Toward an Anarchist-Apocalypse Cinema Analysis

David Christopher*

A spate of avant-garde apocalypse films emerged towards the end of the twentieth-century in apparent response to the endless cycle of patriarchally conservative counterparts coming out of Hollywood at the time. In fact, such films as Geoff Murphy's *The Quiet Earth* (1985, New Zealand), Don McKellar's *Last Night* (1998, Canada), Lars von Trier's *Melancholia* (2011, Denmark, Sweden, France, Germany), or Bong Joon-Ho's *Snowpiercer* (2013, South Korea), to name only a few examples, stage a particularly anarchist-inflected set of apocalyptic themes as I explain them below. The recognition of this proclivity provides an opportunity to add a layer of understanding to their analysis that complements the dominant theoretical lenses through which film scholars have understood them and to explore the wider contexts of their cultural significance. And, again as I argue below, just as there is a distinct vein of apocalyptic philosophy that runs through an otherwise divergent history of anarchist theory, so too is there a noticeable vein of anarchist philosophy permeating the narratives of such apocalyptic films. Summarily, my project is to recover lost and/or displaced notions of apocalypse and put them in the service of developing an anarcho-apocalyptic analytical paradigm that can be used in future research. This analytical vehicle will help to understand and evaluate an unfolding global ideology reflected in any apocalypse cinema that is imbued with anarchist-inflected sentiment and that significantly challenges a now deeply questionable patriarchal state-capitalist status quo.

In the long history of anarchist philosophy being relegated to the margins of scholarly inquiry, its neglect in film studies is typical. Only a handful of texts explicitly marry anarchist theory to analytical film analyses with as much intellectual rigour as neo-Marxist currents, and few develop substantive *methodologies*: rather, the focus has been on searching for cinematic *representation*. Turning to the issue of

*Guest Editor, David Christopher is Lecturer in Popular Screen Cultures in the School of Arts, University of Leicester.

apocalypticism in anarchism, intimations of secular apocalypse, neither celebratory of violence nor nihilistic in its outlook, are rife in the movement. "Apocalypse" is deeply embedded in its discourse and is perhaps best exemplified in founding figure Mikhail Bakunin's famous apocalyptic aphorism that a destructive clean sweep will be both necessary and creative in the process of progressing towards an emancipatory and sustainable social system.[1] And yet one looks in vain for any evidence of this paradigm in anarchist film studies.

Richard Porton's ground-breaking foundational study, *Film and the Anarchist Imagination* (1999), sets the stage for this neglect.[2] The paradigm itself is swept away as a valid analytical approach in his discussion of Bakunin: "Bakunin is often caricatured as an apostle of violence, and the sentiment from his pre-anarchist essay *The Revolution in Germany* (1842) — 'the passion for destruction is a creative passion' — is too often cited as an anarchist tenet, rather than as a prolegomenon to a more constructive vision of decentralized federalism."[3] Similarly, such significant contributors to anarchist film and cultural studies as Nathan Jun, Jesse Cohn, and Susan White avoid the politically-charged notion of apocalypse in any specific sense. In contrast, recent contributions from Newton and Kristoffer Noheden, for example, more openly embrace the apocalyptic in their anarchist film theory. Following these indications, I use the term "anarchist-apocalyptic" to describe the praxis of filmmaking that includes apocalyptic themes, and a concomitant effort to effect revelation and ideological conversion towards the construction of a non-hierarchical social order.

In what follows, I develop this analytical methodology through a series of questions. What is anarchist theory? What notions of apocalypse are embedded in it? What contributions from anarchist cinema analyses are instructive? Is there any critical value to "progressive" and "reactionary" terminology? And lastly, can an anarchist-inflected cinema analysis lead to methodology applicable across many genres?

What is Anarchism?:

The advent of the modern anarchist movement is often attributed to William Godwin's *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* in 1793. Godwin openly rejected "the state," deeming it "despotism: a government … altogether 'vile and miserable,' and 'more to be deprecated than anarchy itself'."[4] Godwin's early writings duly influenced Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Bakunin, and Pyotr Kropotkin to which more contemporary anarchist theorists regularly turn as a point of departure. Proudhon is most famous for his *slogan "property is theft" in his 1840 book, What Is Property? — An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government.* The fundamental argument here is that property, as a form of capital, will inevitably result in inequitable economic relations. Bakunin criticized Karl Marx on a number of counts, but specifically took issue with Marx's program for violent revolution, which he deemed unnecessary, and Marx's vanguard tendencies, fueled by party-building.[5] Instead, Bakunin propositioned the emergence of a set of affinity-based interactive production communes. The concept of "mutual aid" was popularised by Kropotkin in his eponymous essay collection in which he argued that cooperation, not competition, was the driving mechanism behind the development of human civilization.

Newton's work in anarchist film studies provides a contemporary definition of anarchism. "Anarchist theory is primarily concerned with a more equal and just society through the formation of a non-governmental and non-hierarchical order."[6] Newton contends that "there are core principles which form a basis for most anarchist theory. The fundamental tenet is an opposition to the twin bodies of State and government. This includes resistance to institutions which are in service to them, such as the police, the military, and other bureaucratic entities which organise on their behalf."[7] However, these summary concerns with state and government, and the attendant Althusserian repressive state apparatuses to which Newton refers, do not fully recognize "the articulation of many 'anarchisms' within and outside the movement, sometimes in conflict, sometimes in harmony, sometimes in formation or decline, or simply maintained in uneasy coexistence."[8] Much contemporary anarchist "critique deals with

the entire system of domination, including not only its statist and bureaucratic aspects, but also such factors as economic exploitation, racial oppression, sexual repression, sexism, heterosexism, ageism, and technological domination."[9] Cumulatively, anarchist theory encompasses a wide array of philosophical tenets which are mutually concerned with the social pitfalls of power and authority as is implied by the etymology of the term, an anti-*arche*.

Into the population of anarchist theoretical tenets, Richard Day usefully introduces specific forms of direct action. The "*affinity for affinity*" is an extension of Kropotkin's notion of the much repressed human social propensity for "mutual aid."[10] Day explains the "*politics of demand*" as a hegemonic mechanism in which oppressed social subjects are systemically kept from realizing autonomy by perpetually deferring to an ostensible (and always patriarchal) authority from which they are compelled to plead for "the gift of *recognition* and *integration*."[11] Day discusses what he refers to as "exodus" praxis in which individuals refuse to participate in the social, economic, and political constructs of global capitalism.[12] Day argues that an exodus has the ability to "achieve the goals of revolution and reform here and now, rather than putting them off to some distant place and time. And, in theory at least, if everyone joined the exodus at once, then the whole world *could* change in the way that those who believe in a simultaneous transformation desire."[13] With an allusion to the biblical Book of Exodus and its intimation of the ways that it might visit upon capitalist culture its final dissolution, exodus theory has an apocalyptic tenor. Similarly, in *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism* (1994), Todd May concludes that "anarchist struggle is conceived not in terms of substituting new and better hierarchies for old ones, but in terms of getting rid of hierarchic thinking and action altogether"[14] in the ongoing process of constructing a non-hierarchical social structure that might be considered akin to the apocalyptic notion of a "New Jerusalem."

Anarchist-Apocalypse:

May's apocalyptic intimations are typical in anarchist discourse. However, much anarchist theory has not explicitly adopted "apoc-

alypse" as a progressive philosophy. Anarchism is fundamentally concerned with a rejection of authority in all its guises, especially such patriarchally-inflected forms manifest in capitalist social relations and state socialism. However, it has often had to unduly defend itself against reactionary accusations of unmitigated violence, unproductive nihilism, and naïve utopianism. Such a trend may have begun with Godwin. Although he posited the central anarchist tenet of anti-statism, he described anarchy in terms little better than the contemporary cliché of it, in which it is practised only by what Porton laments as the stereotype of the bomb-throwing 'beardy-weirdy'.[15] In somewhat apocalyptic language, Godwin concludes that "though [anarchy] be a dreadful remedy, it is a sure one."[16] Notwithstanding, Bakunin's apocalyptic aphorism has been echoed by numerous anarchist theorists through history, particularly George Woodcock and Paul Goodman, and is in many ways implied in the works of such post-structuralists as Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze to whom self-identifying "post-anarchists" regularly turn.[17]

"Apocalypse" is an unwieldy term that has come to signify a wide range of social, mythological, and narrative phenomena. As with theoretical efforts to pin down a definition of the term "anarchism," critics who explore the concept of apocalypse as a cinematic motif reference the etymological origins of the word. The term, first appearing in the biblical Book of Revelation (although its conceptualization has even further antecedents), derives from the Greek word *apokalypsis*, which refers to an unveiling or revelation, presumably of God's plan to destroy the world to make way for a New Jerusalem. However, Maria Lisboa states that "apocalypse (in the original meaning of the term), usually tends to be not an absolute wipe-out, [but] merely a clearing of the decks in the anticipation of a new beginning."[18] Elizabeth Rosen agrees that "despite the emphasis on the destructive wrath of God, an emphasis which is made clear both through the pointedly detailed descriptions of the devastation and the proportionately larger amount of time devoted to it, New Jerusalem is still the *raison d'etre* of the traditional apocalyptic narrative."[19]

In a telling similarity of phrasing, Day summarizes Bakunin's philosophy thusly: "It would be necessary to overthrow 'all the heavenly

and earthly idols' in order to organize a new world on 'the ruin of all churches and all states.'" "However," Day reminds us, "after the stage of destruction had ended, [Bakunin] argued that reconstruction could be expected to go on for 'an indefinite period', until the dawning of the day when the 'triumph of [the principle of social revolution] throughout the world removes its *raison d'être*.'"[20] From these definitional foundations, the term "apocalypse" comes to signify four clear political concepts in anarchist theory: 1.) the unmasking of an ideology of domination judged to be corrupt and undesirable; 2.) the destructive sweeping away of an entire social system that supports such ideology; 3.) creativity towards an impossible-to-imagine "New Jerusalem"[21] that will emerge to replace such a system; and 4.) an ongoing or "indefinite period" of permanent evolution in the apocalyptic transition. Summarily, these anarchistic tenets of apocalypse embrace the call for a "clean sweep" of contemporary cultures followed by an ongoing period of creative reconstitution.

