Home on the Estate:
(Un)Mapping British Homelands in *Attack the Block*

Sarah Heinz (Vienna) & Mark Schmitt (Dortmund)

Corresponding Addresses: sarah.heinz@univie.ac.at &
mark.schmitt@tu-dortmund.de

Abstract: the previous two decades have seen a surge of British movies set on council estates. The majority of these movies belong to the genres of drama, thriller, and horror, and they focus on the inhabitants of the council estates as violent, angry or pushed to their limits by addiction, mental illness, and dysfunctional family lives. Accordingly, the estates are shown to be unhomely, estranging, or even deathly, tying in with fears of a rising 'precariat'.

In this article, we examine Joe Cornish's genre parody *Attack the Block* (2011) as a filmic alternative to this problematisation of the council estate as a dangerous non-home, precariously existing outside the British mainstream. We analyse the film's strategies of mapping and unmapping versions of a British homeland via the home spaces of the council estate and argue that an interpretation of the film's engagement with Britain as a homeland is enhanced and complicated by its parodic play with ideals of home. This play is enabled through the use of horror and sci-fi genre tropes, specifically the alien invasion film and its established motif of humanity uniting in the defence of its home planet. We thus offer a threefold reading of the film: as an allegorical confrontation with traumatic aspects of recent British social history; as a horror text that stages moments of transgression; and, finally, as a parody that renegotiates the film's status as a media text, thus complicating the first two readings.

Keywords: home, alien invasion genre, council estates, British cinema, Joe Cornish

---

1.   Introduction

The previous two decades have seen a surge of British movies set on council estates. Examples include *This Is England* (2006), *Harry Brown* (2009), *Ill Manors* (2012), *Citadel* (2012) or *Tower Block* (2012). The majority of these movies belong to the genres of drama, thriller, and horror, and they focus on the inhabitants of the council estates as violent, angry, or pushed to their limits by addiction, mental illness, and dysfunctional family lives. In these depictions, the tower block literally looms large, dominating not only the cinematography of the films themselves, but also their posters and marketing campaigns. Accordingly, the estates are shown to be unhomely, estranging, menacing, or even deathly. This representation ties in with fears of a rising 'precariat' issuing forth from these unhomely spaces, illustrated through the figure of the 'chav' that featured in public debates around the mid-2000s (Jones 2011), making mass housing a key source of urban fear (Kallitsis 2020).

In this article, we will look at filmic alternatives to this problematisation of the council estate as a dangerous non-home precariously existing outside the British mainstream. The paper's key example is Joe Cornish's *Attack the Block* (2011), a comedy about a teen gang in South London and their reluctant neighbour Sam, who join up to defend their tower block against an alien invasion. Intended as a genre parody of science fiction and horror films in general, and of alien invasion films in particular, Cornish's film deliberately and playfully crosses the boundaries between 'typical' British social-realist cinema and the stylised aesthetics and conventions of popular genre films. Cornish is indebted to the model of Edgar Wright's successful trilogy of British genre parodies, *Shaun of the Dead* (2004), *Hot Fuzz* (2007), and *The World's End* (2013), and it features Wright's recurring star Nick Frost in a minor role. Via its parodic crossover strategies, the film comically inverts ideas about home, homeliness, and, ultimately, Britishness by presenting the tower block as a home in need of defence. However, we will also show that the movie evades a problematic reessentialisation of the home-as-homeland metaphor through its use of the alien invasion genre. In the film's ending, Cornish effectively rejects the emotional nationalism of alien invasion movies in the mould of *Independence Day* (1996) by denying recognition

of their heroic acts to his teenage protagonists. In effect, the film thus opens rather than closes the debate on the allegorisation of a national home/land in need of defence.

Earlier scholarship has primarily interpreted *Attack the Block* as a comedic representation of persisting social and racial tensions in the urban setting of the British council estate (Ilott 2015; Power 2018; Bishop 2019; Marin-Lamellet 2020). Indeed, the film premiered just three months before one of the largest civil unrests in recent British history, the August 2011 English Riots. While the iconography of Cornish's film echoed earlier incidents related to council estates such as the 1985 Broadwater Farm riot, the 2011 riots made it glaringly evident that what the film addressed in the mode of genre parody was very much rooted in existing social conflicts. It was thus tempting to read the film with an eye to the riots unfolding during the summer of its release (Korte 2018).

