Dissanayake and Rathnavibhushana 2000, Jayasena 2010, Jayasena 2012, Rathnavibhushana and Cruze 2002). Ashoka Handagama's many films which are represented the second paradigm faced a crisis in the angles of critics and even the audience. If we consider the debate created on *Aksharaya* (Letter of Fire -2005) it appears so called misunderstanding. When the case went to the court, they also articulated the previous knowledge, cultural belief, limitations and interpretations for discussing his modern cinema. It was made a philosophical error first, and then it generated practical, legal and human right wise error. Ultimately it did a great injustice to the movie itself.

An extended dialogue has been launched by the two groups on *Aksharaya*, those two sectors made their arguments on two ways. One group argued that this film destroys our cultural values and identities. Other group insisted on that this film is very avant-garde creation and it could not measure with old tools.

Again, Kuhn mentions that the apparatus should be organized for a new paradigm. This is equal to emerge a new planet. Though they are the familiar objects, now they are being focused under a changed light. Once again, it is very important to concern how to use this concept to understand the social life. Terry Eagleton emphasizes that this interpellation or transformation is related to a wider range such as power, desire and identity that are interconnected between man and society (Eagleton1996).

If we direct the attention one selected angle of that social transformation, for an instance. That is sexuality. The discourse of sexuality in the modern society is not the thing what we had previously. The interpretations, practices, forms about the parameters of sexuality and human love have been totally changed. If we focus with old concepts to see below mentioned sexuality, we can observe that the paradigms would be critically transformed. One of leading philosopher of our time Slavoj Zizek has extensively stated that the concept of sexuality has gone to virtual reality and it is hardly interpreted with early perspectives (Zizek2005). Computerized virtual sex explained by Zizek, is very difficult phenomenon to understand even in the respective discourse.

According to the condition of the scientific knowledge which has revolutionarily changed in general science, the world can use as a mirror to portray the current moment. This scientific related vision is conceptually underpinned to explain social change in Sri Lanka, after a certain moment in recent eco-political history. In this case, whole body of Sri Lankan society has been transformed thoroughly in the zones of economy, technology and culture. First of all, the research should aim to capture this interpellation of the said entities and consequently, we would move to revisit the paradigm shift in Sri Lankan cinema.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Cinema and Capital

The Cinema has been honored and famous as the 20th century art or director's art. Even though it is, this genre of art is empowering all over the world in the 21st century also. The cinema is highly synthesized art. It is incorporated with poetry, music, sculpting, art, visual art, drama and many other different expressions of human totality. The style of communication in the cinema is distinguished as pictorial narration. In this case the visual is dominant and the sound comes secondly.

If we consider in Sri Lankan context, the cinema which is transformed its classical meaning, is rushed among to the cheap and fancy objects on the pavement in Colombo. These DVDs are sold in very low prices. Now the attention of film theatre or

the habit or film going is being collapsed badly and the cinema experience is jumped into a 'pavementalized' and individual solitude thing. The film criticism is transformed to an advertisement. Finally the cinema and the capital are free from their conventional context and reduced to just a trade sign or common-easy commodity.

This transformation of cinema is not a sudden phenomenon. In the middle of last century particular communication experts had theorized that the cinema with the capital has to be destined to commodity at the dream factories. "The movie is not only a supreme expression of mechanism, but paradoxically it offers as product the most magical of consumer commodities namely dreams" (McLuhan 2003:317).

We mentioned already that the film with its initiation had played the commodity's role. It is an entertainment media. If the cinema was gradually being uplifted to a way of creativity, it was not avoid from technology and marketing in all the time. The socialization of cinema is being manipulated according to the principles of culture industry. The cinema just like any other fetish commodity is accompanied to the consuming society through the advertisements and publicity. Vanishing the moment of use value of the commodity, there is over determined only the exchange value in the present society. It is no any special to the concept of cinema.

Considering all these complexities, the cinema and the capital are inevitably combined picture and depend on each other. The existing quarter of the present Sri Lankan cinema, is a manifestation of the said reality. The thousands of latest films which are comprised on verity of themes in the world, can be seen in Colombo as 'the heaps of DVDs' and they are being declined from their prominent and prolific interpretation and pavementalized without any significance. The seeing a cinema is reduced to the mobile phone screen. It has been lined to just a digitalized wave among the limitless waves in the virtual space. Bearing this background, this thesis hopes to evaluate the cinema and its industrial formation at the next step. Then we may realize that it is also a result of the process in the Sri Lankan capital accumulation and the linear development of the country.