These notions of apocalypse are consistently embedded in much anarchist theory. The classical anarchists were perhaps the most explicit in their apocalyptic thinking. In 1844, for example, Max Stirner proclaimed that "the state and I, are enemies. I, the egoist, have not at heart the welfare of this 'human society,' I sacrifice nothing to it, I only utilize it; but to be able to utilize it completely I transform it rather into my property and my creature; that is, I annihilate it."[22] Amongst his myriad references, Jun cites a statement made in 1876 by James Guillaume. "The character of the revolution must first be negative, destructive. Instead of modifying certain institutions of the past, or adopting them to a new order, it will do away with them altogether."[23] Similarly, for Proudhon, the realization of new social relations required "building a new society from the ground up" in order to realize "the alternative form society should take."[24] And, according to Woodcock, "Anarchists believe in the need to destroy, but only in the sense that, as Bakunin said in his famous aphorism, 'the urge to destroy is also a creative urge'. … [W]hat they wish to destroy are the artificial and anti-creative structures of authority and coercion."[25] Day summarily refers to Bakunin's "vision" as "millennial and apocalyptic ... A 'popular social revolution'" that "'destroys everything that opposes' its flow ... It is a totalizing global force."[26] Day reveals this same

sentiment in the works of Kropotkin. "In *The Conquest of Bread*, written in 1892, he sees expropriation [of property by 'the people'] as a singular event made possible only 'when the revolution shall have broken the power upholding the present system' ..., and the people have made 'a *clean sweep* of the Government.'"[27] Kropotkin also refers to the aspect of apocalypse that works as an unveiling of ideology. "By becoming anarchists we declare war against all this wave of deceit, cunning, exploitation, vice — in a word, inequality — which they have poured into our hearts."[28] Echoing Bakunin, German anarchist Gustav Landauer suggested, "Let us destroy mainly by means of the gentle, permanent, and binding reality that we build."[29]

Even avowed pacifist anarchist thinker Woodcock[30] took up Bakunin's mantle. He explains that "because the consequences of our choices can be so disastrous, we are perpetually driven towards absolute conclusions, towards the knowledge that there are some situations which can only be solved by the extremity of a clean sweep. … I have always realized this fact. It led me … to become an anarchist, believing with Bakunin that the 'urge to destroy is also a creative urge.'"[31] In "What is Anarchism?" Woodcock declares to the ruling classes "it is indeed a creed of terror and destruction, for its success means the end of their world, the end of ease for the few at the cost of misery for the many, the end of privilege and exploitation, of the empire of money and greed."[32] Goodman argues the of repression in civilization is "irreversible; our culture has experienced too much of it to ban it, or frighten it, out of mind. Therefore, the only recourse is to try to get … to the end of it."[33] He later reiterates his opinion that "our system is a failure," to which his summary response is, "Then stop it. End it. … change it altogether."[34] This sentiment acutely sums up the anarchist-apocalyptic creed.

The Post-Anarchists' Apocalypse

Many contemporary anarchist thinkers maintain a theoretical counterpoint to those who cannot fathom the constructive side of the project of apocalypse, in which a Nietzschean imprint on anarchist philosophy remains evident. For example, in an obvious reference to

the Nietzschean abyss, the late John Moore has argued if "anarchist art is to be revolutionary then it has to encapsulate 'the anarchist utopia [that] lies over the edge, in the abyss, beyond the veil of the future' … To this end anarchist art should reject all traces of present reality."[35] That is to say that the embrace of the unknown abyss of the future must realize an apocalyptic erasure of the present. Allan Antliff's approach is, comparatively, more materially grounded. Reminiscent of Bakunin's creative destruction, Antliff states that an "aesthetic of tension" occurs in anarchist art, which "constitutes itself within the 'inner life' of an artwork as a socially transformative force" that "escapes the threat of aesthetic closure within the system it challenges by activating our desire to go beyond it, to enter the future society of anarchy."[36] Additionally, Cohn argues that "the anarchist tradition ... does indeed attribute considerable importance to ... the unmasking of ideologies."[37] This anarchist version of "unveiling" suggests a *melioristic* apocalypse over an *annihilating* one in which revelation supersedes the negative impact of a clean sweep.

Post-anarchists May, Saul Newman, Jun, and Day explicitly focus on the manifestation of social power as it is variously articulated by Foucault and Deleuze rather than on an articulation of the latent notion of apocalypse. Nevertheless, from the anarchist perspectives of revelation and renewal, these ideas are closely kindred. According to James Berger, "[t]he desire to see the old order disintegrate links such ... apocalypticists as the romantic anarchist Henry Miller [and] the poststructuralist theorist Michel Foucault."[38] Porton notes "Foucault's longing for 'the intellectual who will *destroy* whatever is obvious and universal and who will seek out and *reveal* the weak spots, the openings, the lines of force … to be found amidst the constraints of the present day.'"[39] In an allusion to Deleuze and Guattari's rhizomatic "lines of flight,"[40] May acknowledges an anarchist propensity "to alter or even destroy some of the relationships of power that [current practises of knowledge] create."[41] He is less ambiguous when he states that "[t]he destruction of capitalism" resides in "a change or set of changes whose effects sweep across the society, causing changes in many other parts of the social domain."[42] May also references Deleuze's notion of social nomadism. "What makes such nomadism a war-machine [against the State] is both the idea that in its creativity it destroys (it

destroys as it creates, a Nietzschean motif [and a Bakunian one])."[43] Similarly, Day alludes to the four horsemen of the apocalypse adapted from the Book of Revelation in a statement he reiterates twice in his text: "the nomadic war machine gallops in off the steppes, sweeping away everything that matters: fields, walls, houses, castles."[44] Day explains that his definition of such "radical activism" comprises "conscious attempts to alter, impede, destroy or construct alternatives to dominant structures, processes, practises and identities."[45] Day suggests that the fomentation of such praxis lies in a form of unveiling: "the strength of anarchist perspectives is in their ability to unmask" exploitative and recuperative socio-political strategies.[46]

It is the recuperative ideological mechanisms inherent to such self-perpetuating socio-economic formations as capitalism that may be part of the reason that such anarchist theory turns to an all-encompassing apocalyptic solution. Uri Gordon, for example, is decidedly apocalyptic in "Dark Tidings: Anarchist Politics in the Age of Collapse" in which he takes the unveiling of such recuperative strategies as the *sine qua non* of anarchist potential. He argues that "capitalism can only go so far in delaying its confrontation with the objective limits to its growth. Thus the ultimate goal of these recuperative strategies is to buy time, prolonging the period of manageable crisis so as to allow hierarchical institutions to adapt away from capitalism."[47] His conclusion is that [s]ince capitalism's strategy of recuperation can only go so far ... its companion strategy – repression – will also remain at the center of establishment responses to collapse."[48] Anarchist film theorist White asks, "If we are functioning within what Marxists have called the 'ideological apparatus of the state,' how can we really critique its cultural products?"[49] Paul Willis proactively disavows the question. "Commercial cultural forms have helped to produce an historical present from which we cannot now escape."[50] However, echoing sentiments that refuse the politics of demand and the "hegemony of hegemony,"[51] Slavoj Žižek makes a distinction between "the 'organic' solution (solving the problem by returning to the purity of [an] original non-corrupted system) [from] the truly radical solution (identifying the problem as the 'symptom' of the entire system, the symptom which can only be resolved by abolishing the entire system)."[52]

Cumulatively, the contributions from these theorists, inflected with such insights from Zizek, demonstrate that there are two strands of apocalypse embedded in anarchist thought. First, these anarchists desire a sweeping away of the established system to make way for ideological revelation and its inevitable social reconstruction, an opportunity to begin the process of radical social transformation. Second, they refuse an apocalyptic excuse to evacuate social responsibility and capitulate to the status quo in anticipation of a wholesale extinction event brought on by an industrial-capitalist driven eco-catastrophe. Žižek, Day, Gordon, and others such as Randall Amster in "The Future" section of his edited compendium in which he submits his tellingly entitled chapter, "Anarchy, Utopia, and the State of Things to Come" (2009), hold abidingly similar apocalyptic pesrepectives.[53] "In these times of … a looming global apocalypse that has lodged itself in the popular consciousness, it appears that present-day society is not sustainable and is nearing its structural and historical limits. Where we go from here is an open question, and the search for an 'anarchist utopia' represents at least one kind of plausible future."[54] What can be gleaned from these contributions, as well as from the notion of apocalypse as the only escape from the recuperation dilemma, is that radical political thought must *embrace* the idea of an apocalypse and engage in anarchist praxis to actively bring it about (including the praxis of cinematic ideological cultivation). However, this embrace gives rise to another question. Exactly what must be swept away?

Sweeping Away Patriarchy = Anarchist-Apocalypse:

The question of what must be swept away is informed by the definitions of anarchism outlined above, part of a discourse that grapples with what it is specifically that anarchism stands to oppose. Antliff includes "bureaucratic procedures and institutional authoritarianism"[55] under which he delineates more specific examples that are characterized by "the exercise of authority – parental authority, political authority, cultural authority."[56] Indeed, the sites of authority against which anarchism struggles pervade the social fabric at all levels from the state and state-capitalism through to the power imbalances within interpersonal relationships that are determined by identity politics.