In the following, we build on these 'symptomatic' readings but focus specifically on the aspects of home and home-making that are at stake in the film's representation of the council estate and its relationship to notions of Britishness. We argue that an interpretation of the film's engagement with Britain as a homeland is enriched and complicated by its parodic play with ideals of home. This play is enabled through the use of horror and sci-fi genre tropes, specifically the alien invasion film and its established motif of humanity uniting in the defence of its home planet. We thus propose a threefold reading of the film: firstly, following Adam Lowenstein, as an allegory that performs "a shocking collision of film, spectator, and history" and "invite[s] us to recognize our connection to historical trauma across the axes of text, context, and spectatorship" (2005: 2) through the "agency of an allegorical moment, situated at the often painful juncture where past and present collide" (*ibid*.: 9). Such a collision of past and present can be found in the film's evocation of council-house-related incidents of violence throughout recent British history, but also in the choice to have the plot take place during Bonfire Night. Secondly, we will read the film as a horror text that stages moments of transgression and "pollution rituals" in line with Stephen Prince's proposal for a "social theory of the horror film" (2004). In a third step, we will focus on the film's subversive aspects to see how its use of genre

complicates the first two approaches in its use of allegorical mappings and 'unmappings' of home and homeland.

2. Housing, Not Home: Normalising Ideals of Home and Homeland

Home is a term with multiple dimensions and historically shifting meanings. However, what most of these meanings share is their tendency towards normalisation that becomes tangible in the conceptual contrast created between 'home' and 'housing'. A critical analysis of the forms that dwelling can take, i.e. an analysis of specific forms of being physically housed in a place combined with the sense of being (or not being) at home in that place, needs to consider that home is a complex mixture between materialities, imaginaries, affects, politics, and practices (Mallett 2004). Through their specific interconnection at any given time and place, ideas of home come into view, and it becomes possible to assess which ideals about community, citizenship, and belonging are transported via these ideas of home. Especially the 'homely' home has been imagined and represented as a "detached, owner-occupied dwelling, in a suburban location" (Blunt & Dowling 2006: 101). This version of the 'homely' home has remained a persistent and dominant ideal in Western cultures since WWII and is associated with middle-class nuclear families and their styles of life, their economic buying power, and a 'leafy' location beyond the inner city. Such houses are supposed to be "a respite from work and a signifier of an individual's status" as much as a setting for 'proper' social relations (*ibid.*: 105). House-as-home is therefore associated with homeliness and ownership, and its comfort and cosiness are seen as enabled by and based on the safety and security of personal property (Heinz 2022). As Mary Douglas has underlined, "home starts by bringing some space under control" (2012: 51), and one form that this control takes is ownership. The cosy, safe, and owner-occupied house-as-home is thus a dominant ideal in most Western societies, considered the best setting for a 'good' childhood, and, for many people, a lifelong (and increasingly unaffordable) aspiration.

It is striking how the depiction of council housing on film differs from this ideal of the bright, cosy, suburban house-as-home. Typically "lit from above, shot from below" (Bochenski 2011), the

tower blocks in council estate films are huge, menacing, dark, and impersonal, confronting the viewer as aggressively as the hoodie-wearing youths that nearly always feature in such films. The tower block itself turns into the key antagonist and something the 'good' or at least redeemable characters in the films have to escape from, survive, or overcome. In line with the mapping of 'good' homes, 'good' childhoods, and 'good' citizens, council housing is thus not a home, but rather mere shelter, i.e. housing, for the lawless, often faceless masses of uncontrollable teenagers on the margins of society. This is significant with respect to ideals of ownership and citizenship, because publicly funded council estates still make up the majority of rental housing in the UK (Bishop 2019: 196). The reputation of tower blocks as "lawless wastelands" (*ibid.*) is thus mapped onto their inhabitants, who are turned into bad or non-citizens who do not 'own' their homes and therefore feel no obligation to care for these spaces, for each other, or the national community at large. The theory that the term 'chav' is actually an acronym for 'council-housed and violent' underlines such a problematic mapping (Jones 2011: 2). As Cyprian Piskurek and Mark Schmitt summarise, "[d]iscussions of British housing [...] quickly and almost reflexively turn into discussions of social housing" (2021: ii), a discursive turn that links social housing to social problems and distances housing from 'homely' (and, thus, 'proper') homes.

