AFTER THE APOCALYPSE AND *ARRIVAL*:
TWO SPECIFIC VOCABULARIES OF THE POSTHUMAN FUTURE[*]

Viorella MANOLACHE[**]

Abstract. The present study proposes, on the basis of philosophical-political projections (fictions), a novel way of interpreting the data of the post-human future, insisting on *two* specific vocabularies, visually displayed by two cinematographic films: *After the Apocalypse* and *Arrival*. In theory, we will update, through a *parataxic* appeal, the Aristotelian foundation of history (Fukuyama) – the moral reconfiguration of the future self (Habermas) – and the reconsideration of the postmodern condition as a revised dilemma of the posthuman (Braidotti). In this sense, we will place the utopian-dystopian visual narratives on the second level, considering that their propensity becomes relevant only as a quantification element, useful in establishing stage peculiarities. Thus, we will support the possible creation of two specific communication / vocabulary means, capable of giving a sense to the *retro-future* and the *pseudo-future*, both creating philosophical-political contexts of reconfiguration for the communicative state itself.

Keywords: Fukuyama, Habermas-Braidotti, Posthumanism; Specific Vocabularies; *Pseudo Future - Retro Future*.

The philosophical-political fiction

Jacek Dukaj[1] experimented, with ta direct role in deploying *fantasy*, the stagnation, the recycling reflex, the exhausting-blocking trademarks of "Western-type culture", and argued that "there is no progress, no social-political-economic-scientific and technological evolution", convinced that, in both politics and philosophy, "no alternative to the still dominant paradigm" can be located. The

---

[**] Scientific Researcher III, PhD, Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations "Ion I. C. Brătianu", Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Departament of Political Sciences; vio_s13@yahoo.com; viorella.manolache@ispri.ro; Academy of Romanian Scientists, Splaiul Independentei no. 54, Bucharest, Romania, postal code 050085.
[1] Interview, *Societatea Română de Science Fiction şi Fantasy* [Romanian Society of Science Fiction and Fantasy], 17 January 2016, http://fantastica.ro/interviu-cu-scriitorul-jacek-dukaj/.

stagnant effect would thus be taking into consideration either imagining the future by amplifying the present or by retro-topic recourse ("retro-future"), or its refusal by exhaustive-apocalyptic constructs ("pseudo-future"). Not by chance, Jacek Dukaj resorts to the ideological construct, via Fukuyama, in order to establish a double reference reflex: *the context* is *the end of history* – a warning-retraced syntax that does not ignore the exit from the matrix of philosophical-Hegelian concepts of history; *the future* belongs to "the driving force of science and technology as finally acknowledged by Fukuyama in *Our Posthuman Future*"[2]. Both of them compete to break away from the classical scenario of *science fiction*, architecturizing cultural fiction with a double dramatic-dramatizing potential: a clear and true presentation of tension and suspense not only at the individual level but also at the level of science through "simultaneous revelation" with regard to itself and to the world, establishing that there is either a generous space of post-singularity, or trans/post-humanism no longer offers anything to discover.

Jacek Dukaj's uncompromising approach can be considered [here] a valence score, both of opening, but also of missing coordinates able to produce the reflex of the political and philosophical scenarios devoted to *the future*. If Fukuyama can be accepted as a renowned author, a follower of a double reflex – *end* and *continuation* – political philosophy goes beyond stasis/stagnation/blockages of meaning through a post-modern turnaround *parataxis,* capable of expressing syntactic ratios without the use of grammatical tools (Fukuyama – Habermas – Braidotti). It is thus argued that there is a *parataxic experience*[3] which gives the measure of *the posthuman future*, without eluding the philosophical-political meaning of the projected/anticipated scenario, and without releasing *fiction* from the nuances of *fantasy* or *science-fiction*, both with an indicator status for the philosophical-political fiction data.