Jun summarizes this entire field with the phrases "coercive power" and "blind authority" which he argues encompass all variants of the types of authoritative or power-driven social relations that anarchism opposes.[57] In contrast, pre-poststructuralist anarchists speak a language that seems governed by Godwin's initial position that specifically targets the state and the economic institutions that support it. As late as the mid-twentieth century, Woodcock stated that "if men are to become free and are to enjoy anything approaching a complete development of their faculties, the state must be abolished, together with a system of property, and other means of exploitation, such as the wage system, which are contingent to it," (i.e. capitalism and its attendant social alienation).[58] However, under the material conditions of global capitalism, the distinctions between these sites of authority are rendered increasingly untenable if not altogether redundant. As Day insists, "[i]t is quite possible to be as critical of the state form as one is of capitalism, while holding the state to be neither powerless nor homogeneous — one simply needs to see these apparatuses, in an Althusserian way, as overdetermined components of a system that exceeds both of them."[59] In fact, it is difficult to see any clear distinction between such abstractions as "capitalism" and "the state," each of which appear to mutually comprise the other. Imagined as two circles of a Venn diagram, they have come to overlap so completely under the conditions of globalization that they are entirely immanent.

However, this contention, too, runs into the hegemonic tautology that Day warns against by focusing all dissenting practices on a singular monolithic abstraction (regardless of how evident its material ontology is), referred to as the "concentration principle." May, Jun, and Day all reject resistance that is aimed at a singular abstraction such as the state or capitalism on the grounds that it recapitulates hegemonic social relations by granting ontology to the very abstraction of power against which such resistance is aimed. However, these same theorists are vague in their efforts to adequately define what is meant by the now nebulous significations of the term "capitalism," which, under the conditions of globalization, seems to have subsumed all of the offensive power relations that anarchism rejects. Cohn cites Landauer's warning "in his 1907 *Die Revolution* against conceptualizing 'the state' as 'a thing or as a fetish that one can smash in order to destroy

it': rather 'The state is a condition, a certain relationship among human beings …; we destroy it by contracting other relationships, by behaving differently toward one another …'"[60] In this light, "the state," even as an abstraction, is at least one that can be destroyed, one that Landauer tellingly defines as the "emotive behaviour between *men*,"[61] a symptom of the language of patriarchal normativity that historically permeated even anarchist philosophy, and that underpins contemporary manifestations of both the state and capitalism.

Moreover, while earlier strands of anarchism are mostly concerned with systemic forms of authority/power on a larger scale, such as the state, or the capitalist system, rather than interpersonal power politics, poststructuralist theory makes it difficult to understand how even these levels of power/authority can be disentangled. According to Foucault, power is immanent to all social relations, particularly in what he defines as discursive practices,[62] and what Deleuze and Guattari define as a rhizomatic social fabric.[63] Day agrees that "politics today occurs on a complex terrain of relations within and between particular identities, corporations, states and groups of states."[64] Louis Althusser's distinction between repressive and ideological state apparatuses is instructive here, at least in a preliminary way. The former category includes such obviously repressive institutions as the police and military. The ideological category is populated with myriad institutional conventions under capitalism that reproduce (rather than enforce) its alienating social politics.

A problem for anarchist theory, however, is that Althusser's distinction continues to rely on the fundamental abstraction of "capitalism." May describes this as a "strategic" fallacy that applies equally to the Marxist critique of capitalism as much as to the "radical" feminist critique of "patriarchy."[65] In their critique of these renderings of political power, however, both Jun and May do not credit either capitalism or patriarchy as the capacious signifiers they are, the former delineating only the global environment in which the complex rhizomatic social fabric of the latter currently manifests, but in which the latter precedes the former. Whereas criticisms of capitalism are largely dependent on faith in Marxist economic determinism, patriarchy manifests as the result of a much wider set of social, rather than strictly eco-

nomic, determinants. Therefore, the more progressive analysis should privilege criticisms of pervasive patriarchal ideology that do not allow capitalism to be its exclusive encompassing framework, but that understand capitalism, rather, as only the most dominant abstraction of its multifarious sites of oppression. Rather than seeing the desire to sweep away "patriarchy" as an essentializing or a universalizing term in the order of the so-called "concentration principle" (which would require the term to have a fixed and singular definition), it works better as an umbrella term under which there are a wide range of power relations and multiple sites of oppression that can each become the object of a focused gaze of progressive criticism.

Patriarchy should not be understood as any concentrated locus of power, but as an *a priori* milieu for the types of inequity it engenders and that anarchist theory opposes. Patriarchy is better understood as the pervasive ideology of masculinist privilege that underpins all social constructs and power relations under the contemporary conditions of global capitalism and that manifests in multiple sites of oppression. Robin Wood has convincingly argued that "[t]he battle for liberation, the battle against oppression (whether economic, legal, or ideological), gains enormous extra significance through the addition of the term patriarchal, since patriarchy long precedes and far exceeds what we call capitalism."[66] Political economist Nicholas Garnham agrees "that patriarchal and ethnically based structures of domination preexisted the capitalist mode of production and continue to thrive within it is not in question."[67] He adds "that forms of domination based on gender and race could survive the overthrow of capitalist class domination."[68] In psychoanalytic theory, Gad Horowitz also argues that "[p]atriarchal domination precedes class domination," very likely the source of Wood's reformulation of this contention.[69] Horowitz argues that "[p]atriarchal domination appears *before* the emergence of the alienating divisions of labour and class societies." According to Horowitz, quite simply, "[a]uthority is male."[70]

From the anarchist camp, Day agrees that "every 'historical' society has been to some extent patriarchal,"[71] a problem endemic to the social fabric on a global scale. Matthew Wilson is succinct on this point when he argues that "disturbingly," patriarchy is "perhaps the most

prevalent form of hierarchy throughout human history" and "remains firmly in place."[72] In a more nuanced consideration, May articulates a complex topology in which patriarchy stands as the governing ideology to a number of oppressive power relations. Summarily, according to May, "the operations of patriarchy are more, and other, than just economic ones. They constitute a realm of oppression that requires distinct address."[73] Less abstractly, Chris Robé points out that patriarchally-inflected social practices permeate and poison even grassroots communities.[74] He describes a number of progressive video-activist movements torn asunder by the unwillingness of male group leaders to respect female agency within their ranks. Canadian film scholar George Melnyk adds a forebidding prognostication to this sentiment: "since civilization is a patriarchal construct, the end result is the monstrous male, monstrous in what he creates and monstrous in what he destroys."[75] If this ideology is so deeply entrenched within the rhizomatic social fabric on all sides of the left-right political continuum, and at all levels of class stratification, in at least one sense, it must be due cause to sweep away that fabric.

Thus, this investigation comes full circle to the etymological significance of the term "anarchy." *Matri*archy is perhaps the gendered opposite of *patri*archy but *an*archy is the radical other, the outright refusal of "*archy*" as such.[76] Therefore, the solution to the problem of patriarchy is not matriarchy, nor any other "archy"; it is the abolition of "archy," an *an*(*ti*)-archy. In an apocalyptic formulation, this translates to the following *ergo* conditional: if civilization = patriarchy, then *an*-archy = the end of civilization (if patriarchal ideology is understood as a set of masculinist socio-political relations that permeate and delimit the social fabric, and if the power structures embedded within it "come from everywhere" as Foucault insists,[77] then escape from it can only come in the form of a phylogenetic reset at the level of a general apocalypse.) Taking this insight as a point of departure, it can be applied to understanding how it can be used as an anarchist-progressive measure of a range of apocalypse or even merely apocalyptic films.

Anarchist Cinema Analyses – Beginning a New Methoodology:

As Newton observes, there is something of a dearth of anarchist film scholarship, and what exists is theoretically disparate.[78] In terms of anarchist film theory, Alan Lovell, Goodman, Porton, White, Cohn, and Jun have all contributed towards the development of an anarchist vehicle of analysis for cinema and media, but none of these contributions have been significantly taken up by film studies scholars. This is probably primarily due to anarchist theory's unfortunate positioning at the margins of scholarship, but it may also be due to the fact that these efforts did not incorporate anarchism's compelling apocalypticism into their models. More importantly, these contributions largely seek anarchist political *representations* within narrative *contents* rather than apply anarchist theory in the development of an analytical methodology (outside of production, viewing, and reception practices, such as those described by White, Jun, and Cohn). However, they provide a rich loam of anarchist possibilities that have significant merit in the construction of an analytical methodology.

Of particular value are Jun's "Toward an Anarchist Film Theory: Reflections on the Politics of Cinema," and Noheden's "Against All Aristocracies: Surrealism, Anarchism, and Film." In the former, rather than wholly rejecting Frankfurt School perspectives (as Porton claims White does),[79] Jun surveys its contributions for useful understandings of the ideological function of popular cinema and puts them to use in his own anarchist-inflected methodology (that is ultimately similar to Cohn's and White's focus on more active audience reception practices). In contrast, Noheden's project is to reconcile surrealism with anarchist tenets through a historical re-telling of the writings of André Breton. Noheden claims Breton openly rejected the Marxian pessimism that characterized contributions from the Frankfurt school which deemed all cinema as mere "indoctrination" in favour of a more progressive reception of "possibilities."[80] Indeed, Noheden's articulation of surrealist philosophies resonates with an anarchist-apocalyptic theory of cinema analysis. Like anarchism, he argues, "Surrealist film reception evinces a disdain for aestheticism coupled with an equally strong imperative to not just consume popular film, but to actively sift through it for glimpses of a world

transformed."[81] Similarly, underpinning much of Žižek's work, as well as poststructuralist theory articulated by Foucault and Deleuze (which Cohn conversely reads as caught in a paradox of anti-representationalism), is the contention that ideology is not immutable; it *can* change.[82] Both White and Cohn see media in general, and cinema in particular, as an opportunity to effect emancipatory ideological change, which Jun refers to as the "liberatory potential of film."[83] In his contribution to this volume, Noheden argues that especially early cinema "accelerated, decelerated, or chopped up and rearranged by way of montage. The world was first captured, then dismembered, and ultimately pieced together in ways that brought with them new conceptions of time, space, and causality."[84] Cohn further insists that philosophy itself (including its cinematic manifestations) is a form of praxis.[85] Cumulatively, these contributions offer the foundations for a fulsome anarchist theoretical analytical methodology for cinema.