The Sri Lankan Cinema Up to 1977: The Early Paradigm

Though this research paper has attended to explore the formation of Sri Lankan film industry and its entertainment ship, it should be extendedly evaluate again some background information and hidden realities. What sort of leaner development is appeared in Sinhala cinema up to 1977? Especially, the Sinhala talkies films and its commercial background story, early Colombo cinema experience and its eco-political background are to be aimed to have a deep discourse. Why should it be emphasized so lengthily? This thesis hopes to bear the main hypothesis which tries to prove the 'shift' or 'interpellation' in Sri Lankan cinema after 1978. Therefore the descriptive history reflects the key points of its metamorphosis.

"No cinema springs from a social and cultural vacuum. All cinemas bear the imprint of the society, culture and moment of history that gave that rise to them. Sri Lankan cinema is no exception. The urbanization of culture and consciousness, the capitalist infra-structure, the crystallization of the idea of the nation state, the encounters with cultural modernization and tradition are all vital to the birth of cinema" (Dissanayake and Rathnavibhushana 2000). After a few years of its European origin, the cinema that was a newly recognized entertainment genre experienced Sri Lankan public in Colombo. As the above quoted argument stresses that the emergence of cinema in Sri Lanka was a rational result of the socio-cultural process at the moment. TAJ Noorbai produced the very first Sinhalese film, *Rajakeeya Wickramaya or Shantha* (The Royal Adventure) in 1925. (Senevirathne 1958, Nayanajith Kumara 2005, Amarasena 2008).

Generally, 21st January 1947 is mostly agreed as the birth day of the Sinhala cinema. The reason for that, '*Kadaunu Poronduwa*' the first token film was screened at Kingsley theatre in Kotahena on that day. Though this is the commonly accepted idea, Nuwan Nayanajith Kumara furnishes an argument about this origin. According to him, "*Paligeneema* (The Revenge) was the first ever screen silent film in this country and it was in 1936 (Nayanajith Kumara 2005). Nuwan's this argument may be controversial. Anyhow, *Kadaunu Poronduwa* was born as a result of strong commercial rivalry made by two businessmen (Sawarimuttu 1977).

While the Sinhala cinema marks its inception, that effort did not articulate the surplus capital in a realistic industrial atmosphere. All the films were produced in the Indian film studios like Chithrakala, Citadel, Central, Wahini, Modern, Neptune, Film Centre, Prabhath, Sothern and Shammuga. These cinema activities were conducted under the fully Indian guidance and with their technical knowledge. In the first half of the 20th century Sri Lankan film industry portrayed three major investors. These triple entrepreneurs and the movie mogul they created were the strong pillars of the industry. The first presidential commission for inquiry of the Sri Lankan film industry has mentioned this monopoly using the term 'Tripoli' (Wickramasinghe and Others 1965). The Ceylon Theatres established by CA Gardiner in 1928, The Ceylon Entertainments

made by Jabir A. Carder in 1946 and The Cinemas of K Gunarathnam in 1949 had played the lion's part of the Sri Lankan film business. The Ceylon Theatres maintained very successful trade relationships with the film production and distribution companies in the Europe and the USA. DV Senevirathne's explanations explore the Sri Lanka's film crazy was created over imported movies of this company. DV Senevirathne's *ChithrapataKalawa* (1958) was the first book or report on Sri Lankan cinema.

While these situations on Sinhala cinema were going on, the upper middle class also showed an enthusiasm to this aesthetic experience. Though a small group of pioneers, they had an enough sense of aestheticism and particular knowledge on concept of art. They had hailed from the fields like painting, music, photography and drama. In the 40s the only artists who achieved any degree of recognition were known in parlances as the '43 group. They were a group of artists and painters who had got together into a sort of club to discuss and disseminate ideas. They were really the product of post-impressionist in Europe, and drew their inspirations mainly from works of Cezanne, Gauguin and Van Gogh. Others specialized in seascapes which were much admired in Britain as well as by the British residents and English educated elites in Ceylon. Justin Deraniyagala, Geoffrey Belling, George Keyt, Harry Peiris, Richard Gabriel, Aubrey Colette and Ivan Peiris (brother of Lester James Peiris) were prominent members of the group (Sawarimuttu 1977).