Cornish's representation of the tower block and the community within it both invokes and undermines these social and filmic stereotypes, and the film's genre parody has a key role in this type of subversion. *Attack the Block* mixes tropes from science fiction, Western, monster movie, gang film, and hoodie horror, pitting a gang of mixed-race teenage hoodies living in a tower block called Wyndham Tower against aliens who follow the scent of a female and land on earth to procreate. This is a parody of white British middle-class fears of porous national borders and illegal immigrants, figured as 'aliens from outer space'. Accordingly, secondary literature has noted how "the character arc of the aliens parodies the history of Brixton's migrant communities and their (problematically termed) 'reverse colonization' of the area" (Ilott 2013: 11). In line with this parody of white, middle-class fears, the film introduces archetypal figures like the drug-dealing gang member,

the gangsta hardcase, the victimised white woman, or the ineffective father figure.

Considering the contrast between home and housing outlined above, this initial otherness of the teenage gang members is "connected directly to the space they occupy – the tower block" (Bishop 2019: 202), and the council estate is turned into outer space and inner city at the same time. This otherness of the looming tower block is set off further by the movie's beginning, which gives the viewer a short glimpse of the normalised 'homely' homes at the centre of 'good' citizenship. This is achieved by the contrastive settings in which the audience's key figure of identification is introduced. Sam, a young, white woman who works as a nurse, exits Oval Station in Lambeth and moves along the street while calling her mother, telling her about working overtime, helping kids who burnt themselves while playing with fireworks, and enquiring about her dad. In terms of her age, her occupation, her clothes, and her casual way of talking to her mother, Sam stands in for the average, white, middle-class person on their way home from work.

This normalised averageness is underlined by the row of white, stuccoed Georgian houses that Sam walks by. Windows are lit in warm light, the cars in front of the houses look nice, street lights are working, there is no graffiti or litter on the street, and the stairs with the iron handrails make this street feel safe, familiar, homely, and specifically British. While Sam is walking along this street, kids run by with sparklers, their families in tow. As soon as Sam leaves this neat street with its row of family homes, however, we enter the 'outer spaces' of the council estate, with a narrow, dark brick passage that features the sprayed-on names of the teenage hoodie gang that will mug Sam in the next scene. This makes clear that the dark passage already belongs to the hoodie gang, making Sam an outsider in 'their' space, and it is therefore logical that she is now "a lonely figure, walking in a different direction to everyone else" (Cornish 2010: 2). The camera perspective of the mugging scene itself then makes the audience share Sam's point of view, with the hoodie gang looming over her in the same way that the tower block will loom over the following events only moments later. This parallel visual construction stresses the similarities between the threat of the gang and the threat of the council estate. It not only shows that Sam (and the white, middle-class viewer she

stands in for) do not 'belong' to the tower block, but that they are even in need of defence against the threat that the tower block represents.

In the light of this initial set-up, which seems to accept normalised notions of home and the demonisation of the hoodie gang, it is logical that Wyndham Tower itself becomes an antagonist. Therefore, movement within the tower block is represented as entrapment and panicked flight (from the police, from the aliens, or from local drug boss Hi-Hatz) in the first half of the film. As Sarah Ilott notes, this sense of entrapment is stressed by "the foreground of shots of the characters often sporting bars that mimic incarceration in a prison" (2013: 12), a visual metaphor that is repeated by several shots of characters sitting behind the barred window of a police van.

At the film's beginning, the inhabitants of the tower block deal with this experience of entrapment by trying to 'own' the block, a move that mimics the rhetorics of homeownership as citizenship. Hi-Hatz repeatedly claims: "[t]his is my block, get me?" (Cornish 2010: 24, 79), and the teenage gang members stress right at the film's beginning (after killing the smaller first alien) that "[t]his is the block man. Nobody fucks with the block" (*ibid*.: 10). This attempt at ownership is proven wrong by the following alien invasion, police control, and the claustrophobic architecture of Wyndham Tower itself, where several of the gang members as well as Hi-Hatz later lose their lives during alien attacks. The film, therefore, seems to reject the protagonists' attempts at mapping their home onto a national homeland because their attempts at 'owning' their tower block fail, and they thus seem to be excluded from discourses of homeownership as the prerequisite for 'good' citizenship. However, the movie's use of genre parody and specifically its twisting of the tropes of the alien invasion film shed a different light on the mapping of 'homely' homes and national homelands, turning the teenage gang and Sam into defenders of their tower block, and their home planet with it.