A New Analytical Methodology - Apocalypse is in the Eye of the Beholder:

In *The Anarchist Cinema* (2019), Newton usefully looks to the analyses of Canadian film scholar Wood. Newton argues that "Wood's analysis of such films works to politicise the horror film, and demonstrates how radical ideas can be found in cinema through methods of interpretation."[86] Wood is most renowned for his distinction between "reactionary" and "progressive" horror cinema, in which the former is ideologically conservative in its return to "normality" in the re-containment of social identities that threaten the status quo, and the latter is emancipatory in its sympathetic monsters who remain at large in unresolved endings described as in aperture.[87] Horror films and apocalypse films are structurally related in the way that the former is generally concerned with trauma to the physical body, often in the form of its violent dissection and dissolution, whereas the latter is concerned with trauma to the social body or the body politic, also by its dissection or dissolution. These converge in the horror films of David Cronenberg in particular -- for example, *Shivers* (1975), *Rabid* (1977), *Scanners* (1981), *Videodrome* (1983), and *The Fly* (1986). According to Wayne Rothschild, in "Cronenberg's work ... the body

is the metonymy of society: in this social critique of the body, the body may stand for society itself. In that case, the disfigured body, so familiar in Cronenberg, stands in for disfigured society."[88] Day applies this same metaphor when he chastises "racism, patriarchy, heterosexualism, ableism, the domination of nature and any other discourse that carves up the social-natural field into a hierarchy of identities, or apparatuses of division that undermine community, solidarity and thereby facilitate capture-exploitation,"[89] although he is clearly applying it referencing negative rather than progressive effects. Lisboa also topically (and echoing film studies' continued application of Lacan's "mirror stage" theory) argues that, whether "realistically or not, when we envisage annihilation (brought about by destructive deities, random forces of nature or destructive man-made machines), we create the horror narratives (and rules) we deserve, and we simultaneously polish the hand mirrors in which we can glimpse ourselves, in a glass darkly."[90] More optimistically, John S. Nelson argues that horror "appalls and revolts; yet horror also can revolutionize, provoking fresh perspectives and effective inventions. For good or ill, horror provokes extreme responses that range from willful oblivion to apocalyptic reckoning."[91] Nelson's description might be understood as a version of Antliff's "aesthetic of tension" (see below) specifically for progressive horror or apocalyptic narratives.

However, as Newton observes, "the methods of Wood and Allan Lovell (in his earlier *Anarchist Cinema* [1962]) reflect only an analysis of content."[92] Newton expresses how extended formal analysis can mitigate this shortcoming in a methodology borrowed from Evan Calder Williams' *Combined and Uneven Apocalypse* (2011). "Williams progresses ... to show how the marginal in horror can also relate to a film's formal aspects, looking beyond the depiction of marginalised groups towards the literal margins of the screen – the edges of the frame,"[93] edges that collapse into the frame with the cinematic wash to white that occurs at the moments of apocalypse in such films as *The Quiet Earth* (1985), Vincenzo Natali's *Cube* (1997) and *Nothing* (2003), *Last Night* (1998) and José Saramago's *Blindness* (2008). According to Newton, Calder's methodological focus is his "response to capitalism's dominance, and the 'apocalypse' of the book's title calls for a return to the origins of the word, of apocalypse as 'an end

with a revelation.'"[94] Adding Williams' insights to those of Wood and Lovell, in the context of anarchism and apocalypse cinema, dictates that narratives in which the apocalypse is averted, such as in the spate of Hollywood blockbusters that emerged at the end of the turn of the millennium, including *Independence Day* (1996), *Armageddon* (1998), *Deep Impact* (1998), *The Day After Tomorrow* (2004), and *2012* (2009), fall into a reactionary category in which a return to the normalcy of a capitalist society governed by patriarchal normativity is restored. By contrast, narratives in which the apocalypse (either metaphoric, allegorical, or literal) is realized would be progressive in their refusal to return to the 'normalcy' of the current patriarchal social world.

Progressive anarchist films *embrace* their apocalypticism (rather than *avert* it as in the Hollywood blockbusters mentioned above), both narratively and formally, even against the emotional or narrative tensions within the cinematic art that such a stance must require. Examples of this progressive apocalyptic embrace abound in films across various traditions. Cronenberg's earliest experimental films *Stereo* (1969) and *Crimes of the Future* (1970) stage glacial documentary-styled post-apocalyptic scenarios that evacuate any capitulation to patriarchal normativity. His early commercial films *Shivers* (1975) and *Rabid* (1977) take prurient pleasure in the apocalyptic destruction of bourgeois social society.[95] Murphy's *The Quiet Earth* (1985) stages an apocalyptic erasure of almost all humankind save for three lost souls whose gendered interactions foregrounds the social contradictions of masculinist posturing. Self-identified anarchist thinker auteured the low-budget *Last Night* (1998) which similarly makes no pretense to averting an apocalyptic event and allows its protagonists to socially connect beyond the social contradictions of normative ideology.[96] Von Trier's *Melancholia* (2011) also makes no pretense to averting the apocalyptic event through which the deeply disillusioned lead protagonist finds her only solace from the suffocating depression she suffers in a patriarchal culture of marital normativity. Also a self-identified anarchist and an avowed apocalypticist, Bruce LaBruce produced *L.A. Zombie* (2010), which imagines a graphic zombie "gaypocalypse" in which the mythologized lead character literally "fucks" back to life the victims of a violent patriarchal-industrial class soci-

ety. Self-avowed anti-authoritarian Patricia Rozema more recently directed *Into the Forest* (2015) which counters McKellar's film with a count *into* a feminist apocalypse rather than a countdown *towards* an annihilating one.

For the purposes of the forthcoming taxonomy, the reactionary rejection/aversion of apocalypse against the progressive embrace of it is a first level distinction. However, as Cohn makes clear, the categories of reactionary and progressive are too limited when considered as absolute and mutually exclusive. The political representations in any apocalyptic narrative are surely more nuanced. Thus, following May's model of the "poles"[97] of political philosophy, it is more useful to consider these categories as theoretical markers between which more nuanced distinctions can be articulated; 'higher' level distinctions and analytical provisions occur within the ostensibly progressive category. Again, Nelson offers an excellent example of this methodological distinction. He explains that the "politics of terrorism in *Fight Club*" (1999) for example "might be categorized as anarchical … since its movement named Project Mayhem claims to pursue a fanaticism of destruction. The obliteration of civilization by bombing credit records is to plunge the world into a kind of chaos."[98] Nelson explains that conservative "Western civilization knows this situation, without government as hierarchical rule, to be anarchy in a sense that traces back to Thomas Hobbes."[99] However, as his reference to Hobbes intimates, Nelson argues that "the charismatic project of liberation by Tyler Durden, the protagonist in *Fight Club*, is devoted less to eliminating all hierarchical order than to reviving pure, impulsive, perfectionist action by Nietzschean nobles in a setting before the West was won. The movie makes such a masculinist trajectory at least borderline patriarchial [*sic*], hence incipiently hierarchical,"[100] and, therefore, even though it may be revelatory, it is not fully progressively anarchist-apocalyptic due to its validation of the patriarchal hero necessary to lead the apocalyptic praxis.

In fact, even within the broadly reactionary category of films that reject the apocalypse/avert apocalypse in favour of patriarchal restoration, progressive distinctions can be made. The distinctions revealed by Žižek and Gordon between an industrial-capitalist driven

eco-catastrophe and some other external source of doom (but not revelation in this instance) are significant here. As Gordon explains, "[a]gainst the campaign of induced collective amnesia intended to detach environmental and social chaos from the capitalist system that created them, anarchists and their allies would be drawn to put forward the clear message that the same social forces and structures responsible for this mess should not be trusted to get us out of it."[101] A narrative in which the apocalypse is averted but blame for its ascent remains on the shoulders of capitalism, the state, or patriarchal ideology is at least more progressive in that regard than a narrative like *Armageddon* (1998), for example, in which the apocalypse is not only averted, but responsibility for its ascent is displaced onto such unlikely external sources as aliens or asteroids. *Armageddon* goes so far as to compound the exploitative and eco-catastrophic practice of oil-drilling with the industrial-military organization of NASA, duly equipped with nuclear missiles, as our combined vehicle of salvation. In the narrative, Harry Stamper (Bruce Willis) is heroically positioned as an industrial patriarch, a capable enough oil baron to have designed a drill for NASA to expropriate and save us all!

In more progressive levels of cinematic apoclaypse, the integration of an anarchist philosophical approach develops into a further nuanced analytical framework. Drawing upon the distinction within the reactionary category described above, certainly a narrative in which the apocalypse is realized, but blame for its ascent is displaced from the sites of authority/coercion/patriarchy already described, is closest to the reactionary side of the dichotomy from within the progressive category. If the displacement, however, is onto some form of progressive social revelation that drives a sweeping away of the entire order, the displacement is certainly more progressive. This frames a second level in a progressive continuum. Such a revelatory apocalypse is certainly desirable, but only on anarchist terms (i.e. the sweeping away of patriarchal ideology as opposed to a capitalist-driven apocalypse which will either be wholly annihilating, and therefore evacuate the possibility of revelation, or allow for an aversion/recuperation). A revelatory apocalypse set in contradistinction to wholesale annihilation constitutes a lower sub-category of the second level. A higher sub-category of the second level addresses the prob-

lem of the concentration principle. In this sense, even narratives that locate responsibility for the ascent of apocalypse onto authoritarian/coercive/patriarchal sites of authority can be more reactionary than narratives that reject the concentration principle as such. These forms of apocalypse are more Marxist than anarchist in their faith in a *political* apocalyptic sweeping away of a perceived singular site of oppression, such as capitalism, rather than an apocalyptic representation in which power is more immanently dispersed throughout a rhizomatic fabric of patriarchal *social* relations. The highest sub-category of the second level is comprised of a social apocalypse that sweeps away patriarchal social relations on an interpersonal level but imagines it as a revolution with its attendant ideological result of a new 'socialist' order potentially still suffused with patriarchal normativity. The more progressive apocalypse in this highest second-level distinction refuses any such imagination of accommodating either a patriarchal-socialist or abstract-utopian future. Cumulatively, these second level categories are mutually concerned with the unveiling of the ideology of patriarchal normativity and/or the politics of demand in their various modes. However, in respect of a rhizomatic model of analysis, these levels should not be considered mutually exclusive, but, rather, as reticulations of progressively apocalyptic representations that can readily interact and overlap.