Veronica Hollinger and Joan Gordon[4] accredit with plus-sense both *fantasy* and *rationalized fiction*, considering as an indicative reference the combinatoric act of quasi-scientific elements with the trans-mutant tropes of genetic engineering, notes which decree the category of *science-fiction* as an exploratory but also ironic genre, interested in scientific discoveries and the contemplation of contemporary thinking, appealing to civic projection data, capable of reaching conclusions and solving any narrative that is inserted in context[5]. Moreover, Hollinger and Gordon admit the existence of narrative formulas and emerging ideologies, both of which play a role in the production of texts and textual products, under the sign of rhetorical and postmodern

---

[2] *Ibidem.*
[3] N. Katherine Hayles, "Postmodern Parataxis: Embodied Texts, Weightless Information", in *American Literary History,* Vol. 2, No. 3 (Autumn, 1990), pp. 394-421.
[4] Veronica Hollinger, Joan Gordon (eds.), *Edging into the Future: Science Fiction and Contemporary Cultural Transformation,* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 2002.
[5] *Ibidem,* p. 191.

dissolution, with interest in the non-conventional narrative (repetitive actions, geographic patterns, clichés) and in the ideological project that combines dialogue with the dialectics of change. The latter leads to a blurring of identity and re-infers the congruent obsessions of society on a planetary scale, by managing subjectivity and totality, by reporting reality to the projection, all these emerging-ideological constructs[6] having as stake preservation and philosophical reinterpretation, the political alternative and the rethinking of the communication mechanisms adapted/ adaptable to the future.

We will establish as the main hypothesis, from this perspective, a triple recognition of meaning: first, the placement of the future under the sign of the philosophical-political orientation signals, according to the model of the *parataxic* appeal to the Aristotelian foundation of history (Fukuyama) – to the moral reconfiguration of the future self (Habermas) – and the reconsideration of the postmodern condition, as a revised dilemma framework of the posthuman (Braidotti); the second projects onto a secondary plan the Utopian-dystopian visual narratives, considering that their propensity becomes relevant only as a quantifying element, a stage measurement (*political forecasts still have to be fulfilled*, says Fukuyama!); the third one claims, as continuing *caputs*, both the *retro-future* and the *pseudo-future*, both of them constituting philosophical and political contexts capable of being visually adapted and whose fundamental stake is the delivery of a system with a specific vocabulary, reconfiguring the communicative state itself.

Our future

Fukuyama ...

Fukuyama opens the op dedicated to *Our posthuman future*[7] with "a story about two dystopias", based on a dual approach, in which Orwell lies "in second place", overtaken by Huxley (with his *Brave New World*); however, both narrations are entrusted with visionary ability, turning them into tools of "approximating the future and its terrifying potentialities". *1984* focuses upon information technology, "with highly accurate technological predictions, but totally wrong politically" [8]. Fukuyama believes that the advent of the personal computer and the collapse of totalitarian empires are two interrelated phenomena-events which contradict the predictions of political Orwellianism. The image of the society in *1984* is an *unnatural* one, says Fukuyama, without being unique, in the sense that it is conceived according to the model of the world of classical

---

[6] *Ibidem,* pp. 15-16.
[7] Francis Fukuyama, *Viitorul nostru postuman* [Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution], Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 2004.
[8] *Ibidem,* p. 16.

tyranny, a project "not very different from the tragedies of human history"[9] (Fukuyama himself, in an optimistic note, is practicing his prophetic talent and realizing three anticipatory scenarios dealing with new drugs, stem cell research and embryo control, all with a view to optimizing life in the future). *Brave New World,* notes Fukuyama, is a more subtle and challenging way of anticipation, a narrative construct in which evil is not so obvious; Fukuyama agrees with Huxley, recognizing that the threat of biotechnology can change human nature, thus opening up the post-human stage of history: human nature continues to exist, is not meaningless, provides continuity, forms and constrains various types of political regimes.

Thus, the solution of using state power to control biotechnology, by creating new institutions to regulate law efforts by avoiding a "defeatist attitude" towards technology[10].

If Fukuyama's text identifies, through a Utopian-dystopian strategy, a way of political impetus, the restart of history is required to be inventoried exclusively by philosophical-political data, having Aristotle as a model, not only philosophically, but also as an ideal type/method of logical argumentation about politics and nature[11].

Utilitarian and pragmatic in the theorizing of "human notions of justice and injustice", by understanding the mechanism of combining wishes, goals, traits and behaviors, Aristotle, as Fukuyama notes, transcends the reductionist perspective about deliverance from suffering or maximizing utility, through an absolutely philosophical sense of differentiation of the natural form from that of conventional and rational reorganization of human goods. Modern biology gives (*finally* – points Fukuyama) a meaningful-empirical content to the conception of human nature, while the biotechnological revolution threatens precisely this conquest[12].

