



KADIR HAS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES

**STATE OF EXCEPTION IN SOUTH KOREAN MONSTER
CINEMA: BIOPOLITICS AND MONSTERS IN *THE HOST*
(2006) AND *TRAIN TO BUSAN* (2016)**

RANA EKİN

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

ISTANBUL, JUNE, 2022



Rana Ekin

Master of Art Thesis

2022

**STATE OF EXCEPTION IN SOUTH KOREAN MONSTER
CINEMA: BIOPOLITICS AND MONSTERS IN *THE HOST*
(2006) AND *TRAIN TO BUSAN* (2016)**

RANA EKİN

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Kadir Has University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Cinema and
Television in the Department of Communication Studies

Istanbul, June 2022

APPROVAL

This thesis/project titled STATE OF EXCEPTION IN SOUTH KOREAN MONSTER CINEMA: BIOPOLITICS AND MONSTERS IN *THE HOST* (2006) AND *TRAIN TO BUSAN* (2016) submitted by RANA EKİN, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Cinema and Television (Thesis) is approved by

Prof. Dr. Bülent Diken (Advisor)
Kadir Has University

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Defne Tüzün
Kadir Has University

Prof. Dr. Nilay Ulusoy
Bahçeşehir University

I confirm that the signatures above belong to the aforementioned faculty members.

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Timur Aydemir
Director of the School of Graduate Studies
Date of Approval: 16/06/2022

**DECLARATION ON RESEARCH ETHICS AND
PUBLISHING METHODS**

I, RANA EKİN;

- hereby acknowledge, agree and undertake that this Master of Arts Thesis that I have prepared is entirely my own work and I have declared the citations from other studies in the bibliography in accordance with the rules;
- that this Master of Arts Thesis does not contain any material from any research submitted or accepted to obtain a degree or diploma at another educational institution;
- and that I commit and undertake to follow the "Kadir Has University Academic Codes of Conduct" prepared in accordance with the "Higher Education Council Codes of Conduct".

In addition, I acknowledge that any claim of irregularity that may arise in relation to this work will result in a disciplinary action in accordance with the university legislation.

RANA EKİN

16/06/2022



To My Brother, Mother and Father...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to first thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Bülent Diken, for his guidance and suggestions. Without his guidance, my thesis would not have come this far. I was able to move forward thanks to his rightful recommendations. His valuable thoughts, directions and studies were extremely helpful for me during the writing process.

I would also like to thank my parents, my brother and my friends who were providing support and constant encouragement in patience throughout my studies writing this thesis. This achievement would not have been possible without them. Thank you.

STATE OF EXCEPTION IN SOUTH KOREAN MONSTER CINEMA:
BIOPOLITICS AND MONSTERS IN *THE HOST* (2006) AND *TRAIN TO BUSAN*
(2016)

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, I study the relationship between monsters and biopolitics in contemporary South Korean monster cinema with the films *The Host* (2006) and *Train to Busan* (2016). I examine monsters regarding sociology, culture, and political philosophy. Fear, desire, anxiety, and fantasy are practically incorporated into the monster's body, giving them life and strange independence (Cohen 1996, 4). Monsters emerge, they create crises where the social and political order is suspended. Grounding on Michael Foucault's concept of biopolitics, political regulations oppressing bodies and controlling populations (Foucault 1978, 140) and Carl Schmitt's concepts of state of emergency and sovereign, one "who decides on the exception" (Schmitt 1985, 5), Agamben goes deeply into the *homo sacer's* bare life in politics which is related to the monsters. *Homo sacer*, although the literal meaning is "sacred man", is defined to be a human who can be killed but not sacrificed that has a bare life who lives in the zone of indistinction (Agamben 1998, 8). *Homo sacer*s can be anybody exposed to biopolitics of the sovereign in modern politics. The water monster represents a Leviathan, strong state, of Thomas Hobbes (1998), in *The Host* and zombies are the *homo sacer* in *Train to Busan*. These two hybrid film monsters, the sea-land beast and the living dead, not only support the narrative but also support the concepts regarding the sovereignty of Agamben. A state of emergency is not declared because monsters emerge, monsters emerge because there is always a state of emergency for the sake of the sovereign.

Keywords: monster, monster cinema, biopolitics, sovereign, state of exception, South Korean cinema

GÜNEY KORE CANAVAR SİNEMASINDA İSTİSNA HALİ: *YARATIK* (2006) VE
ZOMBİ EKSPRESİ'NDE (2016) BİYOPOLİTİKA VE CANAVARLAR

ÖZET

Bu tezde, çağdaş Güney Kore canavar sinemasında, canavarlar ve biyopolitika arasındaki ilişkiyi *Yaratık* (2006) ve *Zombi Ekspresi* (2016) filmleriyle araştırıyorum. Canavarları, sosyoloji, kültür ve siyaset felsefesi bağlamlarında inceliyorum. Korku, arzu, endişe ve fantezi, canavarın vücuduna pratik olarak dahil edilir ve onlara yaşam ve garip bir bağımsızlık verir (Cohen 1996, 4). Canavarlar ortaya çıkar, sosyal ve politik düzenin askıya alındığı krizler yaratırlar. Agamben, Michael Foucault'nun biyopolitika kavramına, bedenleri baskılayan ve nüfusları kontrol eden siyasi düzenlemelere (Foucault 1978, 140) ve Carl Schmitt'in olağanüstü hal ve egemen, “istisnaya karar veren” (Schmitt 1985, 5), kavramlarına dayanarak, canavarlarla bağlantılı olan *homo sacer*'in çıplak hayatının derinlerine iner. *Homo sacer*, kelime anlamı olarak “kutsal insan” olmakla birlikte, belirsizliğin içinde yaşayan, çıplak yaşamı olan, öldürülebilir ama kurban edilmeyen insan olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Agamben 1998, 8). *Homo sacer*, modern siyasette egemenin biyopolitikasına maruz kalan herkes olabilir. *Yaratık* (2006) filmindeki su canavarı, Thomas Hobbes'un (1998) Leviathan'ıdır ve güçlü devleti temsil eder ve *Zombi Ekspresi* (2016) filmindeki zombiler ise *homo sacer*'dir. Bu iki hibrit film canavarı, deniz-kara canavarı ve yaşayan ölüler, anlatıyı desteklemekle kalmaz, aynı zamanda Agamben'in egemenliğine ilişkin kavramları da destekler. Canavarlar ortaya çıktığı için olağanüstü hâl ilan edilmez, canavarlar ortaya çıkar çünkü egemen uğruna her zaman bir olağanüstü hal vardır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Canavar, canavar sineması, biyopolitika, egemen, istisna hali, Güney Kore sineması

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
ABSTRACT	vi
ÖZET	vii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. MONSTER HISTORY AND CINEMA.....	5
2.1 Monsters in History.....	5
2.2 Monsters in Culture.....	6
2.3 Monsters in Cinema.....	8
2.3.1 Zombies.....	13
3. MONSTERS IN POLITICS AND BIOPOLITICS.....	15
3.1 Biopolitics and Biopower.....	15
3.2 State of Exception.....	17
3.3 Homosacer.....	18
3.4 The Camp.....	20
3.5 Leviathan.....	22
4. <i>THE HOST</i> (2006) FILM ANALYSIS.....	25
4.1 Plot Summary.....	25
4.2 Water Monster (Leviathan) as the Host.....	25
4.3 Camp: Between the River and the City.....	27
4.4 Biopolitics: Drilling into the Brain.....	30
5. <i>TRAIN TO BUSAN</i> (2016) FILM ANALYSIS.....	33
5.1 Plot Summary.....	33
5.2 Protestors/Demonstrators as Zombies.....	33
5.3 Ant Workers.....	36
5.4 Sacrifice.....	37
CONCLUSION.....	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	42

1. INTRODUCTION

The reasons for the emergence of monsters and the underlying motivations have often been the subject of investigation, even though the monsters we see in movies fascinate us with their visual feast and captivating storylines. The fact that I think it is critical to analyze monster movies that we can associate with current social and political issues has made this thesis worth writing. The two monster movies, *The Host* (2006) and *Train to Busan* (2016), I chose from contemporary South Korean cinema, which took their place in world cinema by making a big impact, will be the main subject of this thesis. The theories and philosophies that I will approach these films with are mostly determined by the crisis management of the authorities in the moments of social crisis that I have observed commonly in the films and the deficiencies in these administrations or the effect of interest-oriented activities on citizens, in this case characters of the movies. Starting from the biological and chemical factors in the emergence of monsters, the governments that hold the power to follow biopolitics will guide the discussion. My main aim is to examine that it is no coincidence that these films specifically use the monster theme and show how ordinary people are affected by both monsters and inhuman practices of sovereign biopolitics. The connection between monsters and biopolitics will be supported by the formal and content analysis of the films.

Humanity's fear and interest in monsters have fed each other throughout history. Monsters have always been around since imagination and storytelling existed. Thus, research on monsters and the concept of monsters has been redefined over and over again and expanded in fields such as psychology, sociology, and culture. The analyses of monsters in these sciences, have not only remained in fields such as mythology, literature, and art but have also created an extensive field of study on the screen, where cinema is the key storytelling field of the last hundred years of humanity. The term "monster" comes from the Latin "monstrum", which means unnatural incidence and monstrum derives from "monere", which means both "to warn" and "to instruct." (31, Grant 2018) Barry Keith Grant (2018) states that monster movies warn us about our fears and disturbance of the natural order and speak to us about them. The fact that people have to live together has

brought social problems from the past to the present, therefore it is worth examining the concept of being a monster in the fields of culture, sociology, and political philosophy in cinema.

When monsters emerge, they create crises where the social and political order is in danger and suspended. This “abnormal” order can be called the “state of exception” discussed by Carl Schmitt and Giorgio Agamben. While sovereign is defined as the one “who decides on the exception” (5, Schmitt 1985), Agamben brings the terms state of exception and biopolitics together with their effect on the bare life of the people, which these people are identified as the “homo sacer” when they are exposed to biopolitics. Homo sacer, although the literal meaning is “sacred man”, is defined to be a human who can be killed but not sacrificed, that has a bare life (Agamben 1998). The scenes in *The Host* (2006) and *Train to Busan* (2016), which are apparently the biopolitical practices of the authorities during crises, encourage the study of the history of this concept as well as the monsters and state of exception. Michel Foucault states that the political regulations oppressing bodies and controlling populations lead to the emergence of the terms biopower and biopolitics. Biopower was unquestionably essential in the evolution of capitalism and liberalism and achievable with the regulated insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adaptation of population phenomena to economic processes (Foucault 1978). Therefore today, biopolitics can be seen wherever there is liberalism and capitalism.

