"Not Real Can Tell Us about Real": Hegemonic Control and Resistance in Margaret Atwood's MaddAddam Trilogy

Henri Ala-Lahti
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literary Studies
English Philology
MA Thesis
May 2015

Tarkastelen pro gradu -tutkielmassani Margaret Atwoodin MaddAddam-trilogiaa uusmarxilaisen kirjallisuudentutkimuksen näkökulmasta. MaddAddam-trilogia koostuu kolmesta tulevaisuuteen sijoittuvasta dystooppisesta romaanista: Oryx ja Crake (*Oryx and Crake*, 2003), Herran tarhurit (*The Year of the Flood*, 2009) ja Uusi maa (*MaddAddam*, 2013). Romaaneissa esiintyvät päähenkilöt muistelevat entistä elämäänsä äärikapitalistisessa, uusliberaalissa yhteiskunnassa koettuaan yhteiskunnan romahtamisen lähes koko ihmiskunnan tuhonneen viruksen seurauksena.

Analysoin tutkielmassani, kuinka suuryritykset, jotka hallitsevat yhteiskuntaa, ylläpitävät valtaansa ja kuinka tätä valtaa pyritään vastustamaan. Analyysini pohjautuu Louis Althusserin ideologian teoriaan ja Antonio Gramscin hegemonian käsitteeseen, joiden mukaan yhteiskunnan hallitseva luokka ei pidä asemaansa yllä ainoastaan väkivallalla ja sen uhalla, vaan se tarvitsee lisäksi kansalaisten hyväksyntää, jota tuotetaan yhteiskunnan muiden instituutioiden, kuten koulutuksen, uskonnon ja tieteen diskurssien avulla. Gramsci ja myöhemmät teoreetikot, kuten Raymond Williams, ottavat lisäksi huomioon kansalaisten mahdollisuuden vastustaa hallitsevan luokan hegemoniaa. Tämä vastustus näkyy trilogiassa erityisesti uskonnollisen Herran tarhurit (God's Gardeners) -lahkon toiminnassa.

Tutkin analyysini yhteydessä lisäksi, kuinka Atwoodin trilogia sijoittuu dystopiakertomusten perinteeseen ja kuinka se pyrkii varoittamaan lukijaa siitä, millainen tulevaisuus on mahdollisesti odotettavissa, jos nyky-yhteiskunnissa ja erityisesti länsimaissa tapahtuva uusliberalistinen kehitys jatkuu ilman vastustusta.

Tarkasteluni osoittaa muun muassa, että vaikka trilogian suuryritykset turvautuvatkin väkivaltaan kansalaisia hallitessaan, ne pyrkivät ennen kaikkea saamaan edes näiden passiivisen hyväksynnän toiminnalleen helpottaakseen vallankäyttöään. Kansalaiset eivät kuitenkaan ole aivopestyjä väärän tietoisuuden alaisia kuluttajia, vaan kirjan henkilöiden toiminta, sisäinen monologi sekä dialogit osoittavat, että he ovat tietoisia yhteiskunnan ongelmista – joskin toiset enemmän kuin toiset. Herran tarhurit -lahko toimii vastarintaliikkeenä ja käyttää lähes samoja instituutioita kuin suuryrityksetkin tuottaessaan vastahegemoniaa. Korvaamalla uusliberaalin ideologian omallaan lahko pyrkii opettamaan jäsenilleen, kuinka parempi yhteiskunta rakennetaan.

MaddAddam-trilogia poikkeaa klassisista dystopiakertomuksista, joissa päähenkilöt kamppailevat autoritaarista hallintoa vastaan, usein tuloksetta. Atwoodin trilogiassa ihmiset elävät näennäisesti vapaassa yhteiskunnassa, joka kuitenkin rajoittaa kaikkien, erityisesti huono-osaisten, vapauksia. Trilogia edustaa kriittistä dystopiaa, joka jättää lukijan päätettäväksi sen, saavutetaanko tulevaisuudessa utopia vai ajaudutaanko lopulta takaisin dystopiaan.

Avainsanat: hegemonia, ideologia, valta, uusliberalismi, dystopia, Atwood, MaddAddam-trilogia

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In 1989, Francis Fukuyama wrote in his famous essay "The End of History?" that with the proliferation of Western capitalist liberal democracy, history has "ended" and the world has reached a point where discussion about ideologies has become redundant, because what he sees as "the final form of human government" has been achieved and there are no serious alternatives to liberal democracy. Fukuyama views free market economy as closely connected with and supporting the liberal democratic system. Writing 25 years after the publication of his essay, Fukuyama (2014) continues to claim that "[t]he emergence of a market-based global economic order and the spread of democracy are clearly linked." While Fukuyama's predictions of the proliferation of the free market system have largely become true, there is significant opposition to the idea that we live at the end of history, and that the free market system is the only means of achieving a democratic or equal society. Indeed, some critics even regard the free market system as having the potential of undermining democratic principles. One area where this opposition manifests itself is contemporary dystopian literature.