3. Alien Invasions, Home, and Identity: Confrontation and Compensation

The first scenes of *Attack the Block* already mark it as a parody of alien invasion films. Echoing similar shots from films such as Philip Kaufman's *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1978), John Carpenter's *The Thing* (1982), and John McTiernan's *Predator* (1987), Cornish's film starts with an establishing shot of outer space, focusing on a flying object approaching Earth, which signals the arrival of an alien species on the planet. The camera then zooms in on the film's main location, the inner city and council estates of London – replacing New York City in Kaufman's film, the icy landscapes of Antarctica in Carpenter's film, and the South-American jungle in McTiernan's film, respectively. In all of these invasion films, the first scene and the establishing shots of planet earth and the sky highlight the fact that what is at stake in view of the intrusion of a hostile alien life form is the whole planet as humanity's homeplace, even though the narratives focus on particular locations and a limited set of (human) characters. According to Prince, such films focus on the "transgression of boundaries" and "the violation of a spatialized social system" (2004: 125), which makes them ideal territory for exploring the functions and limits of the mapping of home, homeland, and identity.

Building on Douglas's anthropological theories of dirt and pollution, Prince uses Carpenter's film *The Thing* as a model case for a social theory of horror film. Prince's choice is peculiar, since Carpenter's film employs all the typical tropes of the alien invasion film and infuses them with the subgenre's interest in infestation. The conclusions Carpenter draws, however, are bleak, even by the standards of the horror genre. Unlike more conventional invasion narratives, the encounter with a hostile extra-terrestrial life form is not resolved by humanity redefining itself as one species united by their defence of and existence on a shared home planet. A typical example of this positive resolution would be Roland Emmerich's *Independence Day* (1996), in which the eponymous American holiday is repurposed for the whole of humanity. As the president of the United States says in his rousing call for battle, the very word "mankind" should have "new meaning for all of us to-

day. We are reminded not of our petty differences but of our common interests" (Devlin & Emmerich 1996: 111). In Emmerich's blockbuster, it only takes an alien species laying waste to earth's major cities for humanity to overcome its "petty differences", an overcoming enabled by a global adhering to American ideals of independence.

In contrast, no such lofty ideals are promoted in *The Thing*. In fact, Carpenter's film not only denies its alien invader a clearly definable (and attackable) form (it is a shapeshifter infiltrating other organisms), but it also challenges clear definitions of what it means to be human or even alive. Its main protagonist might repeat the sentence "I know I'm human", but there are no guarantees that this self-awareness is even accurate (Prince 2004: 126). Consequently, the film plays with ideas and images of infiltration, pollution, infection, and cancerous mutation, making the alien 'thing' a symbolically loaded, multi-semantic entity. Thus, Prince concludes that

> [h]orror films may be regarded as a compulsive symbolic exchange in which members of a social order, of a class or a subgroup, nervously affirm the importance of their cultural inheritance (*ibid.*: 129).

Comparing *Independence Day* and *The Thing*, it becomes clear how wildly different this symbolic exchange and its internal contradictions can be handled within the subgenre of the alien invasion film. While Emmerich's film presents its audience with a straightforward resolution of the conflict, in which the alien aggressors even become a means to an end for redefining the human spirit under the banner of American and Western values, Carpenter's film leaves the audience with the prospect of the eradication of the human as both an onto-epistemological category and an actual species – and thus with the precariousness and even futility of symbolic boundary categories such as 'culture', 'community', 'nation', or 'home planet'. In Lowenstein's terminology, the two films' very different treatment of an alien threat to human life leads to either compensation (in the case of *Independence Day*, in which a national and indeed a species-wide traumatic threat is represented but resolved through clearly successful defensive measures) or

confrontation (in the case of *The Thing*, in which not only the limited cast of characters meet their certain death, but in which the human as a category is radically questioned, and no comforting answers are provided). With respect to ideas and ideals of home, the specific trauma of these alien invasion films therefore consists of an existential threat to humanity as being at home (and therefore safe) on earth as a clearly limited, controlled, and controllable home space. This existential threat can either be contained (because earth as home can be defended and thus delimited against everything that is not-home) or confronted (because earth itself becomes an undefinable, porous entity, in effect making humanity the problematic category discussed above). As Lowenstein argues, films can allegorically represent historical trauma by either, in Benjaminian terms, confrontationally "blasting open the continuum of history" or by "sealing the cracks" (2005: 180). The choice between these representational strategies therefore allows for an analysis of a film's politics of home as contained or open, controllable or porous.