As monsters seem to be one of the tools for us to understand society and the world better, I believe that the concept of biopolitics, which gained importance with the takeover of the whole world by the COVID-19 pandemic, is also a subject worth investigating. There are many types of research about biopolitics that mostly focus on the science fiction genre in film, however, I will focus on the monster theme differently from the general. South Korea, which stands out with its democracy, capitalism, development of technology, and media reflections of social events, gains importance as its cinema handles these issues in blockbuster films. A Godzilla-like monster of chemical waste and an outbreak of zombies out of the faulty project make the COVID-19 epidemic in the world prominent today. Not only the epidemic, but also the managerial practices that came with it, and the necessary or unnecessary operations made due to the epidemic have also been the subject of this

monster cinema. Although these two films are mainstream cinema for entertainment purposes, they were able to reflect these situations from different angles intriguingly. The study will compare and contrast the films produced ten years in between. The difference in the reflections of biopolitics, sovereign during the crises, and monsters are to be examined in the films. Examining social, cultural, and political theories about the themes and concepts with narrative and formal analysis of Bong Joon Ho's *The Host* (2006) and Yeon Sang Ho's *Train to Busan* (2016) are the main qualitative methodologies to be used in the thesis. Why and how monsters, sovereignty, and biopolitics are related and are represented in the monster cinema of South Korea will be questioned. The types of the monsters, characters, places (camp place, gymnasium, train wagon, station, etc.) discourses of the government in crises, and the story will be assessed.

In the first chapter, I will make an overview of the history of monsters in terms of culture and sociology from mythology to cinema. I will elaborate on how the monster theorists' conceptual and functional categorization of the monster has evolved to the present day and its implications for cinema. It will include different approaches to film analysts to different types of monsters in films. The second chapter will be more into the political philosophy discourses. The connection between monster and biopolitics will be evaluated by relating the topic to the state of exception of Schmitt, homosacer of Agamben, and last but not least, the leviathan, sea monster, of Hobbes. In Chapters 3 and 4, films I have chosen from the monster cinema of South Korea, *The Host* (2006) and *Train to Busan* (2016), will be discussed with the formal and content analysis supporting the relationship between monsters and biopolitics. The first film which I will examine is *The Host* (2006), directed by Bong Joon Ho. A half-witted man lives with his little daughter and his father in a small snack bar near Han River in Seoul, South Korea. A water monster, formed by the toxic chemical waste years ago in the Han River, attacks people causing the daughter's and many people's death. After learning that the girl is still alive, her family escapes quarantine for the rescue. The second film is Yeon Sang Ho's *Train to Busan* (2016). The main narrative revolves around a workaholic father, in the divorce stage with his wife, who takes his daughter, from Seoul to Busan to her mother with the KTX train, where they encounter the zombie pandemic. The passengers fight against zombies and each other while the train is heading towards Busan. *The Host's* main story proceeds through

the characters' struggle with the state of emergency and the decisions that are against universal human rights by the governments. On the other side, in *Train to Busan*, we see sovereignty and biopolitics even between the struggling characters and in general. While these two mainstream films, shot 10 years apart, reflect today's biopolitics in contemporary cinema, and they do not neglect to get the support of hybrid monsters, water monster which reminds the Leviathan metaphor for the sovereign state of Thomas Hobbes (1998) and zombies, as the "agents of anarchy" (Landis 2011, 227) and homo sacer. These two hybrid monster films, the sea-land beast and the living dead, not only support the narrative but also support the concepts regarding the sovereignty of Agamben. A state of emergency is not declared because monsters emerge, monsters emerge because there is always a state of emergency for the sake of the sovereign in modern democratic states.

2. MONSTER HISTORY AND CINEMA

2.1 Monsters in History

Monsters are old as humanity. Primitive people required a method to reason the natural forces that threatened them and to control the scary forces within, before moving from a world of illusion and magic to one of science. They have painted cave drawings and scratchings, as well as sculpted objects, which may have conveyed prehistoric people's fear of man-eating wild animals and nature's hostile powers including the combination of such natural shapes in unusual and unique ways, demonstrating artistic originality and visual skill in symbolical imaginations as living beings (Gilmore 2003, 24). Hybrid human-animal hybrid creatures are frequently seen in cave paintings encountered in places such as Europe, Asia, etc. where the first traces of humanity are found. David Gilmore (2003), giving examples from the French caves, comments that “These ambiguous creatures are probably the first instance of what we can call a true monster.”

After cave art, monsters emerged in ancient civilizations. Furthermore, according to Gilmore, (2003) monsters play a key and important part in the growth of civilizations. The Egyptian sphinxes, the oldest examples of authentic plastic monster art that have reached us, bring forth the needed heroes to fight them, and such heroes build civilization by setting an example of taming the monsters. Monsters and heroes appear as paired twins in practically all ancient cosmologies, as inseparable opposites of a cohesive system of values and ideas underneath order itself (Gilmore 2003, 27). *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, written in Sumerian around 2000 BCE, is not only the earliest monster text, but also among the earliest texts of any kind, and the oldest surviving substantial work of literature in any language that supports the discourse. The fight between the monster Humbaba and Gilgamesh and Enkidu is depicted in the narrative. Gilgamesh, the semi-divine ruler, is regarded as a symbol of civilization, and Enkidu, supposed to represent nature since he lived up in the wild, in contact with nature until he slept with a priest, have a battle in between where Gilgamesh overcomes Enkidu. Gilgamesh and Enkidu become great friends, possibly Enkidu portraying a whole human person with the wild retaining a vital component of mankind as long as it is controlled by the socialized, civilized side. They

went out to face and destroy Humbaba soon after their relationship began (Mittman and Hensel 2018b). Monster myths like this, sustain the present order by proclaiming our control over the world.

Gilmore also mentions that Adrienne Mayor investigated in search of some rational basis of monsters and discovered some justification of the dangerous unknown nature in classical archaeology. Her book, *The First Fossil Hunters* (2000), shows conclusively that the Greeks and later the Romans based many of their visual images on the megafaunal fossils they observed along the Mediterranean Sea's shores. Because of local geological conditions in the Mediterranean basin, many massive bones of dinosaurs and prehistoric mega-mammals such as elephants and big bears were accepted as proof of the extinct monsters, as these morphologically abnormal remnants could not be identified with any current creatures (Gilmore 2003, 44). These discoveries also reiterate that humanity is again facing nature and perceiving it as a threat.

The earliest signs of monsters we come across, other than parietal and mobiliary art, are mythology, folk tales, religious texts, art, and literature. There are remarkable parameters to the myths' change such as aspects of politics, localization, and time, giving myths a different form in different conditions and historical periods. In the end, the audience is the one who receives the implicit message delivered by these stories, therefore, the alterations are made according to the changing audience (Syropoulos 2018, 131). The audience and approach change but monsters never disappear and therefore, monster studies have been an ever-expanding area, particularly in the last two centuries with the development of sociology, psychology, and other social sciences.

2.2 Monsters in Culture

The term "monster" comes from the Latin "*monstrum*", which means unnatural incidence and *monstrum* derives from "*monere*", which means both "to warn" and "to instruct" (Grant 2018, 31). Another interpretation of the word monster is mentioned by St. Augustine who confers that the monster/*monstra* comes from action of *monstrare/demonstrare* (to show) and they "demonstrate" so much the audience can learn from

(Augustine and Knight 2018, 60). The word, “demonstrate” here is relatable not only with the differences in the visuals of the monsters -drawing attention- with their awkwardness but also with showing the differentiations in humanity or society at that time. Their appearance in the stories should therefore be inspected for exactly this reason. As in for the "to instruct", it gives a clue for the approach of monsters demarking the boundaries by deconstructing them at the same time. Revealing and alerting features of monsters exist only to be read (Cohen 1996, 4). Consequently, it ceases to be just a show and entertainment area.

As in real-life “monsters”, they manifest themselves in a variety of culturally specific ways, but what makes them monstrous is often the form of their embodiment. They are “otherized” beings who challenge and resist normative human beings, first and foremost through their anomalous corporeality (Shildrick 2002, 9). Since the visuality comes in the first place, their strangeness and quirks scare people away and probably that's why for many years throughout history, monsters remained just an intriguing visual element in stories and even “freak shows”, instead of delving into the intended underlying meanings of the monsters. However, advances in social sciences such as cultural, psychological, and sociological studies have added a deep dimension to monster studies.

One of the dimensions of the concept of a monster is the act of marginalizing individuals or societies against another individual or society due to their fears or anxieties for many reasons. Margrit Shildrick, in her book *Embodying the Monster: Encounters with the Vulnerable Self*, has various and contradictory interpretive reports, containing both the concept of monstrous races and individual monsters. And the concept of monsterizing other races and individuals, tend to justify a variety of sexist, racist, and colonialist attitudes, among others. She concludes that monsters have a far more paradoxical position although the monstrous appears to be an undeniable example of otherness. The western way of reaching knowledge is systematized around an infinite sequence of binaries that based on the dynamic of sameness and difference, the only way to define self-identity is to make such distinctions, to have a clear sense of self and other (Shildrick 2002, 17). If we can tell who we are by who we aren't, then the other, in its visible separation and differentiation, plays a useful purpose in maintaining the self's limits (Shildrick 2002).

However, the monster cannot be included in other's domain; it is not just strange but provokes the paradoxical emotions of denial and recognition, disgust and empathy, exclusion and identification repeatedly (Shildrick 2002, 17). Hybrid dislocations are thus the surface symptoms of a far deeper self-uncertainty and vulnerability (Shildrick 2002, 18). This biological and ontological approach to monsters indicates that the dichotomies serve the purpose of revealing human-monster relationships.

There are several notable scholars, who have combined their studies of the monsters in books. In one of the cultural approaches to the monsters, Jeffrey Cohen's essay with seven theses in *Monster Theory Reading Culture* (1996) is used as a bible of the monster studies, where the monster theory is conceptualized firstly in it. In connection with his theses, he also included essays by other authors in his book. Latter scholars studying monsters have based their work mostly on these seven theses. In summary of the seven theses, according to Cohen (1996), monsters are cultural bodies that escape, signal the crisis, live in the difference zone, control the limits of the possible, stand at the threshold of becoming, and are between fear and attraction. According to these peculiarities, it is possible to make cultural analysis in every medium where monsters are seen. Cohen's generalization of monsters in terms of instability, ambiguity, and hybridity will be assistive in the next chapter, where the state of exception and homo sacer in political philosophy is explained.

2.3 Monsters in Cinema

Before cinema, literature was affected by the tight controls of European churches on monstrous images in religious art and architecture by the late seventeenth century and people shifted their focus to human scapegoats such as witches, vampires, and werewolves (Gilmore 2003, 63). Literary monsters reappear in the nineteenth-century in Gothic literature, led by Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) and Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) with the scientific discoveries of galvanism and electromagnetism. Resembling others before and after, both examples of modern monsters are structural hybrids that are violating known boundaries. Frankenstein is a combination of the dead and living, and Dracula is a cross between human and animal and both are capable of bloody violence, sucking the blood of victims or ripping them apart (Gilmore 2003, 63).