Dystopian literature refers to literary works that are set in societies that are undesirable for the majority of people to live in, often because citizens are oppressed in some manner or cannot act or think freely.[1] Sargent (9) defines dystopian fiction as featuring "a non-existent society described in considerable detail and normally located in time and place that the author intended a contemporaneous reader to view as considerably worse than the society in which the reader lived." Dystopian works have, as Baccolini and Moylan (2) point out, served as warnings and cautionary tales "of terrible socio-political tendencies that could, if continued, turn our contemporary world into . . . iron cages." Many well-known and popular dystopian novels, such as Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932), George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), and Ray Bradbury's

---

[1] The term *dystopia* literally refers to 'a bad place.'

Fahrenheit 451 (1953), were, and still are, read as warnings of the potential bleak futures that we may end up in if we do not change our behaviour.

However, with the approach of the new millennium, a shift occurred in dystopian literature. In "the hard times" of the 1980s and 1990s, Moylan (2000, 181–182) maintains, "new, critical dystopias" in the genre of science fiction began to emerge. These critical dystopias, Baccolini and Moylan (7) posit, do not simply describe an undesirable society in which the protagonists have no hope of overcoming the hegemonic power but they combine the pessimistic view of the society with the idea that there is potential for change. As Moylan puts it,

> [Critical dystopias] go on to explore ways to change the present system so that such culturally and economically marginalized peoples not only survive but also try to move toward creating a social reality that is shaped by an impulse to human self-determination and ecological health rather than one constricted by the narrow and destructive logic of a system intent only on enhancing competition in order to gain more profit for a select few. (2000, 189)

Moylan (2000, 185–186) also makes the claim that critical dystopias are closely linked to the emergence of the capitalist, neoliberal, social order. However, the critical dystopia is not, according to Moylan (2000, 186), a completely new genre but rather a "retrieval and refunctioning of the most progressive possibilities inherent in dystopian narrative."

Interest in dystopian fiction has soared in the new millennium, and young adult fiction featuring dystopias, in particular, is at the height of its popularity. This is evinced by the prevalence of novels such as Suzanne Collins's *Hunger Games* trilogy (2008–2010), James Dashner's *Maze Runner* trilogy (2009–2011) and Veronica Roth's *Divergent* trilogy (2011–2013) as well as the movie adaptations of these trilogies (the tendency towards trilogies perhaps reveals something about contemporary reading habits – or marketing tactics). While many of the dystopias featured in young adult literature cannot be termed critical dystopias, there is nonetheless the question of what makes dystopian fiction so popular in the Western world at a time of relative peace and after many of the authoritarian ideologies have been toppled. This thesis may provide a partial answer to this question.

In this thesis, I will examine three satirical novels by Margaret Atwood, which can be read as critical dystopias: *Oryx and Crake* (2003), *The Year of the Flood* (2009) and *MaddAddam* (2013). These three post-apocalyptic novels share their setting and are collectively known as the MaddAddam trilogy. I shall study how corporations that control the society described in the novels maintain their power through ideological and hegemonic means and how this power is subverted and resisted by some of the protagonists. To do so, I will employ the (neo) Marxist concepts of ideology and hegemony, which I shall expound on in the following section. Through my analysis of how the social order is maintained and how it is subverted, in sections 3 and 4, I endeavour to demonstrate that the trilogy, as a critical dystopia, constitutes a relevant social critique of neoliberalist tendecies in contemporary Western capitalist societies – showing that "*not real*" can indeed "*tell us about real*" (*Oryx and Crake*, 102, italics in original).

The MaddAddam trilogy is set in the former United States at an unspecified period of time in the future after most of the humanity has been eradicated by a man-made super virus. The society preceding the catastrophe is extensively described through flashbacks and is depicted as being managed by rivalling corporations. All public services have been privatised or abolished, and the state has virtually ceased to exist. Focus on profit maximisation has led to gene manipulation, unethical marketing and severe environmental problems, such as aberrant weather conditions and the extinction of numerous wild animals. The well-to-do people, comprising mostly scientists working for the corporations, live in Compounds owned by their employers while the rest of the people are confined to cities, commonly known as pleeblands, where criminals and street-gangs hold sway. Many of the *novum*[2] – the inventions and concepts unfamiliar to the reader – in the trilogy have their basis on actual, contemporary developments. Even though gene splices of animals and particularly the humanoid Crakers may appear fantastical, current scientific development is not as far from achieving such outcomes as might initially be imagined. Atwood (2011) herself has claimed that many of her novels, including the first two novels in the MaddAddam trilogy, are

---

[2] To use Darko Suvin's term (63).

speculative fiction rather than science fiction, as they do not contain things that "could not possibly happen." I would argue that this lends credibility to the novels as they criticise our contemporary society, because any society depicted in a critical dystopia has to be recognisable enough to effectively function as critique.