Obviously the cinema in Sri Lankan context did not reach the level of its European meaning. Because of, it did not have the parallel progress of the both streams that were the limited and classic audience generated by Colombo Film Society or '43 group and eco-political realities of investments. The second fatalistic missing of this trend itself is more tragic one. That is the story of establishing of the Government Film Unit (GFU).

The very first Sinhalese token film *KadaunuPoronduwa* was screened with special participation of Prime Minister DS Senanayake and the dame at the Kinsley theatre, Kotahena on 21st January 1947. DS Senanayake starts a strange and really new film culture appealing the signature, giving an autograph to Desi Daniels, later heavenly famous as Rukmanee Devi. There was a long queue to make a glance of this 'divine lady'. The mansion called '*Jaya-Ruk*' in Negombo was given the police security. Some people spent the night at the queue itself and made the chance to see *KadaunuPoronduwa* at the next day. The deluge of 'stars' had been launched. The Sri Lankan people were experiencing the features of a film culture.

It is widely known argument that *Rekhawa* is the realistic, artistic and cinematic turn of Sinhala film industry. The attention of government directed towards industry from second decade of Sinhala cinema. The government commission to inquiry to Sinhala film industry was appointed in 1962. This commission report points out the real situation of existing cinema. It realizes that the film monopoly which had immersed the industry and market in this country has been understood as the biggest barrier for the qualitative development of Sinhala cinema.

When some commercially successful films for earning profits, such popular box office directors were funded openly by above mentioned monopoly. It is very known factor that how Lester James Peries was helpless in the beginning period of filmmaking. Ultimately, Raj Kapoor in India had interfered personally with CA Gardiner for requesting an opportunity to Lester who was honored as the father of Sinhala cinema and a versatile genius in the industry. Then *Sandeshaya* came out and it was a great commercial hit. Dr Sarath Amunugama who was a front lined film enthusiastic in Sri Lanka had interpreted this situation as 'money collecting' (Amunugama 1990). Dr. Amunugama, as the very first chairman of the National Film Corporation, 1972, uses that important two words 'money collecting'. This situation is rather identical for today merely. In few years ago when film critic Ajith Galappatthi criticized Soma Edirisinghe's cheap films, on behalf of EAP, Soma Edirisinghe states that "I do not care the film critics for a dead cent (*thambasathaya*)". Even today in the globalized society, the capitalist traders do not concern on artistic value or cultural ground rules, but only chasing money. The present Ceylon Theatres management is busy with opening Cargill's super markets at the places of film theatres which are being run on under profit, belonged to the company. The term 'money collector' is highly suitable for naming them today even. It is historical truth that according to the time and space, there is no trifle change of these merchants in speculating profits. The investment capacity and the income of so called 'early big three' are well established in a large scale. The film importation, distributing, exhibiting and producing were subject to their consent. The studio facility was other strong avenue enriching that stability and monopoly.

This was the condition of Sri Lankan cinema up to 1977. As Lester says, the serious and ideological films were not produced in the time of national cinema. The concept of a national cinema is restricted to merely a name board. Some sort of advancement has taken place and that should be considered as post national cinema. It will be broadly examine as 'a paradigm shift' in Sri Lankan cinema.

Economic Shift Powered by Politics in Sri Lanka

The economy is said to be the bedrock of the modern societies. WD Lakshman has classified the modern history in Sri Lanka into few economic power regimes, after the independence. We can update Lakshman's opinion and then it is the map of history of Sri Lankan power politics. It is not difficult to realize that they are apparently the economic entities also.

- i. 1948-1956 8 years
- ii. 1956-1965 9 years
- iii. 1965-1970 5 years
- iv. 1970-1977 7 years
- v. 1977-1994 17 years
- vi. 1994-2000 6 years
- vii. 2001-2004 2 years
- viii. 2005-2015 10 years
- ix. 2015- Update

“The UNP which came into office in 1947 represented the interests largely of the country's bourgeois and elite groups, who wish to see the continuation of the ‘export economy’ they inherited from British colonial administration” (Lakshman1997). This point is the decisive moment of the economy in Sri Lankan modern state that was changed completely in 1977. If somebody wants to understand that transformation, he should clearly realize the earlier paradigm first. The first regime that came into office after the independence was terminated in 1956. Then a people's alliance was elected to power. In a cultural perspective, most of critics recognized this transition of state as ‘1956 Revolution’. But the economy was not sharked or influenced vastly.