Vampires, werewolves, and the living dead (zombies), common creatures in modern novels and films, may appear to be a recent existence, but they can be found in ancient Greek and Roman literature. The first kind of vampire, for example, appears when the Greek hero Odysseus, visits the Land of the Dead in Homer's *Odyssey*, where he cuts the throats of several sheep that he sacrifices, and the dead are drawn to the blood and gather in immense numbers to it (Murgatroyd 2007, 5). Although not the same, monsters inspired by their "ancestors" with similar characteristics have survived to the present day. Another example would be the werewolves mentioned by Herodotus. A tribe called "the Neuri" were said to transform into wolves once a year for a few days and as for the zombies, in the epic poem *The Civil War*, a witch called Erichtho, orders the Underworld to send the soul of a dead soldier on a request of a Roman general who wishes to know how the civil war will end (Murgatroyd 2007, 15). These examples can be easily reproduced, and even the effect of literature on cinema is due to this domino effect.

With the introduction of cinema into our lives, all the literary and mythical monsters unfolded in front of our eyes with the help of visual effects. Not only that, but it has also been very successful in producing original monsters. The monster genre emerged in the cinema early as the first films. One of the earliest monster films is the German silent horror film *The Golem* (1915), directed by Paul Wegener and Henrik Galeen. The film depicts the story of the animated statue-like figure made from clay, with a human ritual, who is created to serve but rages creating chaos. Conceptually, monster movies portray a conflict between normal values and those that threaten to disrupt normal, as represented by the monster, and allow us to deny these secret or immoral desires by expressing, the forbidden outward, as monstrous Others, who must be eradicated (2018 Grant). Two stories from literature can be examples of the otherness, which films *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1920), directed by John S. Robertson and *The Werewolf* (1913) directed by Henry MacRae were made. Both of these stories show two sides of a human being; one is himself and the other is the monster. The monster within only comes in several times and acts aggressive and wild.

Ridley Scott's *Alien* (1979) and its sequels and John Carpenter's *The Thing* (1982) are the classic monster films that shows the uncertainty of boundaries of the monsters and

human beings. These monsters “capable of metamorphosis” (Grant 2018, 2) proves the cultural and the changeable bodies of both humans and monsters. Grant's description of the monsters in the aforementioned films as "amorphous, without a consistent shape” fit with Cohen's description of monsters on the run and in between or at the threshold. The characters in these films have a struggle between the monsters and the other people. The monsters hiding inside bodies and then revealing themselves are the symbols of the corrupted social systems the characters live in. The social threat they pose is manifested in their repulsive and horrifying physicality. (Grant 2018, 2) Other than the individual obstacles, there are the institution representatives in the *Alien* films. The character named Ripley, not only escapes and fights aliens, but also tries to prevent the world from the evil plan of the company which is to use the alien as a weapon against enemies.

The repeating and modifications of a few fundamental plots in genre films became important examples of mass-mediated myth of today (Grant 2018). Monster films are a subgenre of the horror genre that also has elements overlapping with science fiction (Kawin 2012) and apart from exceptions, it generally includes components from mythology, folk tales, and literature. As before, analyses such as cultural, sociological, etc. were carried over to movies as well. Moreover, with the moving image, formal analysis has become even more meaningful in these analyses. Monsters, being used as metaphors in cinema, depict their environment at the moment, related to the social and political order they are born into. Although Hollywood films, for example, were especially popular entertainments during times of crisis, classic horror films grew popular during the Great Depression as a way to escape the real miseries of economic hardship (Matthews 2007), the films themselves produce a reflection of life. From a dialectical point of view, cinema is life and, life is cinema, both tell the truth about each other (Diken and Laustsen 2010, 3).

As a result, we as an audience can also deduce adequately from films. To give an example, fear of communism, nuclear war, and radiated mutations contributed to science fiction monsters. Rather than confronting the facts of Communism and nuclear war head-on in Cold War, Hollywood used metaphors: alien invaders represented the Russians, giant ants symbolized the Bomb, just as Godzilla represented Hiroshima for the Japanese (Matthews 2007). Even though the horror genre first started, more or less, to create a runoff area for

the audience, films reflect their times and social environment even if it is allegorical by using the monsters.

Barry Grant's book *Monster Cinema* (2018) reveals some of the meanings behind the cinematic monsters and generalizes that, monsters establish the community's bonds and restrictions, as well as shaping and defining it. As a result, monsters that promise destruction can aid social order. He adds that monsters warn us about our fears and disturbance of the natural order and are always about us, not them. In this sense, we as film readers should approach monsters in films as members of society, not outcast creatures or some adrenalin producer. In the early 1970s, with the Vietnam War at its peak, massive and sometimes violent protests were erupting, the Watergate political scandal was rising and civil and political-institutional order seemed to be collapsing resulted in a new phase of disaster movies and a golden age of the horror film (Grant 2018). Cold war, population growth, intense migration to cities, urbanization problems, industrialization, intensive consumption of natural resources, changing consumption habits, increased energy demand, and intensive use of chemicals, and fossil fuels, fear of technology are some of the social problems societies faced which made way for the monsters to appear in films. By the same token, in contemporary art, literature, and cinema, there is an enormous number of social issues to be handled. Fear and uncertainty about the implications and morality of new areas of scientific research and technology are also common. Nuclear power, cloning, virtual reality, and other technologies have all been portrayed as "monstrous" in films. (Grant 2018) Andrew Tudor's book, *Monsters and Mad Scientist* (1989), talks about the reproduction of this fear in the cinema in a cultural context. Tudor interprets a crisis of legitimacy at the social scale as an identity crisis at the individual scale. Humans are no longer protected by the unquestioned values of traditional social order, but instead, face the terrifying scene of unpredictable social relations that is open to the possibility of increasing chaos as time goes on. The identity crisis is one of the phenomena that make us the monster. There is a crisis where the monster comes both from the outside and from within. That is why we have to internalize what comes from the outside (monsters) and look at what they want to tell us.

The concept of "the other", which is most prominently accompanying monsters in the traditional sense, is revealed in a basic monster examination where monsters are only

enemies such as alien films. However, as we approach the present day, as a result of more in-depth cultural and sociological analyzes and changes, we see that the monster represents not only the 'other' but also the concept of 'self.' The destruction of cities by monsters, who often turn famous landmarks into ruins, depicts our wrath and disappointments. Despite the social systems where demonizing and extermination of the monsters are likable, we also sympathize with them to some extent (Grant 2018). At this point, this perception of "otherness" can only be a cover, which makes it necessary to purify, uncover and search for its true meaning. Our monsters symbolize fears that are both timeless and relevant, the undiscovered and the unfamiliar, as well as the historically and culturally specific. As a result, the specific forms that monsters take on, shift over time, as cultural conditions alter, and the same monsters are interpreted differently in various periods (Grant 2018). Interpreting monsters and movies in relation to their time is also linked to the evolution and addition of theories in fields such as politics, sociology as well as in cinema.

Godzilla/Gojira (1954) was the Japanese monster film, which later sequel and American versions were made, directed by Ishiro Honda, where the atomic weapon testing products a giant dinosaur-like monster who attacks the city of Tokyo. It emphasizes the traumatic fears of nuclear war for Japan, the only country to have been attacked by a nuclear weapon (Grant 2018). The wrath of Godzilla destroys everything down its path. The monster is more of a symbol of the bomb than a reaction to it, (Kalat 2017) because of its harm to the city and people. Another monster film is Alfred Hitchcock's film, *The Birds* (1963). In the story, birds of every kind attack people with the identity crisis of the character with maternal dominance, can be correlated to the bird crisis. Whatever the cause of the bird aggression, *The Birds* highlights, like so many other post-apocalyptic films before it, how fragile civilization is, how quickly it crumbles and how people return to savagery (Grant 2018). Bird eye's view camera shots in the film depicts the civilization from above and the chaotic scenes. More examples can be given of the help of monsters who have drawn lines and reconstructed social and political conditions in the history of cinema.

2.3.1 Zombies

The biological dangers, and the recent wave of zombie movies where the undead state is accidentally caused by virology experiments, declare the same anxieties (Grant 2018). Zombies are the cannibalized creatures in between life and death. They are typically agents of anarchy in contemporary cinema, and they symbolize the breakdown of a civilized society (Landis 2011, 227). There is a difference between zombies and other monsters. Whenever there is a zombie emergence, they come as a mass of zombies. Unlike, the other monsters, they are never alone, they have a community. Therefore, they symbolize society more than any other monsters in terms of number and influenceability. The first fear related to zombies is the fear of death and a possible apocalypse scene in zombie stories. The collapse of civilizations due to 'society' itself cannot be better illustrated by any of the other monsters. They not only push us to confront our mortality but also allow us to consider a world without it (Olney 2017). A world without mortality will not be feasible for the sovereign power mentioned in the next chapter of biopolitics.

Ian Olney has analyzed the last two decades of zombie films in his book *Zombie Cinema* (2017). The critics argue on the major characteristics of the zombies that make them an excellent 'other' for the twenty-first century by resonating particularly well with our contemporary fears and dreams. In the last decade or two, our popular perception of "the zombie" has shifted dramatically: it is increasingly being used not as a symbol of the 'other' but as a symbol of the 'self'. The living dead's mass appeal is built not in our perception of their distinctions from us, but in our understanding that they are us on a basic level (Olney 2017). Olney adds to George A. Romero's "blue-collar monster" discourse and breakdowns the reasons why zombies illustrate who we are as a society in three main concepts: race, capitalism, and gender. Zombie culture is a mirror that reflects our prevailing social system, which is white, capitalist, and patriarchal (Olney 2017). While zombie films frequently dress a "black mask," claiming to be primarily concerned with the notion of black Otherness, the reality is that the actual zombies are white. White people have been depicted as dead and having the responsibility of death in zombie movies for a long time (Olney 2017). George Romero's work, *Dawn of the Dead* (1978), introduced one of the modern zombie movies' primary metaphors: living death as an analogy for late-stage capitalism, by redefining the "dead" as consumers in the shopping

mall. It's frightening and unexpected scenes of zombie cannibalism are encouraged by the rise of international markets and labor, multinational businesses, mass media, and the service sector. The cannibalism metaphor has also been used in 21st-century zombie films to excite our interest in the ultimate product of the late-capitalist era: mass media (Olney 2017). And Romero's films were criticizing the capitalism by showing what the society looked like as dead livings working and consuming as if there are no other choices. Olney emphasizes that we finally recognize ourselves in the dead, which is why they are so popular today and in the new millennium, the zombie means that we are the monsters.



3. MONSTERS IN POLITICS AND BIOPOLITICS

3.1 Biopolitics and Biopower

The term “biopolitics” was discussed by Michel Foucault and developed furthermore on the concept of biopower with a connection to sovereignty. Linking them with “liberalism” (Foucault, Senellart, and Burchell 2008) and “capitalism” (Foucault 1978), biopolitics is a term that emerged in the eighteenth century with biopower. Starting in the eighteenth century, the theme "biopolitics" was an effort to rationalize the difficulties faced by governmental practice effecting a wide range of a population such as health, hygiene, birthrate, life expectancy and race (Foucault, Senellart, and Burchell 2008, 317).