The story in *Oryx and Crake* focuses on Snowman who tries to survive after the 'end of humanity' and reminisces his life as Jimmy, born in a Compound to scientist parents working for one of the largest medical corporations. Jimmy is a friend to Crake, the person responsible for the creation of the super virus *JUVE* and a new species of humanoid creatures called Crakers designed to replace human beings. Before the society collapses, Crake appoints Jimmy to look after the Crakers. After the disaster has taken place, Jimmy/Snowman is under the impression that he is the only human survivor in the world. As he attempts to come to terms with the fact that the only beings to keep him company are considerably different from him, he mostly stays away from the Crakers, but every once in a while supplies them with a creation myth of how they came to be. At the end of the novel, Snowman finds out about other human survivors and the novel ends right before he goes to meet them.

In *The Year of the Flood*, the story focuses on the members of a group called the God's Gardeners, an environmental organisation which follows a doctrine that combines environmentalism, survivalism, evolutionary science and teachings of the Bible, and which rejects the dominant free-market ideology and consumerism espoused by the corporations. For the majority of the novel the two protagonists, Toby and Ren, having survived the virus in separate isolated locations, write in their journals and reveal a great deal about their time as Gardeners and the surrounding society. Towards the end of the novel, Ren is reunited with other former Gardeners, and during their escape from Painballers – psychotic murderers incapable of empathy – she comes across Toby. Ren and Toby then happen upon a small community comprising former Gardeners and MaddAddamites (renegade Gardeners). The end of the novel ties into the end of *Oryx and Crake*, as Toby and Ren go rescue one of the former Gardeners, Amanda, from the Painballers. Amanda and

the Painballers are, in fact, the same group that Jimmy is about to go meet. Thus, Jimmy also eventually joins the community, surprisingly many of whom are already familiar with him from before the collapse of society.

MaddAddam, for the most part, describes the life in the community as its members attempt to continue their lives, adapt to life with the Crakers and protect themselves from external threats, such as the Painballers who previously managed to escape. The life in the community is described from Toby's point of view, but the flashbacks are from the perspective of Zeb, Toby's love interest, as he tells her about his life before and after establishing the God's Gardeners with his stepbrother Adam. The flashbacks, as in *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood*, extensively describe the society before its collapse.

There is a considerable body of research on Margaret Atwood's production. Her previous dystopian novel *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985) as well as her historical fiction novel *Alias Grace* (1996), in particular, have received a great deal of attention in the academia.[3] The novels in the MaddAddam trilogy, especially *Oryx and Crake*, have also been studied rather extensively. The novels have been studied, perhaps unsurprisingly, from the perspectives of ecocriticism, biotechnology, animal welfare, and feminism.[4] Due to its relatively recent publication year, *MaddAddam* has yet to receive academic attention to the extent the previous two novels have, but it is likely to be studied along with the first two novels in the future. In my analysis, I shall focus on all three novels of the MaddAddam trilogy, because concentrating on only one or two of them would subtract from the full understanding of how the social order envisioned by Atwood is upheld and contested.

It appears that there is little previous research focusing on neoliberal hegemony and opposition to it in the trilogy. Vials (238), in his recent article, also notes the lack of research on the "challenge to neoliberalism" presented in the novels and proceeds to consider this challenge. While

---

[3] See, for example, Stein (1991), Neuman (2006), Toron (2011), and O'Neill (2013).
[4] See, for instance, Bergthaller (2010), Bouson (2011), Hengen (2011), and Sanderson (2013).

my premise is similar to Vials's, my theoretical framework differs from his. Thus far, there appears to be no research on the maintenance and subversion of social order in the MaddAddam trilogy, especially from the Marxist perspectives of hegemony and ideology. Furthermore, while Althusser's notion of ideology has been examined in literary studies, Gramscian concept of hegemony, in comparison, has received less attention in the field of literary criticism in recent years.

With this thesis, I endeavour to contribute to existing research on dystopian literature and studies on Margaret Atwood's production as well as to participate in revitalising (neo) Marxist literary criticism, which has, in my view, suffered undue decline in recent decades (see also Eagleton, 2008, 195).

In the following chapter I will present the theoretical framework I will use in the analysis of the novels. I will then proceed to my analysis of the trilogy focusing, in the third chapter, on how the ruling group maintains its power, and, in the fourth chapter, how the social order is being subverted. Finally, in the fifth chapter, I shall summarise my findings, consider the limitations of the thesis, and suggest further research opportunities.

2. Theoretical framework

In this chapter, I will introduce the theoretical framework I shall use in my analysis of Atwood's trilogy. First, I will briefly discuss capitalism, neoliberalism and globalisation in the context of the trilogy and provide definitions of these concepts for the purposes of this thesis. Second, the neo-Marxist concept of ideology will be considered as well as the related concept of hegemony. I will refer to Terry Eagleton's comprehensive work, *Ideology* (1991), throughout my examination of the concepts. Eagleton discusses ideology at length from the perspectives of different critics throughout history, but for the scope of this thesis it is Louis Althusser's thoughts on the subject that will mainly be discussed as well as Antonio Gramsci's notions of hegemony. Althusser's concept of ideology has been very significant in cultural studies (Storey, 56), while the concept of hegemony, with its consideration of the problems of ideology, has perhaps received less attention in the field of literary criticism.