There cannot be an end to history – as Fukuyama's own lecture re-teaches – since there is precisely one (another) *beginning* of the technological process era, in which biotechnology exploits not only the conquests of science but also prefigures the renewed meanings of philosophy and significant political ramifications[13]. However, Fukuyama pleads, philosophically, for a theoretical construct centered on the issues of human nature and the understanding of good and evil, concluding that the challenges being launched are both ethical and political, guided by reporting, but also by the unidirectional decision to accede within the area of post-human future.

---

[9] *Ibidem,* p. 17.
[10] *Ibidem,* pp. 22-24.
[11] *Ibidem,* p. 25.
[12] *Ibidem,* p. 26.
[13] *Ibidem,* p. 28.

... Habermas

Jürgen Habermas begins the preface to his volume *The Future of Human Nature*[14], with the rhetorical interrogation taken from Max Frisch's novel, "What could the human being do with the time that is left to him?", which he submits, detaching it from the indicative mode, to an ethical evaluation. The philosopher proposes, as an alternative to postmodern coordinates, the *self-success ethics*, a principle by which philosophy questions the anthropological generality of "good life" landmarks, deprived by the importation of *science fiction* and included in fundamental philosophical queries[15]. Once science and technology have marked the desocialization of the desolation of outer nature, preaching the purpose of liberty, the great goal seems to consist in the re-enchantment of inner nature. This implicit recommendation lies in the proper elucidation of the archaic reminiscences of emotions that can persist in the chimeras created by genetic engineering, cloning or embryonic politics. Or, a different scenario resulting from the "moralizing of human nature" is represented by the assertion of self-understanding of species, as an essential act for the ability to re-see us in the hypostasis of authors of our own life histories, in the mutual recognition of autonomous persons[16].

Habermas notes that, despite futurologist explanations, the inaccuracies of the projection / project remain as a result of the sufficiently profound opacity of the [future] theme, with reference to the connections of /between the contingency of the beginning of life and the freedom to mold the ethics of existence claiming qualitative analysis. The interpretative and analytical perspectives differ on both sides of the Atlantic, with America preoccupied with the way in which essential developments are being pursued, aiming at a manifest pragmatism.

But the Habermasian [European] objectives are subordinate to the coordinates of a program oriented by the "kingdom of the endings", in which no one − except the participant holding an autonomous role in self-regulation − is a mere subject of general laws. Any imposition within a community, even if it goes against the abolition of relations obtaining the status of *morally acting person*, should not be confused, according to Habermas, with the external or foreign determination of the natural-mental markers of the *future person*. Prenatal intervention in the distribution of genetic resources involves redefining the naturally-fixed intervals of opportunities and goals for a possible decision in which the person of the future will use his or her liberty to impart an ethical footprint to his or her own life.

---

[14] Jürgen Habermas, *The Future of Human Nature*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2003.
[15] *Ibidem*, p. 15.
[16] *Ibidem*, p. 25.

The critically-Habermasian objection examines the option for the exemplary case – a partial alteration of genetic properties – which leaves the identity of the affected person intact. Habermas casts doubts on the premises of post-metaphysical thinking, and recommends the adoption of an ontological basis for the "ethical-type" context of the incorporation of morality.

In a Habermasian acceptation, clones represent free and equal partner interactions[17]. Genetic programming envisages a reality which is "mute and, in a sense, deprived of any response"; people who have genetically-fixed intentions, unlike naturally born beings, are forbidden to develop through placement in a reflexive flow, a deliberate continuation of personal life history, and firm attitude towards talents (and personal bottlenecks/imperfections) that imply a revised self-understanding and allow a productive response to the original context. This situation is no different from that of a clone, which, by modeling the person's pattern and the life history of a chronological "twin", is devoid of its own, unobstructed future.[18]

... Braidotti

Rosi Braidotti presents the debates of predominant culture – from the *pragmatic direction* in the area of robotics, prosthetic technologies, neuroscience and bio-genetic capital, to the *vague reflexion*, of *New Age* extraction, of trans-humanism and techno-transcendence – correlating them with some relevant findings, relating to Habermas and Fukuyama, reports aiming to mark both the *parataxic* appeal, and to highlight the role of the Braidottian approach in the equation of the directory-prefigurative lines of the posthuman future.