The fundamental privilege of sovereign power, according to Foucault, is the "right to take life or let live, ". Sovereignty shows itself as a right to kill when the sovereign's presence is threatened (Foucault 1978, 135). The idea underpinning war tactics—that one must be capable of killing in order to live—has become the premise that determines state strategy nonetheless the existence at risk is no more the legal existence of sovereignty; it is the population’s biological existence. Power is placed and wielded at the level of life, species, race, and massive population phenomena. This power over life, biopower, evolved into two fundamental forms beginning in the seventeenth century: anatomo and bio-politics. An anatomo-politics of the human body focuses on the body as a machine: its discipline, optimization of capacities, plunder of its resources, simultaneous rise in utility and obedience, and integration into functional and economic control systems. A bio-politics of the population is concentrated on the species body, the body filled with the mechanics of life and acting as the foundation of biological processes like reproduction, births, mortality, as well as the degree of health, life expectancy, and longevity, with all the variables that might cause them to fluctuate (Foucault 1978, 139). Their management was impacted by plenty of operations and regulatory controls. Sovereign power representation, power of death, had been methodically replaced by the governance of bodies and the measured regulation of life. In the classical era, the problems of birthrate, longevity, public health, housing and migration emerged in the realm of political practices and economic observation, along with the rapid development of many disciplines such as universities, secondary schools, barracks, and workshops. It was the start of a "bio-

power" period, with an evident expansion of various and different means for oppressing bodies and controlling people. This evolution was reflected in institutions such as the army and schools, as well as in discussions about strategies, trade, education and the structure of societies. In the cause of population control, demography arose which is the assessment of the connection between resources and residents and the creation of tables assessing wealth and its flow. Moreover, Foucault considers that law does not fade into the background nor does the institutions of justice tend to disappear, however, the law operates further as a norm, and the judicial institution is increasingly integrated into a range of regulatory devices like medical and administrative. For the first time in history, political existence has reflected the biological existence. Part of the reality of life entered the domain of knowledge and power and was no longer an unreachable base that only surfaced from time to time, between the randomness of death and its fate. More than the threat of death, it was taking charge of a life that gave power access to the body. On one side it was tied to the disciplines of the body while on the other, it was applied to the regulation of populations.

Foucault also adds that this bio-power was undeniably an essential component in the development of capitalism; it would not have been feasible without the regulated incorporation of bodies into the machinery of production and the adaptation of population phenomena to economic processes. The adaptation of human accumulation to capital accumulation, the linking of human group growth to the growth of means of production and the different distribution of profit were all made feasible in part using bio-power in its many modes and ways of practice (Foucault 1978, 141). Agamben also lay stress on the fact that the development and victory of capitalism would not have been possible without the disciplinary control achieved by the new bio-power, which created the Foucault's "docile bodies" that it required through a series of appropriate tools (Agamben 1998, 3).

And associatively with capitalism, liberalism, which can be described as the art of government formed in the eighteenth century, is also an essential component of bio-power. According to Foucault's definition, liberalism has three features: market veridiction, governmental utility calculation, and now Europe's position as a region of unlimited economic development concerning a global market. The libertarian formula is

not "be free." Liberalism defines the act of producing what others require to be free and ensures that they are free to be free. Due to the process of producing freedom with the risks of limiting and destroying it at the same time, the liberal practice has always been subject to problematic relationships between the production of freedom and its conditions applying management and organization. Liberalism is fundamentally about a productive/destructive relationship with freedom. It must produce freedom, but this requires the establishment of restraints, controls, forms of oppression, and obligations based on threats among other things (Foucault, Senellart, and Burchell 2008, 64). Therefore, it is expected from it to lay the groundwork for biopolitics.

3.2 State of Exception

The term "state of exception" was studied by Carl Schmitt and the essential affinity between the state of exception and sovereignty was established by Schmitt in his book *Political Theology* in 1922. Schmitt defines a sovereign as the one "who decides on the exception" (Schmitt 1985, 5). According to Giorgio Agamben, the state of exception is increasingly emerging as the dominant paradigm of government in contemporary politics after fronting what has been labeled as a "global civil war," (Agamben 2005, 2). The gradual expansion of the executive's powers during the two world wars, and, more broadly, the state of exception that accompanied and followed those wars, transformed democratic regimes (Agamben 2005, 6). The years following World War One seem to be a laboratory for testing and shaping the operational mechanisms and apparatuses of the state of exception as a government paradigm. The conditional abolishment of the distinction between legislative, executive, and judicial powers, one of the essential characteristics of the state of exception, demonstrates its propensity to become a permanent practice of government (Agamben 2005, 7). As a result, the state of exception appears as a threshold of ambiguity between democracy and absolutism (Agamben 2005, 3). The state of exception is neither outside nor inside of the legal order, and the problem of defining it is the defining of the threshold, or zone of indifference, where inner and outer do not exclude but rather blur with each other. The suspension of the norm does not imply its extinction, and the zone of normlessness it creates is not unconnected to the legal order (Agamben 2005, 23). The direct biopolitical significance of the state of exception as the original structure becomes clear in which law embraces living beings by

suspending itself (Agamben 2005, 3). When the law is suspended, there is no more exception which therefore creates a paradoxical situation.

Sovereign creates and secures the situation that the law requires for its legality through the state of exception, condition of suspension of the order (Agamben 1998, 17). A Protestant theologian, Søren Kierkegaard states:

The exception not only confirms the rule; the rule itself survives solely on the exception. The exception thus explains the universal and itself, and when one really wants to study the universal, one need only examine a legitimate exception, because it will present everything much more clearly than the universal would itself... If one cannot explain the exception, then neither can one explain the universal. (Kierkegaard, Piety, and Mooney 2009)

Since the state of exception, giving strength to the sovereign, is the suspension of the rule, which releases the exception, exception becomes the universal/general. In conclusion, the exception becomes the regulation.

3.3 Homo Sacer

Homo sacer term is the key point in the coincidence of the biopolitics and state of exception. Giorgio Agamben, who has put the term in a slightly different context than its history, defines homo sacer in his book *"Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life"* (1998) as a human who can be killed but not sacrificed that has a bare life although the literal meaning is "sacred man." Agamben discusses that the origins of homo sacer go back to the pre-social life but not the established juridical order. The assimilated werewolf, who is banned from the city, can be seen as the oldest figure of homo sacer. The life of this monstrous hybrid human-animal, is in a threshold of indistinction between the city and the forest, exclusion and inclusion, living paradoxically within both while belonging to none (Agamben 1998, 105). What remains in the collective unconscious from this figure is a man banned from the law (Agamben 1998, 105). Sacred man is not a part of animal nature disconnected from law and the city, but rather a threshold of indistinction and passage between animal and man, physis and nomos, exclusion and inclusion (Agamben 1998, 105). Homo sacer is significant because of its similarity to the

human monsters, that have a monstrous side. Comparable to the overall monsters, there is another identity crisis in homo sacer, related to the subject-object of the sovereign.

Sovereign violence is based on the state's exclusive inclusion of bare life and just as sovereign power's first and immediate object is the life that may be killed but not sacrificed, that has its prototype in homo sacer, the person of the sovereign, in this case the werewolf, lives constantly in the city (Agamben 1998, 104). Homo sacer is in between being a subject and the object of the state. The ban is a force of attraction and antipathy that connects the two poles of the sovereign exception which are, bare life and power, homo sacer and the sovereign according to Agamben (1988). The bare life of homo sacer and the wargus is a zone of indistinction and continuous transition between man and beast, nature and culture, rather than simply natural reproductive life, the *zoe* of the Greeks, or *bios*, a qualified form of life (Agamben 1998, 104). When natural life is fully integrated into the city, these thresholds pass beyond the dark boundaries dividing life and death in order to identify a new living dead man, a new sacred man (Agamben 1998, 107). These living dead man resemble the zombies and their political context. Sherryl Vint (2017) comments that new and abject posthumans evoke concerns of massification and material failure, which stand for our current state of neoliberal crisis and biopolitical governance. Moreover, she adds, "these abject posthuman figures deconstruct the binary of life and death surviving but not truly alive, just like the animal-human homo sacer in the edge of division."

The state of exception is the condition that comes from the suspension of the order, but the general sovereignty must be studied by looking at the state of exception (Agamben 1998, 16) which also represents the zone of indistinction of homo sacer. Like the Cohen's cultural theoretical framework of monsters, in the "threshold" (1996) political term "homo sacer" is understood to be a monster-human which is also in the threshold. The "cultural body" (Cohen 1996) of the monster is now a biopolitical body shuttle between being a subject and an object of the state. It is possible to argue that the creation of a biopolitical body is the origin of sovereign power and, biopolitics, in this sense, is at least as early as the sovereign exception (Agamben 1998, 6). Although it may be seen more visibly around us with the growth of the population, biopolitics ground the Western politics therefore biopolitical bodies, in this case homo sacer, is the base of it. The stream

of biopolitics, that gave homo sacer his existence, makes its way in a disguised but constant manner before rapidly coming to light in our time (Agamben 1998, 121). Not only does it have its way into politics, but it is represented and criticized in many films, especially science fiction and epidemic films. Agamben's discourse of "if there is no clear figure of the sacred man today, it is possible that this is because we are all homines sacri" makes it possible to encounter homo sacer everywhere not only in science fiction genre.

Furthermore, there is a link between totalitarian states and mass democracy, where the spaces, liberties, and rights won by individuals in their conflicts with central powers prepare a virtual but increasing inscription of individuals' lives within the state order and it presents a new and more awful grounding for the very sovereign power from which they sought liberation (Agamben 1998, 121). This is one of the reasons why mass democracy is not free of problems counterintuitively. When its borders begin to blur, the bare life that resides there, frees itself in the city and becomes both the subject and the object of political order struggles, the one location for both the organization of State power and its liberation, and as a result modern democracy emerges, in which man, as a living being, delivers himself as the subject rather than the object of political power (Agamben 1998, 9). In today's modern democracy, mass populations are immersed in their individual biological bodies. Modern democracy reveals oneself as verification and liberation of *zoe* (biological life), and it is always attempting to transform its own bare life into a way of life and to discover *zoe's bios* (qualified life) (Agamben 1998, 9).