Although Marxist literary critics have often studied works that appear to reinforce rather than criticise capitalist values, as Tyson points out (67), I maintain that analysing works that appear to undermine these values is also worthwhile because such works make the suggested shortcomings of the capitalist system more readily apparent to the reader and thus offers the possibility of undermining the dominant system. Furthermore, it can be argued that studying what Tyson (ibid.) calls "non-realistic, experimental fiction" – of which the MaddAddam trilogy can be seen as an example – from a Marxist perspective is feasible because "the estrangement the reader often experiences constitute[s] a critique of the fragmented world and the alienated human beings produced by capitalism in today's world" (ibid.). It can be argued that critical dystopian fiction, in particular, lends itself to such readings, because it emerged, as Moylan (2000, 184–186) argues, out of the economic and social conditions following the neoliberal projects of the 1980s. Additionally, Baccolini and Moylan (5) note the prevalence of hegemony, or "[t]he material force of the economy and the state apparatus," in dystopian fiction as well as the importance of discourse "for the reigning dystopian power structure." I expect that the close connection between dystopian fiction

and the study of hegemonic and ideological dominance proves fruitful in analysing the MaddAddam trilogy.

It is to be noted that because the concepts of ideology and hegemony belong to the Marxist tradition, there are related concepts such as that of class, which are not relevant for my analysis per se. However, I hope to demonstrate that ideology and hegemony are as viable as before in the analysis of contemporary literature. Moreover, it may be argued that a certain kind of class struggle does exist in Atwood's trilogy between the pleeblanders and the well-to-do citizens of the Compounds, although the situation cannot be directly compared to the classic notion of class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, as the trilogy does not provide commentary on whether the pleeblanders are responsible for manufacturing material goods or whether goods are manufactured by automated processes or abroad by a global underclass. Gross inequality between the pleeblanders and the Compound dwellers is nonetheless significant.

2.1 Capitalism, neoliberalism and globalisation

In this section, I will provide definitions of capitalism, neoliberalism and globalisation, and offer my arguments for the claim that the pre-apocalyptic society in the MaddAddam trilogy represents global capitalism taken to its extreme conclusion. As my focus in this thesis is the social order in the novels, considering the economic and social system described in them is unavoidable. It is important to note that it is not my intention to argue that the ideological and hegemonic formations are only possible within a capitalist or neoliberal system, such as the one described in the trilogy. As will become apparent in my discussion of ideology and hegemony, capitalism is by no means the only system to employ ideology and hegemony even if there may be some grounds for arguing that ideology and hegemony are particularly prevalent in neoliberal capitalism, as my discussion and analysis will show.

As capitalism is the dominant economic system in most of the world, especially in Western countries, the basic principles of capitalism such as profit-making, the market, private ownership, wage labour and the freedom of business venturing are presumably familiar to nearly all people

aware of or living in capitalist societies. For this reason, and because of the scope of this thesis, it is not my intention to provide a lengthy account of capitalism nor its different forms or consequences in contemporary Western societies, but rather to point out that the society depicted in the MaddAddam trilogy espouses a form of capitalism, and an extreme one at that.

According to Fulcher, capitalism is "essentially the investment of money in expectation of making profit" (2). He notes the freedom of business ventures by remarking that it is the capacity of an activity to produce profit that is important, not the "nature of the activity itself" (14). Thus, making profit is the defining feature of capitalism and other considerations are secondary to this. Fulcher also points out two other important features of capitalism: wage labour as a mode of production, which leads to a split between the labourers and the owners of capital (15), and markets, which are the "only means by which to obtain anything" after production and consumption are separated from each other (16). The separation of production and consumption means that, generally speaking, people no longer produce the goods they consume; a person's work usually involves the production of one or a few goods, while the goods he or she requires must be acquired through the markets with the wage earned from the work.

Closely related to the separation of production and consumption is the capitalist requirement of *a culture* that will ensure its continuity. According to Ingham, "consumers' wants are stimulated without limit, lest falling demand triggers a recession and a downward spiral of factory closures, unemployment and ultimately social and political unrest" (61). Sklair terms this the "culture-ideology of consumerism" (108). The aim of this culture-ideology is

> to persuade people to consume not simply to satisfy their biological and other modest needs but in response to artificially created desires in order to perpetuate the accumulation of capital for private profit, in other words, to ensure that the capitalist global system goes on forever. [Consumerism] proclaims, literally, that the meaning of life is to be found in the things that we possess. (62)

I will return to consumerism in chapter 3.1. in which I will analyse consumption as a means of maintaining the capitalist social order.