Braidotti also signals "the celebratory meaning", but also the "bypass status" of post-humanism, warning (via Habermas) of the enthusiasm and the anxiety involved in such a post-positioning, which defines a distinct first point of view: "The common denominator of the post-human condition considers the predisposition for its own self-organizing but also non-naturalist structure of living matter"[19]. In fact, Braidotti sets out and clarifies Fukuyama's view of the Aristotelian nature-culture report, establishing that it imposes a scientific paradigm, distanced by the social-constructivist approach, capable of operating the categorical distinction given-nature, construct-culture, substituting it with the non-dual logic of the called interaction[20].

Braidotti notes the assault of patterns of thought imbued with a particular spectral dimension and an obvious ideological dose: from *the right,* the influx of

---

[17] *Ibidem*, p. 57.
[18] *Ibidem*, pp. 62-63.
[19] Rosi Braidotti, *Postumanul* [The Posthuman], Hecate Publishing House, Bucharest, 2016, p. 8.
[20] *Ibidem*, p. 9.

ideas regarding the end of ideological time and the appointment and inventory of *civilization crusades* (Fukuyama & Huntington); from *the left*, a negative ideological concentration is recognized, with repercussions in retrospective movement towards *actual political action* (Badiou & Žižek). The solution-answer proposed by the two directions consists in accepting the theory of the posthuman as a "genealogical and navigational tool". In itself a useful offer, this is announced through the possibility of exploring "forms of affirmative engagement in relation to the present", and "the consistent and empirical understanding of present forms" without omitting the self-preservation of the critical position / positioning, by cultivating the avoidance of theoretical negation / negativity[21].

Taking into account this maturing effect, maintained by/nearing the register of philosophical-political *endisms* - from Nietzsche to Fukuyama - and the assertion of the evaluative predisposition (by joining Habermas' perspectives) regarding the dates of the emergence and consolidation of the "post-secular condition", "the posthuman condition", as Braidotti observes, becomes an elaborate solution developed in order to redefine the new role of Europe in the context of Habermas' sustainable deficiencies and social justice. Privately issued notes agree to intensify post national policies, resonating with posthuman ethics as an obligation of fair and accurate mapping of posthuman recompositions in the series of cosmopolitan pan-human connections. But the Braidottian argument transcends any Habermasian (social-democratic) aspiration, advocating two-stroke architecture of *the posthuman Europe project*: both, "minoritary-becoming" and also "nomad-becoming"[22]. Finally, in articulating *our posthuman future,* in the manner of Braidotti, one can turn towards a triple private particular sensitivity: visionary *and* feverish *and* proactively affirmative.

Clearly, the called *parataxic* appeal establishes hierarchies in the plan of projections with some degree of accuracy in the future and recalculates the priority of political-philosophical positions taken: there are several *important philosophers* – Habermas - and *influential thinkers* – Fukuyama - whose theories maintain a state of alert about the anguish of the future and the humanistic legacy data. Equally, there are *critical theorists* (as important and influential, we note.) Braidotti nominates both Sloterdijk and herself - a category less prone (*sensitive*) to the enumeration of panic dis-centered humans, and more concerned with quantifying the *benefits* that posthuman evolution holds.

Not at all incidentally, Braidotti asserts that the relationship/report of "literature with films about the extinction of our species and others" is itself a kind of "success genre" marked by increased *attractiveness*, part of a "narrow and negative social imaginary". At the same time, "an object of admiration and of

---

[21] *Ibidem*, pp. 12-13.
[22] *Ibidem*, p. 74.

cultural aberration"[23], *techno-teratology* contains the *philosophy* and policy of data posted in the area of *our posthuman future*. Moreover, case films selected for evaluation necessary assert themselves (by expanding the frame of research and *acting positively* in the space of the social imaginary) by the attention brought to the modality of designing two specific means of communication/vocabularies, fit to highlight the context meaning of possible alternatives: *either back* (in retro-future), or *before* (in pseudo- future).