Beyond the narrative topology with which second level progressive distinctions are concerned are the more direct implications of the audience in their own perceptual involvement with the cinematic content. Thus, the third level of analysis comes into contact with psychoanalytic theories of perception and identification that overlap with certain anarchist theoretical approaches. Matthew Adams and Jun, for example, describe the unveiling aspect of the work of "Sigmund Freud, the grand diagnostician of the irrational impulses lurking behind the veil."[102] If the project of psychoanalysis is to unveil repressed desires that are wreaking havoc with healthy consciousness, the related project of Apocalypse is to unveil ideology within "the social unconscious" (a term I borrow from Terry Eagleton)[103] that is doing the same to healthy social consciousness. The philosophy of anarchist praxis ('direct action') is instructive here. Wilson explains that "throughout anarchist thought there is in fact a strong emphasis

on praxis, on anarchy in action, which, however much this may rely implicitly on some metaphysical view or another, is really concerned with uncovering what these views might be."[104] As Jun indicates, such revelation might well manifest in the artistic practice of cinema production. In this regard, even lower progressive levels of anarchist-apocalyptic cinema concerned more specifically with narrative content constitute a form of praxis in their function of unveiling normative ideology.

With regard to cinematic reception and ideological *conversion* (rather than mere *revelation*), such a philosophical praxis works via the mechanisms of cinematic perception and identification. The efficacy of such praxis pivots on the interaction of narrative content and medium-specific affordances, something of a mirror-stage inspired apocalyptic embrace (which can be understood as an early form of interactive media). One specific way that an anarchist-progressive narrative will induce an embrace of the apocalypse is through a mirror-stage identification with apocalypse through prosopopoeia. In their discussion of "Žižekian" cinema theory, both Matthew Beaumont and Fabio Vighi point to the literary function of prosopopoeia as a mechanism through which capitalism is endowed with an independent agency "where the thing [that] speaks is the market itself"[105] and that consequently evacuates personal responsibility for its negative social effects. If anarchist praxis turned this agency back upon itself, it might apply the same sort of prosopopoeia to representations of the apocalypse. That is to say that representations of the apocalypse, either embodied or abstracted, could speak their own revelations. In his discussion of various cinematic narratives of zombie apocalypse, for example, Kyle Bishop describes prosopopoeia in terms of an apocalyptic alteration of normative ideology: "*prosopopoeia* … disturbs logocentric order, the common reality of things"[106] by imbuing ontological abstractions with communicative agency.

This vehicle of apocalyptic prosopopoeia suffuses many of the more progressive apocalypse films already suggested. In Cronenberg's *Stereo* and *Crimes*, for example, the apocalypse is anthropomorphised in the characters of Dr Stringfellow and Antoine Rouge, respectively, although they remain faceless and disembodied in the narratives.

In *Rabid*, by contrast, the apocalypse is specifically embodied in the character of Rose who visits all manner of punitive suffering on a range of patriarchal characters and institutions. In *L.A. Zonbie*, it is the abject queer zombie-monster who embodies the very face of apocalypse, foregrounded in LaBruce's unsettling long-takes centred on the beast's ghastly visage. In Bruce McDonald's *Pontypool* (2008), while the apocalypse occurs as the abstraction of a larger zombie plague, it is literally "voiced" in the way that the virus is transmitted through "infected" English words. In *Little Bit Zombie* (2012), unlikely face of the apocalypse Steve is hilariously emasculated by his overbearing fiancée to whom he capitulates even as he slowly transforms into an unwilling brain-eater. Saramago's *Blindness* (2008) loosely embeds the apocalypse in the character of the Doctor's Wife who visits its fatal vengeance on the disgusting patriarchy of the self-proclaimed "King of Ward 3" before leading her band of survivors to freedom and a new world. Even in the decidedly more commercially spectacular blockbuster series *Resident Evil* (2002-2016), it is the feminine face of the apocalypse, Alice (or any one of her clones), that returns apocalyptic vengeance against the corporate powers that unleashed the zombie plague of which she is an inherent part.

Observing anarchist tenets, such cinematic ideological conversion through a mirror-stage prosopopoeiac identification need not be coercive nor covert. As Jacques Lacan argues, "the process of the philosophical meditation throws the subject towards the transforming historical action, and, around this point, orders the configured modes of active self-consciousness through its metamorphoses in history."[107] In his discussion of the affinities between anarchism and surrealism, Noheden explains how Pierre Mabille, for example, did not consider such a cinematic experience to make a viewer "susceptible to ideological manipulation. Instead, he considers the mirror in its many manifestations to enable an experience of the unity of mind and matter, imagination and reality, and so provide a revolutionary rupture in the fabric of the status quo."[108] Lacan also explains that "[s]pectators, in turn, are free to assign multiple meanings to a given film, none of which can be regarded as the 'true' or 'authentic' meaning,"[109] all of which, however, induce a certain "power of annihilation" in the sense of a Cartesian solipsism in which the fundamental subjectivity of any

interpretation of individual representation to oneself annihilates the subject's certitude of anything outside that interpretation.[110]

Indeed, unlike the soothing mythology of capitalist prosopopoeia in which the status quo is supported and defended by its beneficent agency, a prosopopoeiac mirror-stage identification with apocalypse (an otherwise Lacanian unideal *par excellence*)[111] is likely to induce a traumatic schism. Taken together, along with Lacan's, Noheden's, and Mabille's understandings of ideological conversion through the phenomenon of cinematic perception, such a cinematic experience resonates with Antliff's understanding of an anarchist aesthetic of tension. Again, reminiscent of Bakunin's creative destruction, and significantly concerned with the mechanics of artistic reception, Antliff describes a number of artworks that realize this aesthetic in the ways that defamiliarize the normative aspects of a neo-liberal political ideology[112] by thematically exposing oppressions and contradictions. This, in turn, works to generate a compelling dissonance in the sensibilities of a viewer. This may, as I read Antliff, create a discomfiting affect, revealing to the viewer the ugly contradictions in neo-liberal ideology, and rendering them distasteful to the self. The impact echoes sentiments expressed by Stirner as early as 1844. "Art has for a long time not only acknowledged the ugly, but considered the ugly as necessary to its existence, and takes it up into itself; it needs the villain."[113] The aesthetic of tension in progressive anarchist-apocalypse films manifests between the necessarily ugly conditions of violent apocalypse on the one hand, and its necessity to escape the recuperation loop and achieve anti-patriarchal ideological emancipation on the other.

The notion of apocalypse in general duly lends itself to the affect that such an aesthetic engenders. As Berger acknowledges, while writing *After the End: Representations of Post-Apocalypse* (1999), he was "greatly assisted by the enormous scholarship on … apocalypticism [which reveals] the emotional responses of fear, desire, relief, fascination, horror, contempt, agony, and nostalgia inspired by imagining some definitive End."[114] Indeed, the embrace of such a violent notion as apocalypse must of necessity invoke a tension between trauma and desire. Summarily, Berger states that "[t]he apocalyptic desire is a

longing for the end" and his short list of those who have best articulated this longing is telling.[115] He specifically delineates the anarchist "Henry Miller's wish to put dynamite in the world's anus" and "Michel Foucault's wish to see the traces of Man erased."[116] These two, according to Berger, epitomize the ways in which "Apocalyptic desire coincides with a total critique of the world, a critique that annuls any chance of reform."[117] However, "apocalyptic desire is a longing also for the aftermath, the new Jerusalem and for the frustrated humanist-anarchist visions behind Miller's destructive rants and Foucault's analyses."[118] Berger's description echoes May's poles of political philosophy, and considerations of the "is" and the "ought" to be.[119] "The combination of violent hatred for the world as it is and violent desire for the world as it should be has characterized apocalyptic representations and apocalyptic social movements since their first recorded instances."[120] The desire for apocalypse, as Berger describes it, is both tension-filled and seductive in the very way that Antliff characterizes with respect to the anarchist aesthetic of tension's appeal.

However, the anarchist embrace of apocalypse need not be solely traumatic and wholly destructive. Jamie (Vishwam) Heckert cites Samuel Clark and Dave Morland's positing that "anarchists have developed more sophisticated arguments than simply suggesting that the official political economy and all other mechanisms of control could be abolished in a moment allowing human nature to be free to express its natural cooperative instincts, free of repression."[121] Following Heckert's work, progressive anarchist-apocalyptic cinema analysis views both anarchism and its apocalyptic implications as a set of relationships,[122] specifically reminiscent of Landauer's description of how to visit an apocalyptic dissolution on a "state," also understood as a set of relationships amongst its subjects that give it ontology. Heckert, citing Landauer, explains that the state, understood as "a social relationship … cannot be 'blown up' …, but can be destroyed 'by entering into other relationships, by behaving differently to one another.'"[123] Heckert summarily concludes that "Anarchism is offered as affirming alternative relationships to those of state (and equally, to intertwined hierarchical relationships including capitalism, patriarchy, heteronormativity and colonialism)."[124] Thus, Heckert's loose allusions to apocalypse see "anarchism as an ethics of relationships,"

a view that understands even apocalyptic transformation "not as a banal revolutionary slogan, but as actual process. Change as the ability of revolutionaries to admit mistakes, to stop and question everything."[125] Progressive anarchist-apocalypse cinema operates as a process towards ethics of relationships without normativity, patriarchy, or prescribed hierarchies of morality.