3.4 The Camp

Agamben coins another term related to the state of exception; the camp is "the space that is opened when the state of exception begins to become the rule" (1998). This term comes from the Nazi concentration camps for the Jews in World War II. The Jews are the representatives and incarnate symbol of the bare life that modernity inevitably creates within itself (Agamben 1998, 179). The state of exception, which was essentially a temporary suspension of the law based on an accurate state of crisis, is given a permanent spatial arrangement in the camp, which remains outside the normal order (Agamben 1998, 175). Not only concentration camps but refugee camps and prisons can be examples for these spaces. Individuals could be "taken into custody" in the camp regardless of

criminal behavior, in order to protect the state's security (Agamben 1998, 167). Because its citizens were removed of all political status and lowered to bare life, the camp was the most exact biopolitical space ever, in which sovereign power approached nothing but pure life, without any negotiations (Agamben 1998, 171). Hence, in biopolitics, homo sacer takes place of the citizens, and the camp is a biopolitical space.

The political space of modernity itself is signaled by the event of the birth of the camp in our time and was produced when the modern nation-political state's system entered a long-term crisis and the State decided to take direct responsibility for the nation's biological life as its job (Agamben 1998, 174). And the regulations (sensible or not) are legitimized according to this reasoning of crisis. The camp, which is now tightly settled within the city's interior, is the world's new biopolitical law and it has become the fourth, inseparable factor that now joined—and thus broken—the old trinity of state, nation and land (Agamben 1998, 176). The COVID-19 applications can be an example of this phenomena of biopolitics and world as the camps, where the whole world had to stay home other than obligatory cases in order to secure against the virus and PCR tests and vaccines are the new passports of entrances to certain places. In addition to state governments, humanitarian organizations require the same bare life that power demands (Diken and Laustsen 2005, 86). Even though, they do not involve directly, accepting and approving sovereigns' decree has the same meaning. A society in which the exception is the rule and the logic of the camp has become generalized, it is impossible to comprehend contemporary society without taking this into account (Diken and Laustsen 2005, 147). The earth has become a camp like the “global village” caused by the “interdependence with electric media” (McLuhan 1962) as if it is managed from a single place with a common (sovereign) mind. This also emphasizes the affinity of different regimes of different states (totalitarian, democratic etc.). The state of exception, which was mainly a temporary suspension of the juridical-political order, has now evolved into a new and stable spatial arrangement populated by bare life, which can no longer be placed in that order (Agamben 1998, 175). As the population increases this becomes more and more visible. When the exception becomes the norm, the norm vanishes, but when the norm vanishes, the exception vanishes as well therefore, in a sense, there is no longer a camp as an exception and today's society is organized around the reasoning of camp (Diken and

Laustsen 2005, 7). Everyone, every “body” is in the exception and degraded to their “bare life”.

There are two types of camps which are of bricks and of thoughts (Diken and Laustsen 2005, 9). This again implies that the ‘camp’ can be anywhere and every one of us can be a homo sacer in modern biopolitics either in totalitarian or democratic regimes. In films, whenever there is a struggle or even a piece of the relation between the sovereign and a “body,” there is the homo sacer. The classical distinction between zoe and bios, private life and political existence, man as a simple living being at home and man's political existence in the city does not exist anymore in the Western political space. (Agamben 1998) The modern camp represents a new community dream that suggests a paradoxical goal of belonging based on not belonging, a community in which dismantling the social bond serves as the bond (Diken and Laustsen 2005, 147). Homo sacer, contemporary hybrid monster, in the camp, overlaps with Cohen’s cultural monster theory (1996) line, borders of the society itself being in the boundary line. The extinguishment of the sharp boundaries is the feature of the contemporary politics.

3.5 Leviathan

Monsters in political philosophy do not conclude with the origins of the homosacer. Leviathan is also another creature related to the oppressive sovereign in Thomas Hobbes’s book *Leviathan* (1998). The term ‘Leviathan’ comes from the Hebrew Bible, Old Testament, where it is mentioned numerous times. It is understood to be a creature with many heads from “crush the heads of leviathan” (Psalms 74:14). It is also mentioned to be a monster to be slain by God: “In that day, the Lord will punish with his sword—his fierce, great and powerful sword Leviathan the gliding serpent, Leviathan the coiling serpent; he will slay the monster of the sea” (Isaiah 27:1). There is another emphasis of its environment as the sea: “Can you pull in Leviathan with a fishhook or tie down its tongue with a rope” and followed by its features similar to a dragon smoke from its nostrils, fire from the mouth and scales on its body like a fish or a snake (Job 41). But late Leviathan becomes the aquatic representative of a group of monsters whose primary function is to swallow (Williams 1996, 186). David Gilmore (2003) emphasizes that the source of the Leviathan's monstrosity is its unnatural combination of elements, earth, and

water, because, while Leviathan is clearly a sea creature or a fish, it is also a type of mammal, as it is frequently illustrated breastfeeding babies where the element of strange hybridization, organic boundary-crossing, is evident. Just like the homo sacer, it is in the zone of indistinction in terms of species. And relevantly to the Hebrew Bible, it seems to represent the evil or the devil, where God had the need to destroy it.

Thomas Hobbes has used this monster, Leviathan, as a metaphorical term symbolizing the strong state/commonwealth (1998). Hobbes explains this artificial body of the state that has the soul of sovereignty and serving body parts such as officers of judicature and execution laws. The initial material and the creator of this artificial body/man is the 'man' and Hobbes says that it is what makes legitimate authority possible by identifying the "state of nature." According to Hobbes, the State of nature is the civil war between man because of their natural urge for rivalry and glory, and their lack of confidence. In this wartime, everyone is the enemy and there is no security other than individual effort. Therefore, there is no decent development of industry, culture, navigation, commodities and immovables. And if the men collectively agreed to live in peace without obedience there would not be a requirement of a civil government or commonwealth. Hobbes defines commonwealth as the establishment in which a gathering of men agrees and makes a social contract that everyone gives the right to represent them to the man or assembly of men, who will authorize all actions and judgments, to live peacefully with each other and be protected from other people. By this mutual covenant, the commonwealth may use whatever strength and resources he deems necessary for peace and common defense. There aren't any changes in the legality to kill in the name of democracy today (Diken and Laustsen 2005, 131). State sacrifices some to others in the name of security because it has sovereign power and everyone else remaining are its subjects. There are two ways of achieving this power for Hobbes. First is by natural force destroying anyone who resists or by war subjugating enemies. Second is by voluntary of men agreeing to accept a man or assembly of men, on reliance to be protected by. Although they are different, the rights and costs of sovereignty, are the same in both ways. The power does not transfer to another without consent and the sovereign cannot pay a price, be accused or punished of causing harm by any of his subjects. He is the judge of what is necessary for peace and of policies and he is the only lawmaker and highest judge of disagreements and of times and circumstances of war and peace. Choosing judges,

counselors, commanders, and all other officers and ministers and determining rewards, penalties, honor and order belong to him (Hobbes 1998, 132). The whole state body rules the territories and keeps the sovereign power using these means.

Hobbes also discusses the state and subjects reducing it to the very basic dominance of parents upon children in civil law. He emphasizes that because he is the father of the children, the parent has the right of dominion by generation over his children which is called paternal as if the child is in consent. This debate is decided by civil law in commonwealths, and the decision is generally in the best interest of the father because commonwealths were mostly founded by fathers, not mothers. Without the contract or consent, in the state of nature, the dominion is in the mother because without the marital laws, the father cannot be known, unless stated by the mother. If she feeds the child, the child owes her/his life to the mother and is therefore in debt to obey her (Hobbes 1998, 134). I believe that this is one of the reasons why Hobbes refers to the state/leviathan as "he." The male sovereign is the contractual power, and the female sovereign is the sovereign in the state of nature. Moreover, Agamben comments on Hobbes' theory that the state of nature is, actually, a state of exception (Agamben 1998, 109). Therefore, the promised condition of peace can never be acquired for the sake of the sovereign.

4. *THE HOST* (2006) FILM ANALYSIS

4.1 Plot Summary

The Host (2006) is a monster film directed by the Academy Award winner South Korean director, Bong Joon-Ho. The main character of the film Gang-du, a middle-aged man, lives with his daughter in middle school, Hyun-seo, and his old father, Hee-bong where they have a small food stand near Han River in Seoul, South Korea. Hyun-seo's mother left them after birth. He has an unemployed alcoholic brother, Nam-il, and a national archer sister, Nam-joo. A monster, formed by the toxic chemical waste in the Han River, attacks and kidnaps people causing Hyun-seo's and many people's death. The Park family is forced into quarantine where they had gathered for the funerals. Gang-du gets a call from his daughter learning she is still alive and ignored by officials. Park family escapes quarantine for the rescue of Hyun-seo. Despite their efforts, the old man Hee-bong and Hyun-seo gets killed by the monster.

4.2 Water Monster (Leviathan) as the “Host”

The Host is an action-horror film in a mocking tone. I believe that the cynical tone of the film is carefully chosen because it criticizes the social issues regarding South Korea and the globe while narrating a blockbuster film of a monster. The opening scene is a prequel explaining the cause of the Han River monster. In 2000, in a US military camp in Yongsan, South Korea, an American scientist ordered his Korean assistant to dump the bottles of formaldehyde pouring them into the drain which directly flows to the Han River in Seoul, violating the regulations. The scientist emphasizes that the Han River is very “broad” and he wants the his assistant to be “broad-minded” about it. In one of his interviews, the director and the writer of the film, Bong Joon-Ho, mentions that the monster's physical appearance is based on a newspaper article he read about “a deformed fish with an S-shaped spine” found in the Han River. (Sedia 2000) As a matter of fact, in year 2000, there is an authentic story about an incident where the U.S. Forces in Korea says its Seoul headquarter discharged the chemicals through the sewage system. (Lee 2000) This is one of the typical disaster film openings where the cause is a chemical

leakage or side effects of scientific research. The instant effect of the poured chemicals is displayed in the next scenes where two fishers encounter a small fish-like animal in the river referred to as “mutation”, and then a man in a suit, looking at the river from a bridge mentions big darkness in the water but does not give up committing suicide. The man's suicide is only one visible indicator of the high suicide rates in the community of South Korea. The authorities have even tried to persuade people to the contrary in the past to change the perception of being famous with the suicides in Han River's most-jumped-off bridge, Mapo Bridge (Schachter and Strother 2012). This third scene of the film is a summary of what the audience will watch. The social problem of suicide, which is jumping into the darkness in the water (monsters/leviathan) is a metaphor for the ‘citizen’s struggle and insignificant death, with no other choice. This is also the first scene supporting my interpretation that the water monster is the Leviathan (state/commonwealth) of Thomas Hobbes (1998). Throughout the film, characters struggle between the monster and the authorities of the state (police, doctor, etc.) The original Korean title of the film is *Gwoemul* (괴물), which literally means “monster” in English. However, the English title used is “the Host.” To interpret this, the English title of the movie addresses the monster and presents it as the host of the deadly virus stated but later denied, providing the analogy for the landlord state, claiming the location for administration.