Arrival: retro-future

Evading the apocalyptic bellicose formula and advocating in favor of accomplishing the communication act, able to create/launch a specific vocabulary, peaceful and decisive at the same time, for human accommodation to the extraterrestrial technological boom, the film Arrival confirms (precisely from this perspective and in this respect) the *atypical* position which it holds under the category of films of the genre. The starting context announces a transgression of frontal contact stages (from initial enthusiasm, to intermediate stage fear / confusion and a state of emergency / taking armed measures), in order to permanently opt-out from such a road map in favor of an intensification of the communication act, the manner in which the *extreme sides* – human and non-human (human and heptapod) – agree to preconditions for the support of a particular dialogue, of connecting the self to the Other (in this case, equivalent to the absolute opposite of otherness – coming from *an extra* space, obviously called and endowed with its own name: Abbott and Costello). The formula is appropriate for at least two reasons: it confirms a directorial act of connecting to a *communication trend*, interested in managing a *communicative action*, which it over-inflates by adding a *nov rhetoric* to science fiction experiments, already receptive to the problematic-ideatic determination of action through dialogue. *Arrival* resorts to a directly exposed questionnaire*: what are the factors, ways and methods that make communication possible?; and if it becomes possible, does it still justify its meaning and usefulness in the context of a posthuman future?*

From the series of reception series due to the film a double interpretation deserves to be retained, by attributing an interpretation to aforementioned interrogations, through circumscribing philosophy (Kelley Ross) [24] to linguistics (Betty Birner)[25], both areas fit to transparentize visual essence and to uncover the

[23] *Ibidem*, p. 89.

[24] *A philosopher explains "Arrival" and "Stranger in a Strange Land",* 28 February 2017, https://fabiusmaximus.com/2017/02/28/language-in-arrival-and-stranger-in-a-strange-land/, accesed on 24 April 2017.

[25] Marissa Martinelli, *How Realistic is the Way Amy Adams' Character Hacks the Alien Language in Arrival? We Asked a Linguist,* http://www.slate.com/blogs/browbeat/2016/ 11/22/a_linguist_on_arrival_s_ alien_language.html, accessed on 25 April 2017.

central stake they overbid. *The plot,* maintained with premeditation on a schematically narrative tone - twelve[26] alien ships arrive on Earth, forcing states to find a protocol (channels) of communication, an approach initially failed from lack of a genuine contact and understanding of *speech,* by the impossibility of articulating any functional communication (guided by "bilateral winning").

Philosophically, Kelley l. Ross insists on several essential elements: the blockage occurring in the decryption and understanding of a specific vocabulary, in the absence of direct contact with the interlocutor (even if brokered by a glass wall! – denotes both the separation /closure and communication); the *talking-writing* correspondence, by valuing the elements/semantic structures suitable to be reproduced digitally and, subsequently, to start the dialogue ("the first discovery was that there is no correlation between what a heptapod says and what he writes. Unlike all human written languages, their writing is through signs. It conveys a meaning. Is does not represent a sound"); the circumvention of time as linear convention (*the end of time* is decreed; *there is no longer time*, the extra-terrestrial declaims, as making contact is marked by learning the triple reporting to *Time-Death-Technology*); the emphasis given to Sapir-Whorfian metaphysics and mental representations, dependent on linguistic categories in use, reporting the world to languages, through the multiple possibilities of composing / translation, not reduced to one element – the coexistence of *linguistic habits of a group* with *language brought back to its initial value;* the insistence on metaphysical fatalism, of accepting reality as a language construct ; dosing the narrative with the effect of personal tragedy, as a philosophical way of re-discussing the *free will – free agency* report of values /possibilities of *anticipating / knowledge* of the future, of the consequences of personal acts, taken from *the matrix design of projecting future elections / past deeds* ("a weird thing, memory!") – state the almost Proustian opening notes of the film.

Betty Birner subsumes, in her turn, the entire visual approach to a simplified equation: Louise is the (super)-feminine linguist-hero whose interactions, qualities and capacities (top linguist) save the world and give a sense to the future. Birner believes the film re-compose the Sapir-Whorfian hypothesis of plausibility, rounding *the weak perspective* of linguistic reality (of correlating language with the world) to *the strong world* of linguistic determinism: language determines the way of seeing and of perceiving reality. Inflections are visibly arranged: "Yes, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. It's the theory that spoken language determines the way of thinking and ... Yes. Affects the way you view everything. I'm curious. Do you dream in their language? Maybe I had a few dreams but not ...".