However, both Heckert's understanding of affective progressive social change and the ideological function of a mirror-stage-like identification with a prosopopoeiac apocalypse leads to yet another question: what cinematic mechanisms might suit the purpose of representing such an apocalypse with an eye to progressively modifying ideology? Indeed, how can a cinematic representation create the desired *affect*? In *Skepticism Cinema* (2016), a text that is timely for its concern with existential solipsism in this era of epidemic mediated social relations that nearly realize Jean Baudrillard's model of the simulacrum in *Simulacra and Simulation* (1981), Phillip Schmerheim turns to Stanley Cavell for answers to such questions. "Cinema presents a screen," Schmerheim argues, "i.e., projected version of the world that, as Cavell roughly puts it, satisfies our normal senses because it simply is present to them, affects them, but the world created through this sensorial satisfaction is ultimately unavailable because it is inaccessible to us."[126] Schmerheim concludes that "[f]ilm stages a projection of a world we cannot interact with as film spectators."[127] However, what this understanding of cinematic reception overlooks is that such absolute foreclosure on complete sensorial access may well heighten the affect of desire.[128]

Indeed, the philosophical aspect of many apocalypse films particularly concerned with an ideological communication with the viewer is congruent with at least one classically-anarchist perspective. Proudhon "reached a conclusion appropriate to an anarchist outlook: that art is autonomous, but at the same time — because it communicates between artist and audience — is a social activity and therefore has its part to play in the transformation of society."[129] According to Adams, "[t]he ink-smudged paper leaving the desks of a Kropotkin or Bakunin for the type setter and printer was intended to inspire, invigorate, and inflame."[130] Robé recounts Sandra Elgear's comments regarding

the anarchist practice of "videotaping" that she expresses with significantly similar sentiments. "We wanted it to be used as an activist tool. That was absolutely what it was for. It's a tape to show, to get people thinking and get people out there and get people angry [i.e. 'inflame' above]."[131] In Noheden's wayward journey to anarchism through the surrealist philosophies of Ado Kyrou, he argues for "a surrealist-anarchist enjoyment in film's transformative capacities" in which "[f]or Kyrou, cinema was heir to a frenzied romanticism that was capable of transporting the spectator, in a state of affective exaltation, to the heart of the unknown."[132] In *Cinema 1*, Deleuze similarly explains the ways in which an appropriately affective image in turn generates the impulse-image and then a concomitant action in a meditation entitled "From affect to action: The impulse-image."[133] In a language that is less ambiguously apocalyptic, Deleuze explains that the result of the affection-image is the creation of a properly cinematic "originary world" to which the representation refers, an analogue to Lacan's Real,[134] which in turn generates a radical possibility of hope. "The originary world is the beginning of the world, but also an end of the world, and the irresistible slope from one to the other; it carries the milieu along and makes it into a closed world, absolutely closed off, or else opens it up on to an uncertain hope."[135] Ultimately, in Deleuze's model, the affection-image resolves into something of an apocalyptic sentiment or impulse.

However, with respect to even the possibility of meliorism or praxis in the face of apocalypse, Peter Manley Scott asks, "*If apocalypse is an event the script of which is already written, in what sense do human beings participate in apocalypse?*"[136] Most traditional apocalypse films, whether ideologically reactionary by displacing the cause of apocalypse onto an external force, or progressive in that they lay blame on capitalist-industrial eco-catastrophe and social alienation, imagine it as an *event* – an eschatalogical epistemology that sees the apocalypse as occurring at a specific point in historical time. By doing so, notions of an *ongoing* apocalypse are effaced. Imagining the apocalypse as a finite event locates it as an identifiable temporal *objet a*, through which fantasies of aversion and dissolution, either before or after *the event*, can allow for ideological management of the fear, and evacuate ideological responsibility for what is ongoing, what is happening now.

According to Antliff, rather than "seeking to emancipate 'everyone at once,'" anarchism propounds "'a non-hegemonic theory of social change … focused on how each of us, as individuals and members of communities, must free ourselves, in an effort that cannot be expected to terminate in a final event of revolution."[137] In keeping with this insight, Italian anarchist Errico Malatesta argued long ago, "It is absurd to believe that, once the government has been destroyed and the capitalists expropriated, 'things will look after themselves' without the intervention of those who already have some idea, however loose or tentative, about what has to be done, and who would immediately set about doing it."[138] Malestesta's contention, however, comes dangerously close to validating a call for some sort of party vanguard. In defense against this, an anarchist apocalypse refuses the fomentation of such a vanguard through an endless apocalypse. Whereas the Marxist revolution is conceived of as an event, even if a lengthy one, the anarchist apocalypse will be indefinite and ongoing, fundamentally progressive.

Narratively, the easiest filmic way to suggest this would be to end a film with the general apocalypse (as with McKellar's *Last Night*, for example) and/or leave it in aperture in order to avoid positing any form of prescriptive social blueprints that preclude anarchist experimentation. As Lisboa observes, in more reactionary apocalypse film narratives, what comes after is usually just some set of not-very-changed patriarchal circumstances.[139] In this regard, *Snowpiercer* (2012) is of particular interest. Featuring a transnational cast of Korean and Western superstars, the narrative depicts an eco-apocalypse that has already occurred, and what remains of humanity is on a high-speed train that, oddly, must continue circumnavigating the globe for their survival. In what appears to be a satire of the threat of the post-apocalyptic return of class-based and patriarchal social relations, the populace on the train is organized quite literally into economic social classes in the same explicit metaphoric way as they are in J. G. Ballard's *High-Rise* (1975), for example, or Andrew Niccol's genetic-dystopia film *In Time* (2012), except that social relations in *Snowpiercer* are in a decidedly post-apocalyptic setting. Under these suffocating conditions, the oppressed classes rise up and vanquish the train patriarch (although really only under the leadership

of another patriarchal hero). Another interesting apocalyptic train narrative is Yeon Sang-ho's *Train to Busan* (2016). The failing family patriarchy of the lead character is mapped on to the general apocalypse of a zombie outbreak. The film begins with an eco-critical anti-anthropocentric intimation when the narrative's earliest infected victim is an ungulate roadkill reanimated after its death. (This same harbinger is employed with the reanimation of a dead dog and dead salmon in Jeff Barnaby's First Nations zombie epic *Blood Quantum* [2019].) Ultimately the narrative ends with a cliché of the sacrificial father but, notably, this failing patriarchal figure succumbs to the zombie apocalypse, literally becoming a part of it, and in doing so, leaves behind all of the patriarchal disappointment by which his life had become so unsatisfying. His daughter and her companion escape into an uninfected military stronghold, but the zombie apocalypse remains ongoing, and it seems unlikely that even this safe haven will survive it.

Embedded in this third analytical level are the intimations of the fourth and 'highest' level of cinematic praxis within the narrative in which the apocalypse can be progressively unfolding through the convention of narrative aperture. Following the Marxist treatment of commodity, or Bourdieuian cultural capital, leaving a narrative in aperture provides a ready opportunity for a sequelization that macro-recuperates any progressive ideology which might be contained within the narrative. This occurs, for example, in the two Americanized sequels to Natali's *Cube*, which include backstories and epilogues that attempt to provide narrow explanations and culprits for the apocalyptic machine. Citing Mabille, Noheden recounts that "the spectator fears that . . . the new living mirrors might reveal to him a universe different from that in which classical systems of thought enclosed it. He is afraid of testimonies which might bring everything into question."[140] Conversely, one way the anarchist aesthetic of tension is achieved is through a praxis that realizes "'a continual reversing of theory into action and action into theory' which refuses closure."[141] Indeed, Jun quotes Cohn to assert that "reality is in a continuous process of change and becoming, and that at any given moment, it includes an infinity – bounded by, situated within, or 'anchored' to the concrete actuality of the present — of emergent or

potential realities."[142] Realities can begin to manifest as an ideological change in an otherwise sedentary viewer caught up in the affect of cinematic narrative aperture.

Thus, the implications of an ongoing apocalypse realized in cinematic narrative aperture satisfy the anarchist refusal to imagine social blueprints and resolve the concern to obstruct the return of patriarchally-inflected social relations within any re-stabilized future. Indeed, Adams encapsulates Kropotkin's understanding of the revolutionary 'event.' "Once the struggle was won, the struggle would continue."[143] In this interpretation, it is desirable for the event that sweeps away undesirable social relations to never end, and for apocalypse to become the new status quo, or as Antliff puts it, to become "an enduring commitment to antiauthoritarian values within and between communities."[144] There is an important distinction to be made here between "revolution" and "revelation." As Porton argues, "[t]he resourceful teacher believes that 'capitalism is collapsing,' but does not partake of the stale temptation to proclaim that revolution is around the corner."[145] An anarchist apocalypse does not seek "progress" in the sense of a long and large historical journey towards social utopia such as that suggested by Marxism, but "progressive" in the sense of immediate and ongoing moves towards egalitarianism and social emancipation. In contrast to Marxist conceptions of cultural *revolution* and its concomitant notion of apocalyptic 'closure', an anarchist apocalypse constitutes itself as a cultural *revelation-evolution*, an ideological metamorphosis brought on by the ongoing destruction of 'civilization' as such: a *continuous* phylogenetic reset that sweeps away patriarchal social relations and all of the attendant domination, authority, and deeply entrenched ideologies and institutions that have been built on its tenets.