The monster in the film, which grows gigantic over the years after the chemical waste dumping in the Han River of Seoul, is a mutant creature who lives in the water but can also run on land. It has a physical appearance of an amphibian, wet-looking with a bent spine, very long-tailed (kidnaps people using it as a limb), and several levels of flesh like the petals of a flower, covering its mouth, and a long tongue like a serpent. It can hang upside down under the bridges like a sleeping bat. This ‘Asian giant monster’ resembles Godzilla in the first place, later on, the features of hybridity and inhabitant of water, reveal and lead us to a leviathan. The mouth resembles the sea monster (a giant octopus) Kraken’s mouth in *Pirates of the Caribbean Dead Man’s Chest* (2006) film, where Jack Sparrow stabs its mouth with the sword while being swallowed by the monster. The aggressive mouth and the oral devastation of the monsters are signs of cannibalism (Gilmore 2003). It is a common feature of the human eating creatures in narratives. Gang-

du, the half-wit father, also has two parallel scenes of stabbing the mouth towards the end of the film where he stabs the mouth of the monster with a signboard pole. This monster has the ability to swallow bodies as a whole, and it vomits them into a sewer as if making a collection of bodies.

4.3 The Camps: Between the River and the City

Gang-du and his family live near the Han River, in a container-like house that is a food stand and their home at the same time. They have a one-room place with a small tube television. They sell snacks to people who come for a picnic near the river. The Park family is kind of pushed towards the river metaphorically due to their lack of wealth in low socioeconomic class. The permanent spatial arrangement in the camp, which remains outside the normal order (Agamben 1998, 175) is in the use of the sovereign state where the bare life of poor people pushed outside the society can be killed without a sacrifice. This container housing area is just the beginning of the miserable life of the outcast citizens who lack wealth and considerable social status in the society. They do not live in the city or nature; they are exactly in the middle as homo sacer and the wargus. Gang-du is a childlike man who only cares about his daughter, Hyun-seo. Hyun-seo's mother left them after birth. The grandfather of Hyun-seo runs the food stand to earn for living despite Gang-du's foolishness. (He either sleeps or steals the customer's food.) Gang-du's alcoholic brother Nam-il attends drunk to Hyun-seo's parent meeting at school. He is from the unemployed university graduate segment of society. The aunt, Nam-joo, a national archer, seems to be the only succeeding person in life among the family until she misses the gold medal in the semifinals due to her late timing at the shot. The family is poor, as interpreted Gang-du's savings of ten cents to get a new cellphone for Hyun-seo. All the family members are kinds of homo sacer. They even become more visible symbols of the outcasts. While their existence is already insignificant they transform into bare lives in the name of the security of others and the state throughout the film.

On a typical riverside picnic day, people realize something is hanging from the bridge which jumps into the water. When it comes near the edge, Gang-du throws a can of beer into the water; the monster grabs it under the water. Other people gather around and start

throwing everything they have (plastic, trash, food) to get the attention of the fish-like creature. Koreans and Pakistan refugees cause a pile of garbage to float on the river in a very short time (the scene takes under a minute). The crowd suddenly realizes the pollution they have made but it's too late. The monster is created by the pollution of the river with toxic waste, but this scene also draws attention to the real crisis, the environmental pollution, which is one of the problems of the growing population and moreover to the issue of domestic and foreign immigration to the cities.

The monster gets onto the land and starts attacking, resulting in everybody rushing to the end of their lives. Only Gang-du and an American man fight against the monster while others run away or get killed by the monster. Gang-du accidentally grabs another girl's hand instead of Hyun-seo's trying to save her, causing her to get abducted by the monster. The monster gets away with the bodies it has collected. The authorities and the military declare the place as restricted area and clear it with a large group of soldiers. Relatives of the deceased are gathered for mourning in a sports hall. The Park family, except Hyun-seo, meets there. Nam-joo brings her bronze medal and Nam-il his bottle of alcohol meeting Gang-du and their father in front of the photographs of dead and they create an exaggerated crying scene. Grandfather cries and indicates that the family is all together again thanks to Hyun-seo. Their mourning, making a big fuss, falling and crawling over each other on the floor in a humorous way causing the reporters to take photographs of the family. This absurd scene is well matched with an employee announcing a car plate number for a car which blocks the way. A lady runs to claim the car apologizing. Nam-il accuses Gang-du of his nephew's death and attacks him. They are being pushed over, while fighting and crying, by officials making space for a senior bureaucrat looking man so he can come near the photographs of dead people. And the attention of the photographers is drawn by this group of black suited people. The camera stays on low angle showing the Park family on the floor being wiped away. This scene is also another visual proof of the power and its subjects. The bureaucrat men in suits are being welcomed by wiping the unimportant people out of the way (Park family).

A guy in a yellow quarantine suit walks around in the sports hall. He slips and falls. He stands up to make an announcement indicating a matter of "life and death" and asks people to raise their hands if they have been near the river in the incident or were in

contact with those that were or with the monster. The film's portrayal of the authorities' failure to perform professional in times of crisis attitudes in complete contrast to the monster movies of the 1950s, in which viewers could be assured that once authorities were convinced of a threat, it would be dealt promptly (Grant 2018). The authorities are not only convinced in *the Host* but overreact and mostly generate false information without in-depth research. Nam-il asks for an explanation to the quarantine officer but the man cannot find any explanation for the news on the television. Other yellow-suited men start to release disinfection gas into the hall. In chaos of people running away, the man keeps asking if anyone contacted the monster. Gang-du voluntarily confesses that its blood was on his face without thinking about the consequences. He and his family are taken for quarantine and medical examinations with brutal force. Gang-du is forcefully being put in a yellow body bag like he is dead. On the news of the quarantine bus's television, a US Army sergeant who lost an arm fighting the monster is diagnosed with a virus that is thought to be from the monster. Park family and other people are in the hospital waiting for examination. These people are dragged from place to place (gymnasium, hospital, quarantine) because they are labelled dangerous. Especially the doctors (hospitals) and the police are the institutional forces Foucault mentions that act as a state apparatus. (Foucault, 1982, 784) Gang-du's insanity is another key point that enables the process of the state objectivizing him and separating him from the society. (Foucault, 1982, 778).

Gang-du and his family are also in the quarantine, which is another "camp" as a biopolitical space (Agamben 1998), after their home by the river. In Agamben's "camp" (1998), space created when state of exception actualizes, sovereign power contact only pure life, indisputably. Although in the film two important locations, container housing area and the quarantine are representing the camp, it is obligatory to say that the camp is everywhere where there is biopolitics, since the political system today no longer orders forms of life and legal rules in a fixed space (Agamben 1998). Gang-du is constantly exposed to biopolitical practices like doctors interfering human body without consent. They are generally convinced as it is an important phase for the security of others or the state. Although it works absurdly in this movie, it does not overshadow the truth. Homo sacer, in this case Gang-du, his family and whoever are being taken into quarantine can be also seen as "taken into custody" in the camp (Agamben 1998, 167). They are removed

of all political status and lowered to bare life, in this biopolitical space, and sovereign power approaches only pure life, without any negotiations (Agamben 1998, 171). On the other hand, the real monster acting like the state continue to chew and swallow bodies of people making a secret pile of them in the sewer.

4.4 Biopolitics: Drilling into the Brain

Throughout the film, absurd situations come to life emphasizing the unimportance of human life with the applications of authorities. After taken to the hospital Gang-du gets a phone call from Hyun-seo, telling her father that she is alive in a sewer. Hyun-seo is one of the bodies in the sewer that was lucky to survive. Gang-du is behind the quarantine curtain trying to convince the officer that he got a call from his daughter. The police officer insists that her name is on the deceased list therefore she is dead. Nam-il requests phone tracking but the officer refuses and tells him it is not for everyone. The grandfather tries to bribe him and Nam-joo threatens him with a hand gesture, but he has already decided that the girl is dead, believing the phone call was a dream of Gang-du. After the quarantine process this is the second scene in the matter of life and death. The police officer, as an agent of the state, has the right over life. The privilege of the sovereign power over the right to live in danger is reflected in the police officer. (Foucault 1978, 135) Further insist of Gang-du, the homo sacer, with his reenacting the monster swallowing and spitting his daughter, the police recommend psychological treatment and walks away. Ridiculous run-away scene of four members of the Park family, narrates their individual struggle to find Hyun-seo on their own with the help of trickster gangsters.

They disguise as a quarantine team in order to slip into the restricted area to search for sewers. Even so they get to bribe the check-in officer with the last money they have, Gang-du's collected ten cents for Hyun-seo's cellphone. They start searching for sewers, Gang-du voluntarily disinfects himself running behind the disinfection truck to avoid getting the virus to others and most importantly to his daughter. The grandfather believes the news and the government by saying "If the government says so we have to accept it." Throughout the film the grandfather's role is to find a way out of every situation, already accepting the corruption as it is. The monster attacks the family again knocking over the

container house. They chase the monster shooting him with rifles several times. Gang-du handing over the blank rifle to his father causes his death and the monster kills the grandfather. Gang-du and his siblings cannot even protect him running away from double enemies, the monster and the police. Gang-du gets caught crying next to his father. A squint-eyed American doctor asks Gang-du why he did not report his daughter being alive, acting like he is pitying him. And then he talks certainly that Gang-du has delusions indicating the virus and his brain needs to be examined, especially the front lobe. The American doctor later confesses to his colleague that the virus was not found in any of the patients quarantined and the American soldier died of shock during the operations. Gang-du, who is about to be carried out a live autopsy drilling his brain, understands the inexistence of the virus. He resists however, cannot avoid it. The doctor drills into Gang-du's forehead making two holes into the brain. After the surgery he manages to go out taking one of the nurses as a hostage, threatening the doctors with his own blood stating he has the virus. As soon as he steps out, we come across officers doing a barbecue. I believe that this scene is an indicator of the concrete illustration of biopolitics.

Nam-il makes Molotov bombs with the help of a homeless guy and gets criticized by the homeless man as it is an old method for demonstrations although it is not for demonstrations. They pass by a group of demonstrators against "Agent Yellow", a flying robot controlled by a man releasing chemical gas, probably disinfectant or poison produced by the U.S. They hear the news on the radio about the demonstrators breaking the barricade near the Han River. With a high angle besides the yellow agent spraying disinfectant, people are protesting behind a group of police with a barrier. The crowd is seen from a far point of view of the monster. The demonstrators are being pushed towards the river, where the monster is coming. While demonstrators resist, the monster approaches behind dispersing the crowd. There is nothing left between the yellow agent and the monster except a cop uselessly shooting at the monster. The yellow agent releases gas to kill the monster, causing five people to faint who hold a banner saying, "Free Park Gang-du." When the crowd fade from the scene yellow agent sprays on the monster but it only faints a little. Gang-du takes out his daughter and the little boy she helped holds tight to be saved from the monster. However, Hyun-seo is found dead by his father. People vomit blood, faint, and die because of the poison gas released by the Yellow

Agent. Nam-il gets bombed while trying to burn the monster with a Molotov bomb and fails. Nam-joo grabs the falling Molotov with her arrow and shoots the monster burning. Characters firebomb the monster and not the sovereign representative police. This act literally shows the monster as a Leviathan, the state, because of the usual scenery of the resistance method. In modern democracy the Molotov bomb is used by the demonstrators against the police and the state, while in the scene the, despite the demonstrators protesting the poisonous yellow agent, Park family use the bombs against the water monster.