The features of capitalism mentioned above are prevalent in the MaddAddam trilogy, to the extent that they have overridden morality, law and other institutions that previously prevented gross ethical violations done in the pursuit of profits. In a sense, capitalism and corporations have ousted the state and taken its place in the trilogy, and, as Appleton argues, "the government is controlled by corporations" (64). She claims that since such a government has not historically existed thus far, there is no term for it, but she suggests "Corpocracy" could be used (ibid.). It is not strictly true that there is no term for a government controlled by corporations, as the term 'corporatocracy' has been used, but because there appears to be no generally accepted term in academic literature, I shall use the term suggested by Appleton (with a lower case letter) to refer to the type of government represented in the trilogy. It is worth keeping in mind that the corporations governing the society in the trilogy are not a uniform mass that rule people in mutual understanding. Instead, true to capitalist principles, the corporations are constantly competing with each other, which at its worst involves corporate espionage, sabotage, kidnapping and murder.

The pursuit of profits in the corpocracy of the novels has led to a large-scale commodification of things such as sex, health services, police services, scientific research and education. Prostitution is essentially institutionalised with several businesses providing various related services, the Internet appears to supply pornography of any kind (including child pornography) with no laws or limitations to its content, and human trafficking is condoned. Furthermore, public health care appears to be non-existent while pharmaceutical drugs containing viruses are sold to the public to ensure their continued use, scientific research is conducted only to advance the profit-making of corporations, and security in the Compounds is managed by the aptly-named CorpSeCorps (Corporation Security Corps) who also double as the police force for the society as a whole. Even the sanctions resulting from judicial proceedings have been turned into a business where convicts are forced to fight each other to death in a game called Painball (a deadly variation of paintball) on television. Moreover, a clear division and hierarchy exists between people who live in the pleeblands and who are responsible for menial tasks, virtually as wage labour, and between those

who live in the Compounds and have highly-paid jobs in science. The division can be readily observed, for instance, in the sobriquet "pleeblands," where "pleeb" undoubtedly refers to *plebeians*, the common people. The Compounds are notably similar to gated communities of today's world, where the well-to-do people live for prestige or for fear of crime.

In effect, capitalism in the MaddAddam trilogy appears to have reached its extreme form – a completely unfettered economy operated by the corporations rather than individuals. Unbridled free market capitalism is arguably one of the defining features of neoliberalism – a term that requires some clarification. Plehwe et. al. (2) point out the difficulty of comprehensively defining neoliberalism, because of the many ideas it encompasses. However, certain common characteristics can be found. Steger and Roy (11) suggest that neoliberalism can be understood in three different ways: as "an ideology," "a mode of governance," and "a policy package." They (11–12) further note that, as an ideology, neoliberalism attempts to provide a positive image of the global market, while as a mode of governance it is based on values such as "competitiveness, self-interest, and decentralization." In essence, neoliberal mode of governance invokes entrepreneurial thinking in the management of public affairs. As a policy package, Steger and Roy (14) maintain, neoliberalism refers to the concrete policy decisions based on "deregulation (of the economy)," "liberalization (of trade and industry)," and "privatization (of state-owned enterprises)." Harvey (19), in turn, argues that "neoliberalization" can be seen in two ways: either as "a utopian project" that seeks to reorganise international capitalism or as "a political project" that aims at reviving the dominance "of economic elites." He (ibid.) further notes that it has been particularly effective at reinforcing and creating economic elites, but less so at reorganising capitalism. Furthermore, Steger and Roy (53) as well as Duménil and Lévy (10) point out the significance of globalisation for the neoliberal project.

Neoliberalism is presented by its proponents as the ultimate means to provide people 'freedom,' while any government intervention is viewed as detrimental to this freedom (Munck, 65). Vials (240) and Moylan (2000, 186) connect speculative fiction and (critical) dystopian fiction,

respectively, to the emergence of neoliberal projects and tendencies, and Vials (240) points to the paradoxical promise of freedom in market liberalism, which is, in reality, limiting to the freedom of individuals. Vials explains the relation between neoliberalism and speculative dystopias:

> Neoliberalism tries to convince us that our chaotic lives will be solved by yet more neoliberalism – that we will be liberated by the unbound purity of the idea made flesh. Speculative fiction, by contrast, de-familiarises our unsatisfying realities by re-inscribing them into the neoliberal imaginary in a way that converts this imaginary from utopia into dystopia. It makes the reader aware of all the market dynamics that *remain to be realised*, from a privatised police force to a world fully bereft of the humanities . . . (Ibid., my emphasis)

Neoliberalism is thus closely connected to the emergence of new critical dystopias. As a consequence, analysing the hegemonic control of the Corporations in the MaddAddam trilogy is related to questions of how the trilogy constructs a neoliberal dystopia and which current developments in Western societies are being criticised by it.

I shall now consider globalisation and argue that the world represented in the trilogy has reached a point where states have largely ceased to exist and that the extreme form of capitalism described above is not limited to the society in which the protagonists live but has spread globally. There has been a great deal of academic discussion about globalisation and, as Sklair notes, many conceptions relating to it remain contested and even the term globalisation lacks a generally accepted definition (35). It is well beyond the scope of this thesis to consider, for instance, the debate about the effects of globalisation in the world today. Therefore, I will limit the discussion to the main aspects of globalisation pertinent to my analysis.