Cumulatively, the anarchist recognition of a constant threat of the return of patriarchal normativity, its rejection of the apocalyptic "event," and its further rejection of authoritarian vanguardism, all require the refusal of any grand narrative of social engineering or utopian teleology. As such, the anarchist refusal of social blueprints and the call for an ongoing apocalypse are necessarily complementary and result in an anarchist apocalypse that is soteriological rather

than eschatological. Whereas eschatology refers to a final judgement resulting in the apocalyptic destruction of mankind, soteriology offers an opposing perspective in which an apocalyptic event will result rather in the 'salvation' of mankind through 'redemption'. I am not working with the mystical religious meaning of these concepts. I reference the ways in which "apocalypse" may result in humanity's continuation on a new foundation rather than its wholesale destruction. In progressive films representing such an apocalypse, it is either a metaphor of change or a harbinger of the outcome of current trajectories of the social fabric. A progressive anarchist apocalypse realizes an *ongoing* change within the rhizomatic social fabric, rather than a wholesale movement from one totalizing phase of history to another, although it may narratively use the latter to allegorize its prompt to change. Translated specifically into the construction of a progressive anarchist-apocalyptic cinematic manifestation, the prosopopoeiac identification with apocalypse cannot be allowed to stabilize and must resolve into the narrative aperture of an ongoing apocalypse.

Summarily, an analysis of the anarchist-apocalyptic propensities in cinema runs along two axes. The first axis measures films that reject or avert the apocalypse (reactionary) against films that realize and even embrace the apocalypse (progressive), an anarchist-inflected reticulation of Žižek's distinction between an ineffectual "'organic' solution (solving the problem by returning to the purity of the original non-corrupted system)" and a "truly radical solution (identifying the problem as the 'symptom' of the entire system, the symptom which can only be resolved by abolishing the entire system)" (cited above). The second is a more nuanced lateral axis that considers a range of progressive levels starting with fully reactionary films that decouple the apocalypse from its anthropogenic, patriarchal, and capitalist foundations in favour of external sources that 'bring it on' such as interstellar phenomenon (as in *Last Night*, for example, in which an ambiguous heavenly light descends upon earth throughout the film, expected by all the characters as an end-times) through to more progressive representations that see the apocalypse as ongoing and socially erotic (if not anxiety- and tension-filled, as in Cronenberg's oddly titillating *Shivers* or LaBruce's unsettling queerpocalypse in *L.A.Zombie*).

Conclusion – The Anarchist-Apocalyptic 'Progressive' Double-Entendre

Thus, the fourth and most progressive level of analysis gives rise to a double-entendre in which the anarchist apocalypse with which a viewer might experience a third-level prosopopoeiac identification (in Wood's sense of it being socially emancipatory by rejecting normative patriarchal ideology) must be continuous and ongoing (in both Wood's and Barbara Klinger's sense of rejecting narrative closure or apocalyptic finitude).[146] Concisely encapsulating the double-entendre implied in the term progressive, already present in the refusal of closure, is the anarchist aesthetic of tension. "Its paths are tactical and multiple: residing in the flux of contestation, it signals anarchism is an empowering idea, one that orients itself towards the future, rather than atrophying in the present, because the conditions for its realization are ever-changing … a social vision that has no end goal or final reckoning: … – a social aspiration without limits."[147]

In this way, an anarchist-apocalypse narrative has the potential to realize an extreme case of the aesthetics of tension. According to Berger, in order to relieve the anxiety that arises in the unknowability of the other side of apocalypse, "[v]ery few apocalyptic representations end with the End. There is always some remainder, some post-apocalyptic debris, or the transformation into paradise."[148] Thus, "the term 'post-apocalypse' turns out to be both a misnomer and conceptual error. What follows apocalypse ought to be either nothing or something epistemologically different but in fact [the 'afterwards'] almost always turns out to be … a not-very-revised version of prior realities."[149] A true anarchist-apocalypse, in contrast, gives rise to an aesthetic of tension that leaves the panacea of imagining the other side of apocalypse unresolved. In its peculiar refusal to imagine the future, favoring instead only a visual fantasy that is freed from the fetters of linear time, the anarchist apocalypse film engenders a very specific form of prefiguration that is directly related to the refusal of closure and an apocalypse that must be ongoing. The anarchist apocalypse film thus creates a form of prefiguration replete only with potential rather than any form of doctrinaire praxis: here we have an *ongoing* apocalypse in which normative patriarchal hierarchy is in a constant state of era-

sure, and survival necessitates that "diversity and inclusivity without hierarchy"[150] are all that remain. In other words, it is *progressive*.

This is why the term "apocalypse" is more critically useful here than such terms as "horror" (often considered a larger category in which apocalypse cinema is a subgenre), "holocaust," "catastrophe," "disaster," "tragedy," or even "Armageddon," all of which have duly received their own attention as genres of cinema. Unlike these other terms, and in common with much anarchist philosophy, "apocalypse" not only implies a clean sweep, but it is also deeply concerned with revelation and renewal, themes that permeate progressive anarchist-apocalyptic films. In a language resonant with this sentiment, in *The Apocalypse on Film* (2016), Angela Krewani explains that "apocalyptic thinking emerges as a result of institutional and societal failures to embody individual fears and a deeper distrust in society's institutions. As such, this approach to the apocalypse offers a well-known argumentative structure, which can provide the basis of political and cultural criticism" through and of art-forms including cinema.[151] Krewani concludes that "the apocalypse provides the political discourse, on the one hand, and on the other, it offers a rich visual and semantic pool of meanings to be experimentally connected with topical political criticism."[152] If "radical critics also have a role to play by writing ... from an anarchist perspective,"[153] then it is timely to respond to this prompt in concert with Krewani's related call to "explore ... how apocalyptic thinking and topics can be integrated [especially, I think, with anarchist philosophy] in experimental 'art house' films" such as those produced internationally by filmmakers working so hard to operate outside of the global hegemony of Hollywood.[154]

In what might be considered the "age of apocalypse," characterized by the post-structuralist "death of the subject," the post-modern "incredulity to grand narratives," the collapse of culture (on one side of the digital divide) into digital media, the credibility of science losing ground to populist opinion and religious zealotry, industrially-driven eco-catastrophe, global pandemic, sheer untenable global populations, and the concomitant rise of representations of apocalypse in cinema, the anarchist understanding of apocalypse and its application to cinema analysis is well due. Perhaps, as many anarchist-apoca-

lyptic films seem to suggest, the "end times" can be emancipatory. Indeed, perhaps the *embrace* of the more progressive aspects of apocalypse can help save us from an annihilating inevitability. In any case, I am advancing an understanding of apocalyptic tendencies in contemporary films, their radical socio-political dimensions and the cultural work that they do with respect to politics, social practice, and ideological identity, believing an anarcho-apocalyptic methodology is key to assessing just how *progressive* these films are.

Notes

1 See the different approaches to this aphorism in George Woodcock's *The Rejection of Politics and Other Essays* (Toronto: The New Press, 1972) and Richard Porton, *Film and the Anarchist Imagination* (London, Verso, 1999).
2 Others include Alan Lovell, *Anarchist Cinema* (London: Peace News, 1962), Stuart Christie, ed. *Arena One: Anarchist Film and Video* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2009), James Newton, *The Anarchist Cinema* (Bristol, UK: Intellect Books, 2019), and Chris Robé, *Breaking the Spell: A History of Anarchist Filmmakers, Videotape Guerrillas, and Digital Ninjas* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2017).
3 Porton, 7.
4 William Godwin, *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (Oxford University Press, 2013), 15.
5 Vanguardism is the notion that an intellectual or military elite within the proletariat must take the reins of political revolution in order for it to develop the necessary cohesion and momentum to succeed.
6 Newton, 4.
7 Newton, 9.
8 Allan Antliff, "Anarchism and Art History: Methodologies of Insurrection" in *The Continuum Companion to Anarchism*, Ruth Kinna, ed. (London: Continuum Press, 2012), 74.
9 John Clark, "Anarchism and the Present World Crisis" in *Reinventing Anarchy, Again*. Ed. Howard J. Ehrlich (AK Press, 1996), 100.
10 Richard Day, *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2005), 8, 9, 14-15.
11 Day, 14-15, 75-6, 83.
12 Day, 148, 210, 214-15.
13 Day, 215.
14 Todd May, *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), 51.
15 Porton, 11.
16 Godwin, 291.
17 Matthew Adams and Nathan Jun, "Political Theory and History: The Case of Anarchism," *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 20:3 (2015): 247.
18 Maria M. Lisboa, *The End of the World: Apocalypse and its Aftermath in Western Culture* (Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2011), 8.
19 Elizabeth Rosen, *Apocalyptic Transformation: Apocalypse and the Postmodern Imagination* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008), xiv.
20 Day, 113-14.

21 Lisboa, 63, 132.
22 Max Stirner, *The Ego and Its Own* [1844] (Wokingham: Dodo Press, 2010), 173
23 James Guillaume cited in Nathan Jun, *Anarchism and Political Modernity* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2011), \116.
24 May, 57-8, 59
25 George Woodcock cited in Mark Antliff, "Pacificism, Violence and Aesthetics: George Woodcock's Anarchist Sojourn, 1940-1950," *Anarchist Studies 23.1*. (2015): 15-44.
26 Day, 113-14.
27 Day, 118.
28 Kropotkin cited in Jun, *Anarchism*, 119.
29 Gustav Laundauer cited in Day, 123.
30 Mark Antliff, 15.
31 George Woodcock, *The Rejection of Politics and Other Essays* (Toronto: New Press, 1972), 100.
32 Woodcock, *Rejection*, 100.
33 Goodman cited in Taylor Stoehr, *Format & Anxiety: Paul Goodman Critiques the Media* (Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 1995), 78.
34 Goodman in Stoehr, 159.
35 Allan Antliff, "Anarchy in Art: Strategies of Dissidence," *Anarchist Studies*11.1 (2003): 80-1.
36 Allan Antliff, "Aesthetics of Tension" in *The Anarchist Imagination: Anarchism Encounters the Humanities and the Social Sciences*, Carl Levy and Saul Newman, eds. (New York: Routledge, 2019): 238.
37 Jesse Cohn, "What is Anarchist Cultural Studies? Precursors, Problems and Prospects" in *New Perspectives on Anarchism*, Nathan Jun and Shane Wahl, eds. (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009), 412.
38 James Berger, *After the End: Representations of Post-Apocalypse* (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1999), 7.
39 Porton, 218.
40 Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, "From *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* – From *Introduction: Rhizome*" in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, Vincent Leitch et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2001), 1605.
41 May, 135.
42 May, 54.
43 May, 105.
44 Day, 138-9, 173.
45 Day, 4.
46 Day, 254.