The final move of Gang-du, stabbing the monster's mouth with the pole of the "Biohazard Extremely Dangerous" signboard, kills the monster. And then he takes care of the little boy Hyun-seo helped, seeing him alive. We see time has passed and snowy winter has arrived. Gang-du lives with the little boy who survived. The TV is on while they are eating. U.S. Senate Investigating Committee announces the misinformation about the recent Korean virus incident. Gang-du and the boy agree on turning it off finding it boring. Him replacing his own child with another is an act of biologically having a child with him, confusing the audience to feel sad for the death of the daughter or appreciating him for taking the living boy under his arms. This visuality and the plot choice of the film once again indicates the systematically transforming individuals into a homo sacer. Their bodies are only a tool as a pure life, for the maintenance of the sovereign power. The psychological compensation of Gang-du's sadness making him decide to raise the other surviving child, is another way of criticizing the biopolitics.

5. TRAIN TO BUSAN (2016) FILM ANALYSIS

5.1 Plot Summary

Train to Busan (2016) is a zombie film directed by Yeon Sang-Ho. The main narrative of the film revolves around a workaholic father, Seok-woo in the divorce stage with his wife, who takes his daughter, Soo-an from Seoul to Busan to her mother with the KTX train, where they encounter the zombie pandemic. The passengers fight against zombies and each other while the train is heading towards Busan. Everybody on the journey becomes infected except Seok-woo, the pregnant woman, Seong-kyeong, and Soo-an, the little girl. Seok-woo, after getting bitten, sacrifices himself in the end for his daughter and Seong-kyeong.

5.2 Protestors/Demonstrators as Zombie

The film starts with a traffic control and disinfection for the vehicles passing. The driver complains about how last time he had to bury his livestock animals due to a virus. He moves on and hits a gazelle very hard, but it comes to life with eyes different than normal. This is also another monster film start with the virus leaking and causing the mutant monster such as *The Host*. The zombies in this second movie are also caused by the leaked chemicals. The main character, Seok-woo is a white-collar worker paints a picture of not having time to eat at work and eating fast food while working. He reviews an article about mysterious fish deaths at a water reservoir. He is a fund manager and orders to sell their funds on a project to his secretary-looking guy. He argues with his wife on the phone being accused of not being a good father because his daughter, Soo-an, wants to go to Busan with her mother on her birthday and not expressing this to her father. Seok-woo lives with his mother and daughter in a high-middle-class-looking apartment flat. He realizes he bought a birthday gift that Soo-an already has after explaining he is too busy to take her to Busan. He asks if she wants anything else, and she replies she wants to go to her mother, looking really depressed. Seok-woo's mother tells him to talk about divorcing again and gives him a video camera in which she shot Soo-an's singing performance at school. She forgets the lyrics and her classmates laugh at her. Seok-woo

finally decides to take Soo-an to Busan. He tells her that he knows she could not finish her singing and adds that he may look like he was not there, but he is always watching her. He is suddenly cut by a few fire trucks ambulances and police cars with sirens. Soo-an catches an ash piece falling like a snowflake. They see a skyscraper with several floors on fire.

We see a crowded train station, hearing an announcement about the KTX train to Busan. And then the crew and passengers are introduced group by group. Seok-woo gets a phone call that there is a protest strike in an industrial park. An unknown passenger runs into the train while the trainmaster is not looking. She seems to be hurt and ill. The doors are closed, and the train is ready to move. The officer witness turmoil upstairs. It seems like two men are fighting in the crowd. Soo-an sees a man jump on the officer while the train is moving. The woman leaked onto the train and is in the toilet with a bite mark on her leg, coughing and struggling with a medical attack. Soo-an turns the pages of a magazine, advertising clothes, accessories, etc. A black-suited middle-aged man reports a suspicious man boarded on the train to the train attendant. Because it is right after the infected woman scene, it is made for the audience to think that it is the case. However, when they open the toilet door, a homeless-looking man is sitting on the floor, mumbling, "Everyone is dead!" in fear. The arrogant man, Yun-Seok, who turns out to be a CEO of one of the train companies, otherizes the homeless man and tells Soon-an "If you don't study well, you'll end up like this man." Pointing at the homeless man on the floor. Soo-an replies that her mother said those are words of evil people. And he says, "it seems your mother failed to study well too". Seok-woo gets another phone call and is told by his employee that the strikes are growing nationwide. The news headline on the TV was "Military deployed to control riots" and "Indiscriminate violence at the riot." Two old women are talking about the news. The older one worries that people will get hurt. The younger one says that people riot over everything, and they should have been prisoned like in the old days. The older woman warns her not to say stuff like that. The riots are not caused by people they are the chaos made by zombies. The government does not tell the truth showing itself strong.

The only infected woman, who got last on the train, attacks the train attendant and others. Infected people become zombies and attack living passengers. All people who are still alive, run away from the zombies. The black-suited Yun-Seok orders to close the door seeing the man and his wife running towards them. Seok-woo closes the door leaving two behind. Sang-hwa and his pregnant wife Seong-kyeong, defend themselves a bit before the crowd opens the door again. Zombies do not know how to open the door therefore no need to lock the door. They only attack when they see and hear. Seong-kyeong covers the glass in between with newspaper sheets which lower the aggression of zombies. Sang-hwa and Seok-woo argue over the people leaving them behind the door. An announcement is made about the train that it will not be stopping at Cheonan station due to the situation. Yon-suk, talks with the center over the intercom, yelling and ordering him to stop at Cheonan. Seok-woo's mother calls, and speaks her last words, cursing at the end which is a sign of being infected and turning into a zombie.

The train slows down in a station but a crowd of people begging for help from the zombies start hitting the windows. Destruction scenery is shown in the city. The authority on the TV starts making a press statement:

“My fellow citizens, violent riots have broken out in major cities, resulting in multiple civilian and police injuries. It led us to shut down several key districts, to subdue the attempts to destroy or take over government property. For this reason, we are declaring a state of emergency, to stabilize and control the current situation. (Internet video zombies falling from a helicopter) Thanks to our government's rapid response (zombies attacking people in traffic) several outbreaks are being constrained. (Zombie attacking a car out of control) Fellow citizens, please refrain from reacting to baseless rumors (social media reviews are shown about zombies and the word “zombie” (jombi/좀비) is in the first place of topics) and stay safe in your homes. We must stay calm and trust our government, as we all work together in facing this current crisis. To the best of your knowledge, your safety is not in jeopardy. (Destructed city videos online is shown)”

The state as a sovereign does its duty to see zombies representing homo sacer as unimportant humans in their bare lives. The general news about the demonstrators/protestors against some governments reflect the attitude towards the citizens seeking for their rights in today's states. Protestors are disdained and ignored by states, because as sovereigns, they need to keep their authority against all potential dangers. Therefore, the zombie, homo sacer and protestor analogy is made in the context of the scene.

Soo-an cannot reach her mother, her phone is turned off. She is given a seat by her father but passes it to the old woman receiving snacks in return. Her father warns her to care for herself first in situations like this. An announcement is made. The train will stop at Daejon as a final station and there will be military. The rich man, Yun-seok makes a phone call and tries to learn the situation. Seok-woo also makes a phone call to his employee to learn.

5. 3 Ant Workers

Sang-hwa asks Soo-an about her father, while he is on the phone. He asks if he is her real father. She answers yes. He asks what he does for a living and gets the answer of a fund manager. Sang-hwa comments that he is an anteater, (gaemihaltgi/ 개미 훃기) (translated as a bloodsucker in English subtitles) who lives sucking other people's blood meaning exploiting them which is same with an anteater. Ant eating is the act of absorbing and destroying small businesses called ants. Pregnant wife warns him not to tell stuff like that in front of kids. Soo-an says that it is okay because everybody thinks like that anyways. Seok-woo takes out his phone to make a call. His contacts are split into groups. He enters the group called "Ants" (gaemideul/ 개미 들) and picks Daejon Captain Min, who appears to be from the army. He learns from him that Daejon station is under the control of the army but all the passengers will be quarantined. The character that has power, labeling other inferior human beings as animals (*zoe*) regardless of their *bios* is an act of biopolitics on micro level. Seok-woo has a strong social status in terms of wealth and job position. His self-seeking attitude towards the workers are a small display of the sovereign power. In this case he does whatever it takes to maintain his and his family's safety. Seok-woo asks for help only for himself and his daughter insisting he will compensate for the favor. The captain tells him to go to the east square to skip the quarantine, where his men will wait for them. There is no one at the Daejon station. Yun-seok, who turns out to be the CEO of Stallion Express, tries to convince the conductor secretly to keep going on until Busan because all the routes to Daejon are cut off due to quarantine. The conductor runs to warn others about the quarantine not listening to Yun-seok. Passengers follow the restricted exit, on the other hand, Seok-woo takes his daughter to another exit. Soo-an interrogates her father to understand the situation after the homeless man insists to follow

them because he heard Seok-woo on the phone about the other exit. Soo-an tries to run to the crowd to notify them about the quarantine-safe exit. However, her father rejects her, and she starts crying: “You only care about yourself. That’s why mom left”.

Passengers get close to look for the military. However, all the soldiers have been infected and turned into zombies. The film’s key point of the transformation of homo sacer into sovereign and sovereign into homo sacer, start to come into sight. Foucault’s (1982) institutional apparatus, in this case the military, is the instrument towards the goal of keeping the power. Soldiers becoming zombies in the scene becoming, is a way of telling the initial apparatus of state losing its primary duty. As zombies are the representatives of homo sacer, their sovereignty collapses. The borders and labels are getting blurred towards the end of the film. The homeless man also runs into a wounded soldier who cries for help and gets attacked by the soldier zombies. Seok-woo starts to run back to the station like the other passengers. Soo-an is saved from a zombie attack by Sang-hwa. And Seong-kyeong takes Soo-an and runs before Seok-woo comes. The instant helping and leaving each other behind continue to increase. Seok-woo is also knocked out by a zombie and puts a book in his mouth between the teeth to protect himself. And then saved by the homeless man, who covered the zombie with a jacket to block his sight. People are running into the train from the zombies. Yun-seok shouts to take off without waiting for the others but is pushed by the trainmaster because there are still people alive. Yun-seok keeps forcing the trainmaster to move the train and he pushes the girl who states her friends have not come yet. Another announcement is made that the train will not stop at any stops and directly go to Busan. Sang-hwa tells Seok-woo that he must have been an expert on how to leave useless people behind since he is a fund manager, while they are preparing to go through a group of zombies. A baseball player student hesitates to attack when he encounters his friends as zombies.