Held and McGrew define globalisation as "the expanding scale, growing magnitude, speeding up and deepening impact of transcontinental flows and patterns of social interaction" (1). They argue, however, that this does not imply that the cultures would converge into a larger uniform whole and that no conflicts would follow from the increased interaction (ibid.). Further, they note the divisive nature of globalisation, as only the select few benefit from it (ibid.). While Held and McGrew understandably consider globalisation in its actual (capitalist) form in the contemporary world, it is important to bear in mind that globalisation does not necessarily entail a capitalist

system, as Sklair points out (5). Globalisation could have existed, say, in a socialist world order, if socialism had spread in the world in the same way capitalism has. Nevertheless, Sklair sees capitalism as the driving force behind globalisation in the contemporary world (47). Held and McGrew also acknowledge the significance of capitalism in globalisation (53).

Sklair as well as Held and McGrew mention the relevance of multinational (transnational) corporations in global capitalism. Held and McGrew assert that "central to the organization of [the] new global capitalist order is the multinational corporation" (53), while Sklair argues that "major transnational corporations are the most important and most powerful globalizing institutions in the world today and by virtue of this fact they make the capitalist global system the dominant global system" (7). This prevalence of multinational corporations is, as already discussed above, readily seen in the MaddAddam trilogy to the extent that they control the society.

According to Sklair, the globalised world can be classified into the First, Second and Third world based on different measures, for example, income and quality of life (13-22). There is some evidence of the divide between the First and the Third world in the MaddAddam trilogy, most notably in the story of Oryx's journey from her home somewhere in South-East Asia to North America. Sklair notes, however, that following the state-centrism of these classifications they can be misleading, because the First, Second and Third world all have both rich and poor classes (26). Sklair calls "the widening gaps" between the most underprivileged and the most affluent "the class polarization crisis" and refers to the increased wealth of the rich (both absolutely and relative to the poor) and the decreased income of the poor (relative to the rich) (48). While Held and McGrew acknowledge the existence of global inequality, they argue that there is "considerable disagreement" on what the cause of this inequality is (77). For instance, neo-liberals see globalisation as alleviating poverty, because the number of people living in absolute poverty has decreased (Held and McGrew, 79-80), while those who challenge this view, like Sklair, point to the fact that the gap between the rich and the poor states as well as the rich and the poor population within states has grown as a result of globalisation (Held and McGrew, 81-82). In Sklair's view, the

cause of the class polarisation crisis is "the lack of economic resources" and he argues, notably, that "[i]t is their *relationship to the means of production,* to capital in its various forms, that locks most of the poor into poverty" (Sklair, 52-53, my emphasis). Sklair's argument includes basic ideas of the Marxist class theory, into which I will not delve in any great detail here. However, these notions will be of some relevance in my subsequent discussion of ideology and hegemony.

2.2 Ideology and hegemony

Ideology is perhaps popularly understood as a set of beliefs, principles and values that a single entity, such as an individual, has. It may also be used in a pejorative sense, to imply that a person is under an illusion and not fully using their own rational capacity. Eagleton also notes the latter usage of the term: "To claim in ordinary conversation that someone is speaking ideologically is surely to hold that they are judging a particular issue though some rigid framework of preconceived ideas which distorts their understanding" (1991, 3). However, the popular understanding of the term alone has little to offer in terms of analytical potential, even if the latter sense contains some aspects that are found in a more theoretical discussion of ideology. For the purposes of this thesis, it is necessary to expand on the popular understanding of the term.

Eagleton points out that "the term 'ideology' has a whole range of useful meanings, not all of which are compatible with each other" (1991, 1). It is therefore necessary to establish what is meant by ideology in the context of this thesis. I will first consider the theory of ideology in general before proceeding to examine Althusser's conception of it.

Eagleton offers two differing senses of ideology, a narrow and a broad one. In the narrow sense, ideology is seen as "*legitimating* the power of a dominant social group or class" (1991, 5, emphasis in original). According to Eagleton, this dominant group or class uses different strategies in legitimating its power:

> [It] may legitimate itself by *promoting* beliefs and values congenial to it; *naturalizing* and *universalizing* such beliefs so as to render them self-evident and apparently inevitable; *denigrating* ideas which might challenge it; *excluding* rival forms of thought, perhaps by some unspoken but systematic logic; and *obscuring* social reality in ways convenient to itself. (1991, 5-6, emphases in original)

Ideology is thus exclusively a feature of the group or class that prevails over the others in society. According to this view, the dominant power has considerable agency; it seems as though it is able to eliminate any and all potential opposition without the subjects even being aware of it (I will address such epistemological concerns relating to ideology below). The different methods of legitimation mentioned above will be of interest to my analysis of the way the corpocracy in the MaddAddam trilogy buttresses its dominance. In Eagleton's (1991, 6) view, the narrow definition of ideology is problematic because it raises the following questions: how can only the dominant power's set of beliefs be ideological, and what is the status of sets of beliefs not belonging to the dominant power, if they are not seen as ideologies? Because of these problems, a wider definition of ideology is presented.