It was observed that two regimes shifted in the next phase of 1956-1977. The SirimavoBandaranayake's government 1970 launched a change based on agriculture and indigenous industries in a long term organized manner. It moved the policy regime back to a hard version of Import Substitution Industrialization (ISI). Again we witnessed another electoral change, this time a landslide victory of the UNP in 1977 for the country to make a sharp turn about in its policy from a basic ISI regime to an Export Oriented Industrialization (EOI) regime. Actually this was the turning point that deceives paradigm change demarcated (ibid:).

In the next step of the economy very influentially introduced the concept of ‘Liberal Capitalism’ in rapid way. It caused to make a vast restructuring to the process which had been scheduled on the development based on indigenous industrial strategy. This was the era of 1977-1994. This is the longest power entity in the modern state of Sri Lanka. The liberal capitalistic strategy they used was famous as ‘the open economy’. Moore explained comprehensively that the ‘Open Economy’ policy was first introduced in 1977 that Sri Lanka is inevitably set on the capitalistic avenue (Moore1992).

While Mike Moore interprets that change in such way, Lakshman explains widely this liberal economic policy which had been drastically transformed the government's political and economic ideologies (Lakshman1997). This exclusive changing of economic paradigm in Sri Lanka secondly could be affected as the foundation factor for transforming whole the socio-cultural life upside down in the country. Anyhow, we have to return back for having a glance to next power strata.

Then in 1994, a government of the people's alliance came into office. This new front again used a political metaphor for their proposing economic ideology as ‘market oriented policy with a human face’. Though the UNP came to power for a period of two years in 2000-2002, there were no successes to implement their early liberal ideas as it is, for restructuring Sri Lanka. The PA government won the mandate 2003, and is still going on. It is highly capitalistic regime. They have ended the ethnic war of 30 years through a nationalistic approach. Now, the capitalism being in Sri Lanka is not the ideal, but a muted one. It leads to an economic dictatorship. Though the justice and freedom are not here, it pretends that they are in everywhere. The general public has been tranquilized with unlimited consumerism of fetish commodities. The people sometimes pretend that they critically against the existent system, but while it is, they have given the silent consent to run the corrupted malpractice. This is not an urgent repercussion and they are the off springs of 1977's radical reformations.

“If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to quote from our party manifesto, we are committed to establish: “a free and just society in our land”. The foundation, the sine qua non, for a free and just society, is a free and just economy. It is with this end in view-the creation of a free and just economy-that this budget has been introduced as the first Budget of this government” (De Mel1978). Ronnie de Mel, the Minister of Finance presented the first budget of 17 years powered UNP government on 15th November

1977. He stressed in the budget speech that they had promised to the people to be promoted 'a free and just society'. At the next chapter, he shifted to the statement of 'a free and just economy'. He proposed to open the closed economy and lead to the economic development. It is an operation functioning without killing the patient. "The establishment of a free and just economy after more than 20 years of controls and restrictive practices which hampered and hamstrung economic growth and development is not an easy task. It is, in fact, a massive operation of the highest magnitude. This operation must be performed successfully and without killing the patient" (ibid: 2).

The finance minister revealed to the parliament in his second budget on 15th November 1978, that in a short period, just a year, Sri Lanka's development level was booming. "Mr. Speaker, last year's budget liberalized the economy and laid the foundation for economic development and growth. This budget marks the commencement of the biggest development programme in the history of Sri Lanka. It is geared to quick investment and growth both in the public and private sector. This is the only solution to the problems of our country and our people" (De Mel 1979).

At that moment, the government proposed the liberal capitalism as a remedy for all the sufferings and crisis of this country. They know that the only one avenue of gathering profit through the foreign investments. The country does not have fuel, gold, coal or other natural resources. But ultimately this profit and the accumulation of capital were centralized on the very limited and selected bourgeois traders, not for the sake of general public.

The change occurred in 1977 was rapid and significant than the eventual slow transforming of paradigms of previous Sri Lankan society. The other important fact was that paradigmatic shift was handled by purposely, artificially and intensively. The Minister of Finance, Ronnie De Mel talked openly about the severe changes, at his second budget speech. "I realized the truth of this dictum only when I began to liberalize the economy of Sri Lanka. It became a battle, a battle for men's minds. Changing rules and regulations was difficult, changing the mentality and psychology of people was even more difficult" (ibid).