5.4 Sacrifice

Sang-hwa tells Seok-woo that his daughter will understand why her father is so busy working when she grows up saying “Isn't it all about sacrifice” The life that may be killed but not sacrificed, the life of homo sacer (Agamben 1998, 104) is manifested clearly with

this dialogue. Because homo sacers are not allowed to be sacrificed and their death is insignificant. Seok-woo and Sang-hwa warm up against each other with this conversation and the first conflict disappears. The high school student girl gets excited that her friend is coming toward her with people saved. But Yun-seok starts scolding her that they cannot be sure if they are not infected. None of the other people support the girl in the idea of saving others. The wagon people lock the door tight not allowing anybody to come in. They also hold the girl so that she doesn't open the door or make any noise. The old woman who is doing nothing about the situation gets up when she sees her sister alive behind the door held. She and the girl try to prevent the men from holding the door but fail. Sang-hwa is bitten by a zombie and he sacrifices himself to hold the zombies for a time to save his wife and others. The plot and the dramatizing the sacrifice is another way of protesting the systematic transition of citizens into homo sacer. Yun-seok, the symbol of the micro sovereign in the film, does not care about the others' lives, but characters like Sang-hwa play a big role in deconstructing and changing the way of their insignificant death. The plot creates the dramatic scenes to emphasize the importance of making a martyr of their selves. Seok-woo punch for Yun-seok starts him shouting to make people look at Seok-woo's eyes so that they believe he is infected. He makes his enemy the "other" a monster because his guilt was emphasized as a micro sovereign. And he sets the people up against the "enemy" to send it away from the place they think it is their safe area. People in the wagon get scared from the newcomers and he persists on suggesting they throw the newcomers out. Once they are out, the old woman opens the door to the zombies to take revenge and suicide with the quilt feelings toward her zombie sister and the hate for the people causing her infection.

Seok-woo's man calls and tells him that the virus is from the Biotech company that they have funded. He cries and cleans the blood on his face and hands trying to be clean morally. Yun-seok once again victimizes another person, the trainmaster, for himself by tricking him to get stuck with a group of zombies distracting them. However, he gets bitten too. Yun-seok moves towards a small train wagon and Seok-woo, Soo-an and Seong-kyeong jump on. Seok-woo trying to convince Yun-seok that he is already infected looking at his white eyes. Yun-seok cries that his old mother is waiting for him at home and then loses himself, starts attacking as a zombie. Seok-woo sacrifices himself by

putting his hand in the zombie's mouth. And then jumps off the train before the conversion so that he won't attack his daughter and the pregnant woman, Seong-kyeong. Seok-woo, as a character emphasizes another transform of the sovereign into a homo sacer with his contravene of the non-sacrificed death of the pure life. In the final scene, Seong-kyeong and Soo-an stop the train at the end of the road to walk. They are seen by soldiers who receive the order of shooting the comers. Soo-an sings her song signing she is still an uninfected human which saves them from being shot. They seem to be accompanied safely. The 'state of crisis' seem to be resolved into a safe situation with the soldiers on their duty. However, the state of exception, is not a temporary suspension of the juridical-political order, but it is a new and stable populated by bare life, which does not have a place in the new understanding (Agamben 1998, 175).

The sovereign control has micro and macro dimensions in the film. As in macro, there is a state that acts as a modern democratic state which uses biopolitics in the state of crisis/emergency. It uses the quarantine, soldiers, police in the state of emergency. Zombies in the zone of indistinction between life and death are the homo sacer that are reduced into bare life by the sovereign state (Agamben 1998). However, some of the characters in the film also act as a small representative of the sovereign throughout the film. Yun-seok controls the life of others, deciding for their salvation. The transformation of soldiers, Yun-seok and Seok-woo are the metamorphosis of them turning into homo sacer while they had control over people in the first place. The train is also a type of camping, but it is not limited to this, because biopolitics are everywhere in the film and in real life. "The camp as dislocating localization" (Agamben 1998, 175) is the reason why the film narrates on a symbol of mobility, bullet train.

6. CONCLUSION

Monsters in the cinema, have always been metaphorical and are to reflect the social and political orders of their environment (Grant 2018). Human beings are becoming more disconnected from nature as our culture becomes more urbanized and technological as a result, romanticizing the nature as a distinct and independent space (Grant 2018, 64). However, according to Agamben, “state of nature is the state of exception.” (Agamben 1998) as he refers to the nature state of Hobbes (1998), which is the reason of legitimizing the state/Leviathan. Biopolitics, where the life of the homo sacer is reduced to bare life, is the rule of state of exception for the sake of the sovereign to retain its power. The monster’s homo sacer and leviathan are the two crucial metaphors in political philosophy.

Genres concern mass culture as a popular cinema, and their sociological importance is credited to their contribution as factors that influence of 'mass' behavior (Tudor 2014, 180). Ironically, the sovereign power is criticized with the use of biopolitics in the films that have reached record number of audiences in South Korea. The record-breaking box-office success of *The Host* (Choi 2010) and *Train to Busan* (Hong 2016) with the viewer record of their year are two blockbuster monster films from South Korea. Commonly, they display two different kinds of monsters although they serve the same objective. Both films cover the term of sovereign, biopolitics, camp and state of exception in their own way. *The Host* (2006) shows the struggle between the state and the monster which are eventually the same danger, because the monster is a Leviathan of Hobbes, strong commonwealth (1998). *Homo sacer* characters fight both the monster and the sovereign state and surviving people keep being in the threshold. *Train to Busan* (2016) differently, shows the micro and macro levels of sovereignty in the zombie apocalypse. Agamben’s *homo sacer*, abject posthuman figures as zombies (Vint 2017, 172), becomes the simple anarchists. The sovereign representing characters transform into *homo sacers* as well in the end.

The reason of the monsters may seem the leakage or the scientific in the films indirectly caused by humans. However, the monsters reshape the norms and political order.

We are not sinking because whales and monstrous fish want to swallow us whole, not because the strange beings of the sea wish harm on us, nor because the sea itself is vengeful, we are sinking because of *our* collective hunger and callousness. (Mittman and Tomaini 2017)

The crisis is not a monster. Monsters seem to be the reason for the state of emergency in the narrative of the films, however, the sovereign creates and guarantees the situation that the law needs for its legality through the state of exception (Agamben 1998, 17). Therefore, the state creates its state of exceptions or gets help from the crises in order to maintain its sovereignty. The real crisis is the biopolitics of the sovereign power which is now widely used without the exception.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Edited by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press. <http://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=2003>.
- . 2005. *State of Exception*. Edited by Kevin Attell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Augustine, St., Knight, Gwendolyne. 2018. "St. Augustine of Hippo, City of God." In *Primary Sources on Monsters*, 55–60. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781942401223-010>.
- Choi, Jinhee. 2010. *The South Korean Film Renaissance: Local Hitmakers, Global Provocateurs*. Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press.
- Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. 1996. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Diken, Bülent, and Carsten Bagge Laustsen. 2005. *The Culture of Exception: Sociology Facing the Camp*. London: Routledge.
- . 2010. *Filmlerle Sosyoloji*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*. Edited by Robert Hurley. NY: Pantheon Books.
- . 1982. "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8 (4): 777–95. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1343197>.
- Foucault, Michel, Michel Senellart, and Graham Burchell. 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College De France, 1978-79*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gilmore, David D. 2003. *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Grant, Barry Keith. 2018. *Monster Cinema*. Quick Takes: Movies and Popular Culture. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=f4A3DwAAQBAJ>.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1998. *Leviathan*. Edited by J. C. A. Gaskin. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hong, C. 2016. “‘Train To Busan’ Is The First Korean Film Of 2016 To Break This Audience Record.” Soompi. August 7, 2016. <https://www.soompi.com/article/884427wpp/train-busan-first-korean-film-2016-top-10-million>.
- Kalat, David. 2017. *A Critical History and Filmography of Toho’s Godzilla Series 2nd Edition*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc.
- Kawin, Bruce F. 2012. *Horror and the Horror Film. Horror and the Horror Film*. London: Anthem Press. <https://doi.org/10.7135/UPO9780857284556>.
- Kierkegaard, Soren, M.G. Piety, and Edward F. Mooney. 2009. *Repetition and Philosophical Crumbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Landis, John. 2011. *Monsters in the Movies*. DK Publishing.
- Lee, Charles. 2000. “U.S. Army Apologizes for Korean Toxic Dump,” July 24, 2000. <https://www.upi.com/Archives/2000/07/24/US-army-apologizes-for-Korean-toxic-dump/4678964411200/>.
- Matthews, Melvin E. 2007. *Hostile Aliens, Hollywood and Today’s News: 1950s Science Fiction Films and 9/11*. New York: Algora Publishing.
- Mayor, Adrienne. 2000. *The First Fossil Hunters: Dinosaurs, Mammoths, and Myth in Greek and Roman Times*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mcluhan, Marshall. 1962. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mittman, Asa Simon, and Marcus Hensel. 2018. *Primary Sources on Monsters: Demonstrare, Volume 2*. Edited by Asa Simon Mittman and Marcus Hensel. Vol. 2. Yorkshire: Arc Humanities Press. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781641899475>.
- Mittman, Asa Simon, and Thea Tomaini. 2017. *Sea Monsters: Things from the Sea, Volume 2. Sea Monsters: Things from the Sea, Volume 2*. California: Punctum Books. <https://doi.org/10.1353/book.84169>.
- Murgatroyd, Paul. 2007. *Mythical Monsters in Classical Literature*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Olney, Ian. 2017. *Zombie Cinema*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=ubGrDgAAQBAJ>.

- Schachter, Aaron, and Jason Strother. 2012. "Bridge Signs Used in South Korea Anti-Suicide Efforts." *The World*, September 12, 2012. <https://theworld.org/stories/2012-09-27/bridge-signs-used-south-korea-anti-suicide-efforts>.
- Schmitt, Carl. 1985. *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Edited by George Schwab. Cambridge: MIT Press. Vol. 31. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sedia, Giuseppe. 2000. "An Interview with Bong Joon-Ho." October 2000. <https://koreanfilm.org/bongjh.html>.
- Shildrick, Margrit. 2002. *Embodying the Monster: Encounters with the Vulnerable Self*. SAGE Publications.
- Syropoulos, Spyros. 2018. *A Bestiary of Monsters in Greek Mythology*. Oxford: Archaeopress Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv15d81c6>.
- Tudor, Andrew. 1989. *Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Movie*.
- . 2014. *Image and Influence: Studies in the Sociology of Film*. Vol. 38. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315855646>.
- Vint, Sherryl. 2017. "Abject Posthumanism: Neoliberalism, Biopolitics, and Zombies." In *Zombie Theory: A Reader*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Williams, David. 1996. *Deformed Discourse: The Function of the Monster in Mediaeval Thought and Literature*. Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt80hv3>.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Personal Information

Name and Surname: Rana Ekin

Education

Bachelor's Degree Education: Bahçeşehir University, Film and Television (2014-2019)

Master's Degree: Kadir Has University, Film and Television (2019-2022)