Attack the Block, we argue, lends itself to ambivalent readings that warrant an interpretation as both a compensatory and a confrontational text. When viewed in the tradition of earlier alien invasion films, Cornish's film amalgamates elements from films as disparate as *Independence Day* and *The Thing*. Its setting during Bonfire Night suggests the significance of commemorating the Gunpowder Plot as a threat to the British nation state from an invasion within, and similar to the strike-back in *Independence Day* on the eponymous holiday, the alien invasion and human resistance are linked to the historical event commemorated on that day. If Cornish's film was ideologically as straightforward as Emmerich's, this could be read as the British people demonstrating their resilience, now fighting back an extra-terrestrial threat to the national (and by extension global) community and their home space, earth. Such a reading, however, is complicated by the film's choice to, firstly, ironically play with the preconceived assumptions of who the actual aggressors in the film are, and secondly, to have its protagonists debate the origin, intention, and meaning of the alien invaders.

With respect to the first choice, Cornish's film draws on the iconography and tropes of 'hoodie horror', a cycle of British genre

films that started in the 2000s and gained more traction in the aftermath of the 2011 English riots, drawing on Britain's fear of violent crimes by youth gangs whose choice of clothing became symbolic of their crimes. These films, as Johnny Walker has argued, "have prescient social resonances", since they deliberately play on collective fears and moral panics exacerbated by politicians and the tabloid press: "in most cases, hoodie horror films were deliberately inflammatory, and would often evince a moralistic binary [...] between feral hoodies and the well-to-do middle classes" (2016: 86). Thus, the demonisation at work in these films echoes the real-world demonisation of 'chavs' and the underclass (Jones 2011). Walker lauds *Attack the Block* as an exception to this rule since it consciously deconstructs the binary stereotypes of hoodie horror (2016: 86). Nevertheless, as outlined above, its young protagonists at first appear as the aggressors, specifically towards Sam, to then be replaced by the arriving aliens. These aliens are peculiar when it comes to questions of community and species-related boundary-making: the grown members of the species are clearly gendered, with the male specimens having pitch-black fur and glowing neon fangs, while the females are pale, smaller, and hairless. Their main sensory means of orientation seems to be smelling pheromones, and their physical appearance is tellingly described by one of the young gang members, Pest, as "big alien gorilla wolf motherfuckers" (Cornish 2010: 41). This clearly speaks to the difficulty of species categorisation. Similar to alien monsters such as 'the thing', the aliens appear as hybrids that transgress epistemological boundaries. Ironically, however, their mixture of different species echoes the council-house-dwelling, hooded protagonists' own status as both within and outside of the British community. Pest's own nickname is indicative of this liminality, mirroring his demonisation as a transgressive social figure in British society and his 'feral', even polluting, infectious being.

The aliens' ambivalent status is further highlighted in the young protagonists' theories about their origins. Moses, the hoodie gang's leader, suspects:

> Government probably bred those creatures to kill black boys.
> First they sent drugs to the ends. Then they sent guns. Now
> they sent monsters to get us. [...] We're not killin' each other

> fast enough so they decided to speed up the process (*ibid*.: 65).

This speculation echoes actual historical cases of medical experimentation on the African-American population in the USA, but also post-9/11 conspiracy theories on the New York terrorist attacks being government 'inside jobs'. Later in the film, Brewis, a student living on the estate, concludes that the aliens must behave like spores, drifting through space to land on habitable planets to hatch. Thus, the aliens are not only rendered in human and animal terms, but also in plant terms, thus further defying borders and categorisation. Semantically, this explanation evokes ideas of pollination, multiplication, but also infestation, breeding, and infection, notions that evoke racist and classist discourses used to describe the threat emanating from the council estates through their multiplying inhabitants, endangering the supposed 'indigenous' population of Britain (Tyler 2008). Notions of infection, similar to Carpenter's *The Thing*, are therefore omnipresent in *Attack the Block*. One of Moses's friends even worries that she might get chlamydia if she touches one of the aliens: "[i]t could be diseased!" (*Ibid*.: 13)[1] Thus, their symbolic ambiguity makes the aliens a prism through which the film looks at different notions of home and national identity, the boundaries of which, like bodies threatened by pathogens, are rendered porous and unstable. The fact that the aliens pose a threat to the entire nation and possibly the entire human species leads to a shifting of the boundaries of self and other, rendering intranational hierarchies and distinctions along the lines of class and race temporarily obsolete.