Ideology, in a wider sense, refers to "any kind of intersection between belief systems and political power" (ibid.). This definition, Eagleton (ibid.) argues, accepts both dominant and subaltern belief systems as ideology. However, there is an obvious problem with this definition; if ideology is to include any and all cases where belief systems intersect, what falls outside ideology? Should all questions of power be considered ideological? Eagleton, too, is aware of this problem with the wider definition and notes that "if there are no values and beliefs *not* bound up with power, then the term ideology threatens to expand to vanishing point" (1991, 7, emphasis in original). He also argues that surely not all power struggles are of equal importance and points out, for example, that "[i]f someone actually believes that a squabble between two children over a ball is as important as the El Salvador liberation movement, then you simply have to ask them whether they are joking" (1991, 8).

A solution that has been provided to this problem is to understand ideology more "as a matter of 'discourse' rather than 'language'" (Eagleton 1991, 9). This means that utterances alone are not ideological but it is the context that needs to be examined in order to determine whether a statement is ideological or not. From this follows that practically any utterance can be ideological, but at the same time any utterance can be non-ideological, depending entirely on the context (ibid.) (Ideology

and discourse will be discussed in more detail below). Both narrow and wider definitions of ideology will be used in my analysis when Althusser's notions of ideology and Gramsci's ideas relating to hegemony are employed.

Eagleton points out another important issue that has led in differing perceptions of the term ideology; namely the question of "false consciousness" (1991, 10). This refers to the notion that ideology can either be seen as illusory, misleading the subjects into not seeing the conditions in which they live, or the subjects can be thought of as being aware of their conditions. The former idea is rather problematic and Eagleton lists several reasons for this, one of them being that it portrays individuals as "credulous" and "incapable of reasoning coherently" (1991, 12). He argues that people will not simply believe anything and a belief system must offer something in terms of people's "needs and desires," or as he puts it: "it is surely hard to credit that whole masses of human beings would hold over some extensive historical period ideas and beliefs which were simply nonsensical" (ibid.). While this argument can generally be accepted, it could perhaps be claimed that great numbers of people have, throughout the history of humankind, believed in things that cannot very well be described as rational. Even if some of the acts and customs that people have supported and accepted, such as infanticide in several societies in history, made some logical sense, it would be difficult to call them rational without any consideration for their morality. To some extent, people can be deceived into believing or supporting something that defies reason and is false at least by nearly any moral standards, such as the Nazi ideology during the Second World War. This is not to say that there was a completely totalising Nazi ideology that *no one* was able to question, but the fact that the Holocaust could happen indicates that people are not always perhaps fully aware of what they support. Eagleton also acknowledges this perspective and notes that "ideologies quite often contain important propositions which are absolutely false: that Jews are inferior beings, that women are less rational than men" (1991, 15). He argues, however, that in order to be successful, ideologies must have a basis in people's social reality and cannot simply be "imposed illusions" (ibid.), that is, they "must communicate to their subjects a version of social

reality which is real and recognizable enough not to be simply rejected out of hand" (ibid.). In the Nazi ideology, the recognisable social reality could have been, for example, the severe economic conditions, which were then wrongly attributed to the Jewish population.

Eagleton concludes his discussion of the false consciousness debate by noting that whether one accepts the false consciousness thesis or not is contingent on whether one is a moral realist (1991, 17) and on "what role one ascribes to . . . falsehood in one's theory of ideology as a whole" (1991, 15). A moral realist maintains that all propositions can be subject to rational argumentation regardless of whether they express moral stances or describe facts (1991, 17). Thus, a moral realist could hold that the propositions that suggest discriminating people based on their ethnicity is acceptable or that lion is a herbivore are comparable in their falsity, if placed under rational scrutiny. In other words, a moral realist sees some propositions that involve moral stances as patently false and others as correct. A moral realist would then accept the false consciousness thesis because it is not the factual falsity of ideological language but the moral, normative falsity of it that distorts the consciousness of subjects (1991, 18). As has been pointed out above, the idea of false consciousness as simply the falsity of social reality is problematic. This leads to my acceptance of the false consciousness thesis as the falsity of *moral* reality and it is principally this moral realist perspective that will be taken in this thesis.

Relating to the epistemological questions of ideology, there is an aspect not yet discussed that should be mentioned, which is the different degrees of false consciousness, or the possibility of some subjects being under false consciousness and others not. This point will be considered in more detail when hegemony is discussed below. I also intend to demonstrate in my analysis how the characters differ in Atwood's trilogy in terms of their consciousness as subjects to ideology and hegemony. Next, however, I will discuss Louis Althusser's theory of ideology, which outlines in more detail some theoretical concepts that will be relevant in my analysis.

Althusser developed the notion of ideology briefly outlined by Karl Marx earlier. Althusser terms ideology "the system of the ideas and representations which dominate the mind of a man or a

social group" (149). Eagleton points out that while Althusser theorises ideology in the broader sense discussed above, his thinking is nevertheless "constrained by an attention to the narrower sense of ideology as a *dominant* formation" (18, emphasis in original).