They have used a mass media process to change the mentality of people. Gradually electronic and print media propagated the government vision through the advertising and publicity campaign. A giant media culture was initiated along with those efforts. The television received this operation instantly and the hesitation that the finance minister had was vanished. Because of they used a mixture of images of women and desire, money, uncontrolled indulgence and enjoyment in unprecedented manner to entice people into commodity culture.

In 1978, the government knew clearly that when they transform the economic paradigm, inevitably the social and psychological paradigms also would jump a remarkable leap. The 'correct view' should be generated to win a mandate to introduce a new economic policy. They had to prove that the earlier vision was the 'mistaken view'. In the second budget speech, the minister openly theorized his mission.

Again, they knew that after implementing the open economy, 'worker', 'peasant' or 'common man' would not be safeguarded. All the welfares are to be ceased. They pushed people to a path of limitless consumption by promoting selling and buying while pretending to be doing something else. In these two budget papers, the finance minister has mentioned many times that the UNP is not a capitalist party. This was a double standing to achieve strategically their 'task and mission'. The mindset of people was to change internally. In present day Sri Lanka, all the people are admiring the liberal economy, but they have simultaneously forgotten that the worker, peasant or so called common man has not been protected as promised. This situation is a 'paradigm shift' of public thinking, but it comes to surface initially in the field of economy.

Gradually the welfare state politics was being eroded. The government withdrew from investing in the most of economic sectors. Then the private capital and private entrepreneurship began to fill the sectors evacuated by the state. Accordance with that scenario, the commercial capital of those foreign and private entrepreneurs was flowing into Sri Lanka through the opened and deregulated gates. The government strategically opened most sensitive doors without any regulatory practice. This policy was the exact opposite of the previous SLFP regime of 1970-77.

When these new economic policies were taking roots, an export oriented trade regime was established offering new laws and institutions, simultaneously sidelining the existing laws and organizations. Introducing this economic policy, the Minister of Finance explained that the figure of capitalism in Sri Lanka was shaping into a form which supposedly had an indigenous Sri Lankan identity. That did not come true. The capitalistic consumer market does not tolerate having two faces. Its behavior is universal. What happened in fact was that those native identities, values and customs adopted

themselves to fit global capitalism. This dramatically changed the existing style of Sri Lankan life creating a huge gap between the old and new.

The consumption of this level was never seen in the past. Consumer goods of every type flooded the market 'overnight'. It was heard that Sri Lanka was transformed to a 'Singapore'. This new economy was worshipped, admired and overestimated by everyone. This was the power of the magical constitution drafted by JR Jayawardhane. A popular political commentator described this huge change as '*Sri Lanka after JR*' (Gunarathne 1997). Actually, that Sri Lanka was not the earlier one and it was interpellated in to an unknown-new Sri Lanka. That is why this research suggests that it is a shifting of paradigms. Consumerism, enjoyment, suppression, terror, competition, sex objects and the new fetish commoditized life do not represent the earlier paradigms in identity, form, behavior or structure.

Sri Lankan Cinema After in 1977: The Second Paradigm

Accordingance with the brief discussion related the origin of Sri Lankan cinema; one can understand that what sort of correlations seem to be in the economic bedrock and the cinema. It was unsurpassable inter connection as in other countries. When we evaluate the entire journey of Sri Lankan cinema completed, it is clearly understood that it comprises with two major paradigms. The first or early paradigm (1925-1977) is consisted with few sub-paradigms as follow;

- 1925 -*Rajakeeya Wickramaya* TAJ Noorbaih
- 1936 -*Paliganeema* Don Edward
- 1947 -*Kadawunu Poronduwa* BAW Jayamanne
- 1956 -*Rekhawa* Lester James Peries
- 1963 -*Gamperaliya* Lester James Peries
- 1972 -*Nidhanaya* Lester James Peries
- 1974 -*Ahas Gawwa* Dharmasena Patiraja

As the main argument of this paper, the second paradigm of Sri Lankan cinema began 1977 and it is valid up to date. Including early film industrial monopolies of producing sector and most of film making aspects and parameters have been vastly changed in this zone. Especially the state entrepreneurship has been transformed in to speculative or trans-national capital. Sometimes, private capital like Soma Edirisinghe, Milina Sumathipala and Upul Shantha Sannasgala have rushed to film making business and that capital was accumulated through the investments of Jewelry, pawing, newspaper and electronic media agencies, tuition education and gambling like turf accounting. In some extent, there was international capital also invested from Japan, France and some few countries. Based on these different types of production relations, there were few sub-paradigms representing the second paradigm of Sri Lankan cinema.