This instability of the home's borders and the ambivalent allocation of the roles of defenders and attackers is encapsulated in

---

[1] While the aspect of contagion is also dominant in earlier invasion films, such as *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* and *The Thing*, it has gained additional significance in post-9/11 invasion films. *Attack the Block* echoes the parasitic aliens in Matt Reeves's *Cloverfield* (2008), an allegory of the terrorist threat in which the parasites become echoes of suicide bombers (who walk among the population and infiltrate it) as well as the post-9/11 threat of bioterrorist attacks with anthrax (Wetmore 2012: 52; Schmitt 2012).

the film's ending, which can again be read as both confrontational and compensatory. Moses, who turns into the audience's second figure of identification mid-movie, uses his own apartment in the tower block to lure the aliens into a trap, exploding the apartment with a Bonfire Night rocket. In the meantime, the police have cordoned off the tower block, interpreting the residents' struggle for survival as a riot they need to contain. In the film's ultimate mapping of home, homeland, and national identity, Sam watches Moses's "small figure, dangling from the balcony beneath his own, clinging to a Union Jack" (*ibid.*: 91). In line with his biblical name, Moses turns into the liberator of his people, and the biblical story's focus on reaching the promised land implicitly re-evaluates negative notions of the council estate as mere shelter rather than a 'proper' home space. This re-evaluation is encapsulated by the flag, one of the key symbols of the nation and a prime means of what Michael Billig has described as "banal nationalism" (1995).

However, the movie does not end with this potentially compensatory scene that could unite 'mankind' behind Moses's heroic act, which has saved both the tower block and earth as humanity's homeplace. In a moment that effectively 'unmaps' home, homeland, and home planet, Moses is arrested by the police and bundled into a police van. Denying national or even global recognition of Moses and his friends' preservation of their tower block à la *Independence Day* also avoids the soothing, but ultimately problematic ascription of culturally specific ideas of home and homeland to the whole of 'humanity'. At the same time, this ending shows the potential of communities at the margins of a national homeland, emphasising that the tower block cannot simply be mapped onto Britain at large. The final scene of Cornish's film presents the viewer with Moses sitting inside the police van, while the crowd outside chants his name in a "proud, riotous chorus", as the screenplay states (Cornish 2010: 93). The tower block has turned into a home in need of defence, but it has not turned into a simple allegory of Britain as a homeland. What is more, the riotous character of the scene emphasises the persistence of the divisive forces of racism and classism. Thus, while the final images indicate that Moses will be vindicated, they also imply that closure is withheld and that the conflict over who can call Britain their home is far from over.

4. Conclusion

As we have shown, representations of the council estate and the tower block in contemporary British cinema tend to replicate negative imaginaries of public housing as lawless non-homes inhabited by criminal teenagers, ethnic minorities, and the 'underclass'. Cornish takes up such archetypes, initially turning both the hoodie gang and the tower block into antagonists of the viewer and of Sam, the film's first primary figure of identification. Through its parody of genres and specifically its use of the sci-fi subgenre of the alien invasion film, *Attack the Block* succeeds in both illustrating and questioning normalised ideals of home and facile mappings of home, homeland, and home planet. Taking up tropes from films as different as *Independence Day* and *The Thing*, Cornish thus effectively illustrates that housing, indeed any form of dwelling, can be home if home is disentangled from problematic generalisations about 'good', 'homely' homes and their place in the reproduction of an allegedly 'indigenous' national culture. Consequently, Moses's heroic deed is an expression of belonging, but this belonging does not enable the film or its viewers to turn Moses into a collective symbol of a Britishness that needs to defend its homeland. Offering both moments of compensation and confrontation, *Attack the Block* plays with the symbolic ambiguities of the alien invasion, leaving the viewer with a notion of home whose boundaries are porous and unstable. Who is or is not an alien and who has or is allowed to find a home is still written in the stars when the film's credits roll.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Attack the Block (UK 2011, D: Joe Cornish, Sc: Joe Cornish).
Independence Day (USA 1996, D: Roland Emmerich, Sc: Dean Devlin & Roland Emmerich).
The Thing (USA 1982, D: John Carpenter, Sc: Bill Lancaster).