47 Uri Gordon, "Dark tidings: anarchist politics in the age of collapse" in *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academy*, Randall Amster, ed. (London: Routledge, 2009), 252.
48 Gordon, 253.
49 Susan White, "Anarchist Perspective on Film" in *Reinventing Anarchy, Again*. Howard J. Ehrlich, ed. (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 1996), 273
50 Paul Willis cited in John Storey, *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: An Introduction – Eighth Edition* (London: Routledge, 2018), 265.
51 Day, 8. Day argues that Antonio Gramsci's notion of hegemony dynamics as the social negotiation of ideologies across differently empowered political factions has become so entrenched in cultural studies and political praxis that it manifests as hegemonic itself, widely evacuating alternative political sensibilities and functionally discouraging individualized interventions in social activity.
52 Slavoj Žižek, *Living in the End Times* (London: Verso, 2011), 23.
53 Although Žižek does not ascribe to anarchism, he champions direct action and horizonal power as a praxis. Building upon a famous aphorism from Fredric Jameson, Žižek asks: "How come it is easier for us to imagine the end of all life on earth, an asteroid hitting the planet, than a modest change in our economic order? Perhaps the time has come to set our possibilities straight, and to become realists by way of demanding what appears impossible ... The surprising explosion of Occupy Wall Street protests, the mass mobilization in Greece, the crowds on Tahrir Square, they all bear witness to the hidden potential for a different future. There is no guarantee that this future will arrive, no train of history on which we simply have to take a ride. It depends on us, on our will [i.e. on praxis]." See, Žižek, Slavoj in Fiennes, Sophie (Director), *Pervert's Guide to ideology* [Film] (2012), Zeitgeist Films.
54 Randall Amster, "Anarchy, Utopia, and the State of Things to Come" in *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: an Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academy*, Randall Amster, et. al (London: Routledge, 2009), 290-1.
55 Antliff, "Strategies," 75.
56 Antliff, "Strategies," 79.
57 Jun, *Anarchism*, 114-5.
58 George Woodcock, "What is Anarchism?," *Ark* no. 1 (1947): 21.
59 Day, 51.
60 Jesse Cohn, *Anarchism and the Crisis of Representation: Hermeneutics, Aesthetics, Politics* (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 2006), 69.
61 Landauer cited in Jun, *Anarchism*, 139.
62 Michel Foucault, "Method" in *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture – A*

Reader, 4th Edition, John Storey, ed. (Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Ltd., 2009), 318.
63 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, Transl. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 21.
64 Day, 73.
65 Jun, *Anarchism*, 19.
66 Robin Wood, "An Introduction to the American Horror Film" in *Planks of Reason*, Barry Keith Grant and Christopher Sharrett, eds. (Lanham, ML: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2004), 107.
67 Nicholas Garnham, "Political Economy and Cultural Studies" in *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture – A Reader: Fourth Edition*, 627.
68 Garnham, 627.
69 Gad Horowitz, *Repression: Basic and Surplus Repression in Psychoanalytic Theory: Freud, Reich, and Marcuse* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), 116.
70 Horowitz, 116-7.
71 Day, 197. Gad Horowitz makes this same argument with an extended psychoanalytical defense in *Repression*, 117-8.
72 Matthew Wilson, *Rules Without Rulers: The Possibilities and Limits of Anarchism* (Alresford, UK: Zero Books, 2014), 32.
73 May, 50-1.
74 Robé, 248, 340.
75 George Melnyk, "David Cronenberg: Mapping the Monstrous Male" in *Great Canadian Film Directors* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2007), 84.
76 Amster, 295; May, 51; Murray Bookchin cited in Colin Ward, *Anarchism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 94; Gordon, 252; Day, 184-5, 191, 195, 201.
77 Foucault, 318.
78 Newton, 14.
79 Porton, 252.
80 Kristoffer Noheden, "Against All Aristocracies: Surrealism, Anarchism, and Film," *Modernism/Modernity* 27.3 (2020): 568.
81 Noheden, 573.
82 On anarchism, power, and the ideological function of 'fixed truths,' as well as anarchism's ethos as a continually evolving social movement founded on life experience (as opposed to Lenin's blueprint authoritarianism), see Allan Antliff, "Anarchy, Power, and Poststructuralism," *SubStance* 36.2 (2007): 56-66,
83 Nathan Jun, "Towards an Anarchist Film Theory: Reflections on the Politics of Cinema," *Anarchist Studies* 1:1 (2010): 139.

84 See Kristoffer Noheden's contribution to this issue, "The Wild Medium: Anarchism and Surrealist Cinema."
85 A similar argument championing cinematic analysis as a form of praxis, albeit not an anarchist praxis, is Phillip Schmerheim's *Skepticism Films* (2015).
86 Newton, 30.
87 Wood, 115, 117.
88 Wayne Rothschild, "The Cronenberg Effect" in *North of Everything: English-Canadian Cinema Since 1980*, William Beard and Jerry White, eds. (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2002), 161.
89 Day, 142
90 Lisboa, 105.
91 John S. Nelson, "Four Forms of Terrorism: Horror, Dystopia, Thriller, and Noir" in *Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader*, Ezra, Elizabeth and Terry Rowden, eds. (Milton Park, Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis, 2006), 185.
92 Newton, 31.
93 Newton, 31.
94 Newton, 30-1.
95 See David Christopher, "Early Cronenberg and the Anarchist-Apocalypse," *Anarchist Studies*, 30:1 (2024): 12-42. https://doi.org/10.3898/as.32.1.01.
96 See David Christopher, "Constructions of Non-Diegetic Hope in Don McKellar's *Last Night* (1998)." *CineAction 92* (2014): 60-3.
97 May, 4.
98 Nelson, 190.
99 Nelson, 190.
100 Nelson, 190.
101 Gordon, 254.
102 Adams and Jun, 257.
103 Terry Eagleton, *Culture* (London: Yale University Press, 2016), 49.
104 Wilson, 12.
105 Matthew Beaumont, "Imagining the End Times: Ideology, the Contemporary Disaster Movie, *Contagion*" in *Žižek and Media Studies: A Reader*, Matthew Flisfeder and Louis-Paul Willis, eds. (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), 82.
106 Kyle W. Bishop, *American Zombie Gothic: The Rise and Fall (and Rise) of the Walking Dead in Popular Culture* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., Inc., 2010), 125.
107 Jacques Lacan, *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*, Alan Sheridan, trans. (New York: Penguin Books, 1979), 81.

108 Noheden, "Against," 577.
109 Jun, "Towards," 142.
110 Lacan, 81.
111 See Kaja Silverman, *The Threshold of the Visible World* (London: Routledge, 2013), 10, 26, 29, 37.
112 Antliff, "Aesthetics," 233.
113 Stirner, 105.
114 Berger, xx.
115 Berger, 34.
116 Berger, 34.
117 Berger, 34.
118 Berger, 34.
119 May, 11.
120 Berger, 34.
121 Jamie Heckert, "Listening, Caring, Becoming: Anarchism as an Ethics of Direct Relationships" in *Anarchism and Moral Philosophy*, Benjamin Franks and Matthew Wilson, eds. (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 198.
122 Heckert, 190.
123 Heckert, 188-9
124 Heckert, 188-9
125 Heckert, 193.
126 Phillip Schmerheim, *Skepticism Films: Knowing and Doubting the World in Contemporary Cinema* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016), 295.
127 Schmerheim, 295.
128 Expecially in recognition of the Deleuzian "desiring-machine." See Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (London: Penguin, 2009).
129 George Woodcock, "The Anarchist Critic" (1982) reprinted in *Anarchist Studies* 23.1 (2015): 107.
130 Adams and Jun, 259.
131 Robé, 140.
132 Noheden, 574.
133 Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 1 - The Movement-Image*, Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, trans. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), 123.
134 See Stephen Ross, "A Very Brief Introduction to Lacan," University of Victoria (2002), 3-5.
135 Deleuze, 126.
136 Peter Manley Scott, "Are We There Yet? Coming to the End of the

Line—a Postnatural Enquiry" in *Future Ethics: Climate Change and Apocalyptic Imagination*, Stefan Skrimishire, ed. (London: Continuum, 2010), 265.
137 Antliff, "Insurrection," 77.
138 Malatesta cited in Jun, *Anarchism*, 142.
139 Lisboa, 11.
140 Mabille cited in Noheden, 577.
141 Alfredo Bonanno cited in Antliff, "Aesthetics," 229-30.
142 Jun, "Towards," 152; Cohn, "What," 413.
143 Matthew Adams, "'Uniformity is Death': Human Nature, Variety and Conflict in Kropotkin's Anarchism" in *Governing Diversities: Democracy, Diversity and Human Nature*, J. Paul, ed. (Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2012), 166.
144 Antliff, "Insurrection," 77.
145 Porton, 191-2.
146 B. Klinger, "Cinema/Ideology/Crititicism'Revisited: The Progressive Text," *Screen*, 25: 1 (1984): 30-44.
147 Antliff, "Aesthetics," 230.
148 Berger, 34.
149 Lisboa, 67.
150 Antliff, "Aesthetics," 233.
151 Angela Krewani, "Opposing Thatcherism: Filmic Apocalypse as a Political Strategy in 1980s Britain" in *The Apocalypse in Film: Dystopias, Disasters, and Other Visions about the End of the World*, Ritzenhoff and Krewani, ed. (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2016), 180.
152 Krewani, 188.
153 Antliff, "Anarchy in Art," 78-9.
154 Krewani, 180.