- 1980 -*Hansa Vilak* Dharmasiri Bandaranayake
- 1983 -*Dadayama* Wasantha Obeysekere
- 1996 -*Anantha Rathriya* Prasanna Vitanage
- 2000 -*Me Mge Sandai* Ashoka Handagama
- 2005 -*Sulanga Enu Pinisa* Vimukthi Jayasundara

Three Revolutions

Most of film scholars researched in Sri Lankan film industry have shown three major revolutions in film making history. Obviously the first revolutionary director was Dr. Lester James Peries who was conferred as the father of Sri Lankan cinema. Dr. Dharmasena Patiraja shifted the wave of cinema tradition in 1974 making *Ahas Gawwa* and it was the second revolution. He had absolutely changed the Lestorian paradigm with his concentration of plot, structure, philosophy and whole cinematic language. Again one can observe the third revolution commenced by Prasanna Vitanage and Ashoka Handagama who have opened the great doors to the international film market and internationally awarded accreditation. These two significant revolutions occurred in the so called second paradigm.

Government Contribution, the Role of Film Producer and Film Director

1972, Sri Lanka State Film Corporation was established under the slogan 'Towards an Indigenous Cinema'. They have kept the peoples' promises and furnished many things to generate very big film culture with wider political philosophy. But after 1977, the executive presidency was constituted as an eco-political designation. Then the earlier vision and mission got completely changed and corrupted. "The system worked quit well, without a single court case filed against the SFC till 1977. It was after Anton Wickramasinghe, (The Chairman of Film Corporation from 1979 to 1989) dismantled the system

in 1979, that there was an influx of court actions against the corporation, with over 100 such actions instituted to date” (Nihalsinghe 2005).

When it was 1971, 80% screen time was allocated for the foreign films including English, Tamil and Hindi (ibid:). The film corporation was constructing the industry with a certain agenda, obtaining that screen time for the Sinhala films as well as making a balance from the side of imported films also. Actually the film attendance and audience were increased by a significant number. DB Nihalsinghe who conducted a research on this matter, mentions that the decline occurred since the immature political shift in the Sri Lankan economy, 1977-1979 marked the highest point of cinema attendance in Sri Lanka with 74.4 Million admissions and when chairman Wickramasinghe retired in 1989, it had declined to 27.8 Million, a loss of 45.6 Million in annual attendance (ibid:).

Anyhow, while losing the grip from government interference, the capital accumulated from beyond the nation state and private sector, started to make films in much acclaimed level. Prasanna Vitanage’s *Anantha Rathriya* opened the gate to the international film festivals. Consequently, younger film directors invaded the entity with huge enthusiasm. Stepping in to the new millennium, film directors like Ashoka Handagama, Somarathne Dissanayake, Sudath Mahadiwulwewa, Inoka Sathyanganie, Linton Semage, Sathyajith Maitipe, Prasanna Jayakody, Sumith Rohana, Athula Liyanage, Vimukthi Jayasundara and Sanjeewa Pushpakumara have utilized the multi-faceted capital modes and won many international film festivals with high concentration. Vimukthi Jayasundara won the ‘camera dor prize’ from renowned Cannes in 2005 for his debut feature film *Sulanga Enu Pinisa* (The Forsaken Land). International film producers like NHK and some international collaborated productions have marked a fresh avenue to think of film making. Vimukthi found a producer for his second film from India and he directed the film for Bengal government. As well as the younger generation attracted to the film making had the opportunity to get foreign film trainings in famous film schools (Vimukthi Jayasundara in France, Boodi Keerthisena in New York and Sanjeewa Pushpakumara in Korea). All those behaviors without any hesitation can be recognized as the rational results of liberal economic reformations after 1977.

Film Circulation, Preservation and the Role of Film Critic

In the second paradigm of cinema in Sri Lanka, though the international fame came up, the amount of film theatres and film spectatorship has been declined badly as mentioned before. One fatal reason for this unfortunate collapsing is highly politicized film governing body and private sector ad hoc influence with only the profit making sense (ibid). All the circulation and other strategies had been planned in broader public entrepreneurship but it ended with mistaken strategies in badly politicized private sector after introducing open economy based on power politics.