Secondary Sources

Billig, Michael (1995), *Banal Nationalism*, London: Sage.

Bishop, Bart (2019), "We Never Knew You Lived in the Block: The White Mother and Black Male Sexual Violence in *Attack the Block*", in Cynthia Miller & A. Bowdoin Van Riper, eds., *Horror Comes Home: Essays on Hauntings, Possessions and Other Domestic Terrors in Cinema*, Jefferson: McFarland, 192-205.

Blunt, Alison & Robyn Dowling (2006), *Home*, London: Routledge.

Bochenski, Matt (2011), "*Attack the Block*" http://lwlies.com/reviews/attack-the-block/ (1 March 2023).

Cornish, Joe (2010), "*Attack the Block*: Final Shooting Script (Inc. Reshoots)", https://assets.scriptslug.com/live/pdf/scripts/attack-the-block-2011.pdf (1 March 2023).

Devlin, Dean & Roland Emmerich (1996), "*Independence Day*: Screenplay", https://thescriptsavant.com/movies/Independence_Day.pdf (1 March 2023).

Douglas, Mary (2012), "The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space", in Chiara Briganti & Kathy Mezei, eds., *The Domestic Space Reader*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 50-54.

Heinz, Sarah (2022), "Whose House Is This? Everyday Bordering and the Intersection of Home and Nation in British Property-Themed Television Shows", *Journal for the Study of British Cultures*, 29.1, 19-34.

Ilott, Sarah (2013), "'We Are the Martyrs, You're Just Squashed Tomatoes!' Laughing through the Fears in Postcolonial British Comedy: Chris Morris's *Four Lions* and Joe Cornish's *Attack the Block*", *Postcolonial Text*, 8.2, 1-17.

– (2015), "Multicultural British Comedy / The Comedy of Multicultural Britain", in S.I., ed., *New Postcolonial British Genres*, London: Palgrave, 134-169.

Jones, Owen (2011), *Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class*, London: Verso.

Kallitsis, Phevos (2020), "Representing Mass Housing as the Source of Urban Fear: Cinematic Spatial and Social Stereotypes", https://researchportal.port.ac.uk/en/publications/representing-mass-housing-as-the-source-of-urban-fear-cinematic-s (1 March 2023).

Korte, Barbara (2018), "In the Ghetto: Inequality, Riots and Re-
    sistance in London-Based Science Fiction of the Twenty-First
    Century", in Christoph Ehland & Pascal Fischer, eds., *Re-
    sistance and the City: Negotiating Urban Identities. Race, Class
    and Gender*, Leiden: Brill Rodopi, 130-147.

Lowenstein, Adam (2005), *Shocking Representation: Historical
    Trauma, National Cinema, and the Modern Horror Film*, New
    York: Columbia University Press.

Mallett, Shelley (2004), "Understanding Home: A Critical Review
    of the Literature", *The Sociological Review*, 52.1, 62-89.

Marin-Lamellet, Anne-Lise (2020), "Mad, Bad and Dangerous to
    Know? Hoodies in Contemporary British Horror Cinema", *An-
    gles*, 10.10, 1-26.

Piskurek, Cyprian & Mark Schmitt (2021), "Editorial", *Hard
    Times*, No. 105, i-iii.

Power, Aidan (2018), "Multiculturalism and the Changing Face of
    Europe", in A.P., ed., *Contemporary European Science Fiction
    Cinemas*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 191-217.

Prince, Stephen (2004), "Dread, Taboo and *The Thing*: Toward a
    Social Theory of the Horror Film", in S.P., ed., *The Horror
    Film*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 118-130.

Schmitt, Mark (2012), "The Blowback of Reality: Jean Baudrillards
    und Slavoj Žižeks philosophische Reaktionen auf 9/11 und
    Matt Reeves' Monsterfilm *Cloverfield*", in Solvejg Nitzke &
    M.S., eds., *Katastrophen: Konfrontationen mit dem Realen*,
    Bochum: Bachmann, 149-166.

Tyler, Imogen (2008), "Chav Mum, Chav Scum: Class Disgust in
    Contemporary Britain", *Feminist Media Studies*, 8.1, 17-34.

Walker, Johnny (2016), *Contemporary British Horror Cinema: In-
    dustry, Genre and Society*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University
    Press.

Wetmore, Kevin (2012), *Post-9/11 Horror in American Cinema*,
    New York: Continuum.