---

[26] With all the explicit record of biblical allusions, there are voices which insist about Villeneuve's political approach by highlighting "conflictual-destructive" attributes attached to human history, translated by the splitting and communicational immaturity of humanity as a whole. The prospect is anticipated and clarified in a Zumthorian key, the Babel effect being just one of fragmentary/fragmented *fallibility.*

In sequence, the process/procedure targets: extraterrestrial ability to comprehend what is/what represents a question (the nature of a request for information and its response); clarifying the singular-plural difference; interpreting the sense of "why" and the quantification of the level of consciousness of the choice being made, and the instinctive coefficient of motivation.

Birner insist on sufixoidal clarification, as a classification marker with effect in the ways and formulas that translate and submit equivalences - long things/rigid objects, in the relationship / report between parts of speech (noun-verb), in quantifying the impact of objectification (of temporary order), in articulating a logographic system and in measuring the variations of language; all these illustrate the method of defining a concept, but also of displaying the complex structure of a *dictionary*, composed of new forms produced by linguistic interaction. In fact, the film brings back into focus the Whorfian question: *how does language integrate things into categories*? Or, following the pattern of the game of Mahjong (via decoding of pairs – from forms, shapes, Fibonacci numbers to patterns, emblems and flowers), *how do the aspects of reality become categories*? Amid the abandonment of common concepts, this posthuman stake recalculates its very ability to discover *common meanings without having anything in common.* But also delivering the trenchant conclusion that: "The basis of civilization is not language but science".

Two essential elements, upon which the double registry/response does not insist, require to be specified: first, the ascendancy of the feminine, accepted as more than poetic license (Kelley Ross) or a simple superlative exposure of a professional condition (Betty Birner). The mode of building the character of Louise Banks involves a particular narrative, reassessing the way in which the female maintains a particular relationship with the extraterrestrials, updated to the present: the woman is a scientist, rational and emotional, the mediator and the initiator of contact, a person able to compose and recompose acts of communication, and lead the dialogue. But more than that, the female is raised by / with the maternal profile data, the daughter assigns the necessary tools to the mother, but also indicates the decoding directions, a relationship that revives the holographic sense with the valences of the past-future axis. The *fragment* from the past sends to the *whole* present or future, in the same Sapir-Whorfian manner, where *private markings* refer to the *ensemble.* The mother-daughter relationship identifies in / through *habitus* the type of role and place of the mother tongue, certifying, in an Eco-ian manner, that the subject is the product of languages, of the significant network and the dynamics of the semiotic function; only the natural, maternal language indicates the way and the ways in which the past becomes the future and through which *the future becomes past*. And moreover, that relationship addresses the act of communication: "Hannah – your name is very special, because it's a palindrome".

A second theoretical level refers to *the axis of the future* itself, upon which *Arrival* places the signals of decoding and interpretation, meaningfully loading *the retro-future*. In a Baumanian way, the presence of *retro* presupposes a "second level of denial" – *denial of Utopian negation* – a prefix of prevalence of the topos of territorial sovereignty, considered as a reconciliation of security and freedom. The imperative *Back to the future!* expresses, in this context, the *retrotopic* emerging tendency through the very capacity to rehabilitate a primitive way of being for the community, by returning to the primordial concept of self-determination, facilitated by non-cultural or cultural-immunizing factors / inflections, an essential *nov-condition* for guiding the "civilized order". The conscious ways of manifestation of *iterality*, of Derridian origin, imply, according to Bauman, the data of a *status quo ante*, supposed to exist or imagined to have existed before the second negation; the recycling formula, and the genuinely-putative aspects of the past (whether tested or abandoned) are the reference points of *retrotopia*.[27]

Thus, the meaning of *the retro-future* is defined independently of beginnings and endings, by days/moments /sequences that place "the story above life", combining the written language with visual communication, the first (nonlinear orthography) essential for rewriting the forward-*back* direction. Communicatively, *the retro-future* stands under the sign of *reclaiming the lost opportunity of language and of writing* ("our writing form drives a communication channel"), marked by the need to re-articulate a vocabulary, both *sufficient* and *expanded*. Under the *past* primacy of the daughter's image, *the future* accepts conversation as a game whose stake - whether it be *opposition, victory, or defeat* – unlimitedly elasticizes *the possibilities of future returning to / in the past.*

After the Apocalypse: pseudo-future

If we were to imagine *the pseudo-future* in the form of a communicative construct deprived of words, its architecture would involve an act of dialogue, guided by "what is communicated and not just what is said" (via H.P. Grice) and the assertion of the "complex of reality" in which the statement is not articulated *only* by words, but also by the enunciation potential, appealing to "circumstances that are not words" (O. y Gasset), an act equated to an area in which the subject understands the language of the other without being able to speak it (U. Eco).