This research explored four major inquiry commissions timely imposed. Only the first commission (chaired by Jothiyasena Wickramasinghe in 1962) was truly success and the rest of them AJ Gunawardhane commission in 1985, Ambalawane commission in 1991 and Senaka Bandaranayake commission in 1995 were influenced by polity and business grids (ibid). Some owners of film circulation companies were representing those commissions and that proved the politicization.

The film preservation or archiving also came to an entity which was invaded by self-appointed business. No government proper policy planning, private sector plundered the vacuum. The other thing is that contemporary cinema does not want to concept of preservation, because of those films are made in digital mode. In the age of ultra-capital, early gradual steps of productions are being vanished. These repercussions can be seen without difference in the field of film criticism. At the contemporary cinema there is no specific honored service generated by film critics. The film criticism also is being reduced to couple of narrow sentences or statement or ultimately to an advertisement. Sometime it is simply printed on the DVD cover, like ‘merely a great movie’.

This ‘paradigm shift’ in Sri Lankan cinema and the existing moment of the society are amalgamating day by day and drowning in thousands of commodity signs or simulacrum. The current Central Bank report does not incorporate Sri Lankan film industry to the industrial segment, but under the entertainment factor. The definition given into the film industry in Sri Lanka portrays the crisis and the uncertainty of the subject. The film is one of gigantic entertaining industry. Though the TV or internet invaded the field the well-established transnational trading companies were not shocked or cracked. The most of western countries have changed their point of views and strategies, understanding the formation of the new cinema in a postmodern moment. We observe the same condition appearing in Sri Lanka, but in a mode of ‘perversion’ in some extent or as the repercussions of late capitalism.

CONCLUSION

This paper hopes to test some hypothesis related Sri Lankan cinema, simultaneously with some dimensions in the economy. In the mid of twentieth century the art mode named cinema introduced in to semi-fuddle, post-colonial Sri Lanka and gradually it become a very lucrative business of few entrepreneurs. But, with the strong effort of committed people the film business was converted to a deep art form when it reached to end of 70s. Accordance with the power change in 1977, the UNP government introduced the liberal economic reforms to Sri Lanka, then it effected thoroughly to the film industry without any special. Sri Lankan cinema after introducing the open economy has transformed to a dream factory reality or commodity or simulacrum governed by the logic of the consumerism, while they are over coming international market and makeable fame. This significant turn or interpellation is recognized in this research as a paradigm shift in Sri Lankan cinema and the concept of paradigm shift is borrowed from the contribution made by Thomas Kuhn in the field of general science in 1962.

THE LIST OF REFERENCE

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias

01. New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary 1987, (ed) Bernard S. Cayne, New York
02. Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture 1993, (ed.) Longman Group, UK, Third Edition.
03. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 1996, (ed.) Crowther Jonathan, London, Oxford University Press, 5th Edition.
04. The Oxford English Reference Dictionary 1996, (ed.) Pearsall Judy and Trumble Bill, New York, 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press.