Both object and subject of short, essentialized receptions, often related to the meanings of the *retro-future* (*Apocalypse Yesterday*), to the direct, brutal and macabre impact, and in the same sense to the effects of a post-apocalyptic

---

[27] Zygmunt Bauman, *Retrotopia*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2017, pp. 8-9.

troubling / troubled sincerity, a document attesting to bleak and minimalist human projections/fallbacks and re-flows, in Tarkovskian mode, the film remained unanswered (naturally, otherwise, in the absence of communication!). Both gloomy and eccentric, *After the Apocalypse* requires to be correlated with the premises of communication from *Arrival*, only in the sense of the alternative scenario it proposes: the posthuman condition involves data from *the post-future* (*Near Future*), aimed at over-valuating a present "seemingly similar to the past", of a future return to a barbaric-primitive beginning state, marked by *necropolitics* (as a term attached to bio-power and augmented by the data of destruction, not only of the population but also of human bodies) and by the primacy of the sound/sonorous background unspoken by vocabulary.

The double *biopower-necropolytics* comments are illustrative of the explicit appeal to the five surviving breeds/surviving characters (with Europoid, Equatorial, Asian-American, Oceanic, or Amerindian inflexions) that demonstrate the woman / mother's centrality as an absolute metaphor of future rebirth. The characters are reconnected to the pattern of a last community, by the lack of verbal communication, by blocking articulated sound, and by unmanifest ventriloquisms. Not by chance, the perspective raises what Joseph Auner[28] called "transgressions in particularly vivid ways by opposing human voices" through an "objectification of manipulating sounds as objects" by releasing sounds from original references and by giving meaning to *texture* and *tone* [here] and to the suggestive accompanying background. Moreover, the post-human condition has its own voice, articulates the post-apocalyptic framework and enters into pentadic dialogue, capacitating sound with the valences of "event noise" and the inflections of the source and human resource. The film insists on ambient / context ventrilology through over-objectification in the sense that each objects/tool (fish, water, baby, doll, hockey stick, juggler, cave, etc.) corresponds to a repeated, obsessive sound and a specific action. *The pseudo-future* is anticipated by a *prefigurative graphics* – an insignificant object that substitutes stone-age markings or postmodern *graffiti* and becomes itself an image that comes to life. The maximum intensity sequence, which confirms the attachment of *necropolitics* to the *atonal* director, is the cannibal scene, a survival ritual, accompanied by an aggressive jazz score. The final scene recharges the whole scenario *of the pseudo-future*, through a return to the projection of a primordial-perennial state – the mother carrying the child in her arms – a static, verbally inarticulate image, in which the mechanically produced metallic sounds from the beginning of the film are adapted to emotional experience, humanized by the child's crying and laughter.

---

[28] Joseph Auner "Cântă-mi. Ventrilocia postumană în muzica populară recentă" [«Sing It for Me»: Posthuman Ventriloquism in Recent Popular Music], in *Post/h/um. Jurnal de studii,* no. 1, pp. 228-255.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (SELECTIVE):

After the Apocalypse, Director: Yasuaki Nakajima, produced by Medama Productions, 2004;
Arrival, Director Denis Villeneuve, produced by 21 Laps Entertainment, FilmNation Entertainment, Lava Bear Films, 2016;
Bauman, Zygmunt, *Retrotopia*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2017;
Braidotti, Rosi, *Postumanul* [The Posthuman], Hecate Publishing House, Bucharest, 2016;
Fukuyama, Francis, *Viitorul nostru postuman* [Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution], Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 2004;
Habermas, Jürgen, *The Future of Human Nature*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2003;
Hayles, N. Katherine, "Postmodern Parataxis: Embodied Texts, Weightless Information", in *American Literary History,* Vol. 2, No. 3 (Autumn, 1990), pp. 394-421;
Hollinger, Veronica, Joan Gordon (eds.), *Edging Into the Future: Science Fiction and Contemporary Cultural Transformation,* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 2002.