Books

05. Amunugama Sarath 1990, Notes on Sinhala Culture, Colombo, MD Gunasena, 2nd Print
06. De Mel Ronnie 1978, Budget Speech-1978, Colombo, Ministry of Finance, 15th November 1977.
07. De Mel Ronnie 1979, Budget Speech-1979, Colombo, Ministry of Finance and Planning, 15th November 1978.
08. De Silva Colvin RD 1995, Ceylon under the British Occupation, New Delhi, Navrang, Reprint
09. Dissanayake Wimal and Rathnavibhushana, Ashley (2000) Profiling Sri Lankan Cinema, Colombo, Asian Film Centre.
10. Eagleton Terry 1996, the Illusions of Postmodernism, USA, Blackwell Publishers.
11. Fuller Steve 2000, Thomas Kuhn: A Philosophical History for Our Time, Delhi, Orient Logman
12. Gunasinghe Newton 2007, Changing Socio-Economic Relations in Kandyan Countryside, Colombo, Social Scientists Association, 2nd Print.
13. Jayawardhana Kumari 2000, Nobodies to Some bodies: the Rise of the Colonial Bourgeoisie in Sri Lanka, Colombo, Social Scientists Association.
14. Kannagara PD 1966, the History of the Ceylon Civil Service (1802-1833), Dehiwala, TisaraPrakasakayo.
15. Kuhn Thomas S 1970, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Chicago, the University of Chicago Press, 2nd Edition.
16. Lynch Caitrin 2007, Juki Girls Good Girls: Gender and Cultural Politics in Sri Lanka's Global Garment Industry, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press.
17. Lyotard Jean Francois 1984, The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
18. McLuhan Marshall 2003, Understanding Media, London, Rutledge, Reprint.
19. Metz Christian 1973, Language and Cinema, (trans.) D. Umiker-Sebeok, The Hauge, Mouton
20. Moore Mick 1992, What Kind of Capitalism Does Sri Lanka Need?, Colombo, Institute of Policy Studies, Visiting Lecture Series-ii.
21. Nayanajith Kumara Nuwan 2005, *Sri Lankeya Sinama Wanshaya*, Nugegoda, Sarasavi Publishers
22. Nihalsinghe DB 20015, Public Enterprise in Film Development: Success and Failure in Sri Lanka, Canada, Radford Publishing
23. Roberts Michael 1995, Caste Conflict and Elite Formation: the Rise of a Karawa Elite in Sri Lanka 1500-1931, New Delhi, Navrang
24. Senevirathne HL 1999, The work of Kings, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.
25. Silva SBD 1982, The Political Economy of Underdevelopment, London, Rutledge and Kegan Paul.
26. Wickramasinghe Nira 2006, Sri Lanka in the Modern Age- A History of Contested Identities, Colombo, Vijitha Yapa Publishers.
27. Zizek Slavoj 2005, Interrogating the Real, London, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Periodicals and Journals

28. Athukorala Premachandra 2009, "Export-led Industrialization Are the critics right?", Sri Lankan Economy in Transition: Progress, Problems and Prospects, A Tribute to Jayantha Kelegama, (ed.) Ajitha Tennakoon, Colombo, Vijitha Yapa Publishers.
29. Dunham David and Abeysekera, Charles 1987 (ed.), Essays on Sri Lankan Economy 1977-1983, Sri Lanka, Colombo, Social Scientists Association (SSA).
30. Indrarathne ADV De S 1998 (ed.), Fifty Years of Sri Lanka's Independence, A socio- Economic Review, Colombo, Sri Lanka Institute of Economic Studies.
31. Jayasekara PVJ and Amarasinghe YR 1987, "The Economy, Society and Polity from Independence to 1977", Essays on the Sri Lankan Economy 1977-83, (ed.) David Dunham and Charles Abesekera, Colombo, SSA.

32. JayamanneLaleen 1992, "Hunger for Images: Myths of Femininity in Sri Lankan Cinema 1947-1989 (ed.), South Asia Bulletin, Vol. xii. No. 1, spring.
33. NarapalasinhamSupiramaniam 1987, "The Financial Social and Economic gaps in the 'open' economy", Essays on Sri Lankan Economy, (ed.) David Dunham and Charles Abeysekera, Colombo, Social Scientists Association.
34. JayasenaNalin 2010, "Where have all the Tamils gone? Ethnicity and the body in the films of PrasannaVithanage" (ed.), Quaterly Review of film and view, UK, Routledge.
35. JayasenaNalin 2012, "Like making Love to God": The Politics of Intimacy in VimukthiJayasundara's The Forseken Land (ed.), South Asian Popular Culture, New York, Routledge.
36. Rathnavibhushana Ashley and Cruze Robert 2002, "Calm Beneath the Storm", Being and Becoming the Cinemas of Asia, (ed.) ArunaVasudev and et al, India, Macmillan.
37. TennakoonAjitha 2009 (ed.), Sri Lankan Economy in Transition: Progress, Problems, and Prospects, A Tribute to JayanthaKelegama, Colombo, VijithaYapa.
38. Lakshman WD 1997 (ed.), Dilemmas of Development, Fifty Years of Economic Change in Sri Lanka, Colombo, Sri Lanka Association of Economists.

Commission Report

39. WickramasingheJothiyasena (Chairman); Weeraman, Palitha Edmond and Siriwardhane, Reggi (1965) the Report of the Commission of Inquiry in to the Film Industry in Ceylon, Colombo, Government Press Ceylon, Seasonal Paper ii, Appointed by His Excellency the Governor- General on September 10, 1962.