Althusser presents two theses concerning ideology. Firstly, he claims that "[i]deology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" (153). Althusser sees ideology as "constitut[ing] an illusion" while also alluding to reality (ibid.). Therefore, reality can only be discerned by interpretation (ibid.). Furthermore, he claims that "in ideology 'men represent their real conditions of existence to themselves in an imaginary form'" (ibid.). This, he notes, leads to the question why such an imaginary representation is needed (ibid.). Two answers to this question are provided: either it is the superior class of people ("Priests and Despots" in Althusser's example) who "'forged' the Beautiful Lies" in order to have power over people, or people themselves create the imaginary representation of their conditions of existence because those conditions of existence are alienating (153-154); the latter answer is based on a classical Marxist notion of alienation, which will not be discussed here further. Althusser (154) rejects both of the abovementioned answers, because in his view, in ideology, people do not represent their real conditions of existence to themselves but it is the imaginary *relation* of people to their real conditions of existence that is represented to them. Eagleton explains Althusser's idea more comprehensibly as follows:

> ideology for Althusser alludes in the main to our affective, unconscious relations with the world, to the ways in which we are pre-reflectively bound up in social reality. It is a matter of how that reality 'strikes' us in the form of apparently spontaneous experience, of the ways in which human subjects are ceaselessly *at stake* in it, investing in their relations to social life as a crucial part of what it is to be themselves. (1991, 18-19, emphasis in original)

According to Althusser, ideology is irrevocably bound up with the subjects, that is, ideology exists only "by the subject and for subjects" (160). In other words, as Eagleton notes, "[i]deology is subjectcentred;" it makes people "view the world as somehow naturally oriented to [them]selves" and makes them think themselves as "a natural part of that reality" (1991, 142). Closely related to this prevalence of subjects in ideology is Althusser's well-known concept of "interpellation" or

"hailing" (Althusser, 163). Interpellation refers to the process by which ideology causes individuals to become subjects (ibid.). Althusser's example of interpellation involves a police officer "hailing" the utterance "Hey, you there!" to which an individual responds by turning around, thus becoming a subject (ibid.). Sara Salih (78) notes, importantly, that interpellation does not need involve an actual physical act of someone hailing at an individual to make them a subject, as in Althusser's instance. Eagleton, again, coherently explains the process: society "single[s] [individuals] out as uniquely valuable" and makes them believe that they are important and needed by society, thus transforming them into subjects (1991, 142-143). Therefore, in effect, subjects are created by providing individuals with identity. Ideology – which "exists before the individual" – assigns, through interpellation, individuals their "subject-position[s]" (Hawkes, 123). An often noted example of interpellation is how women and girls are interpellated into a certain feminine role in society (Salih, 78-79).

There are complex issues (not all of which can be considered here) with the concept of interpellation, such as the problem of how individuals can be "always-already" subjects even before their birth, as Eagleton points out (1991, 143). This issue relates to the wider problem of the totality of ideology, which will be discussed presently. Regardless of these issues, I will, in my analysis, examine some of the characters in terms of how they are interpellated as subjects in society before the apocalypse and how interpellation by society serves to make the circumstances of subjects seem natural and inevitable.

Althusser's second thesis is the claim that "ideology has a material existence" (155). This means that ideology does not simply consist of abstract ideas but that it exists in "an apparatus, and its practice" (155-156). This apparatus, or, more specifically, the ideological state apparatus, refers to an organisation or institution in the society through which ideology is realised (156). Ideological state apparatuses (ISAs), as Althusser argues, include religious, educational, family, legal, political, trade-union, communications and cultural ISAs (136). The religious, educational, communications and cultural ISAs will be of particular interest in my analysis of how different institutions uphold

the social order in the society of the novels. Althusser argues that the imaginary relation of people to their real conditions "is itself endowed with a material existence" (156). In other words, ideology has a material existence in the actions performed by individuals in the ideological state apparatuses (158). An example of this would be an individual who believes in God, whose actions of church-going, praying, confessing and attending Mass are all acts through which the individual 'performs' ideology (157-158).

ISAs are not to be confused with the RSA, or repressive state apparatus, which refers to the state apparatus of the classical Marxist theory of the state and comprises the government, the courts, the administration etc. (136). Althusser points out that while there is a plurality of ISAs, there is only one repressive state apparatus (137). He also makes a distinction between the RSA, which is public, and the ISAs, which are private (ibid.). However, the most significant difference between the RSA and ISAs, according to Althusser, is that the RSA operates primarily by violence, while ISAs operate by ideology (ibid.). The distinction between violence and ideology will guide my analysis chapters, where I will first focus on ideological/hegemonic means and then consider violent strategies.

A great deal of criticism can be, and has been, levelled at Althusser's theory. It is not my intention to present all such criticism here but to acknowledge some of the most obvious problems with the theory that have been pointed out. Perhaps the most notable criticism of Althusser's theory has been the fact that it treats subjects as incapable of free will or questioning ideology. In other words, there is no escaping from ideology; even if we think we are free, it is nothing but an illusion (Eagleton 1991, 146). I, like most critics, reject this view of ideology as a total illusion which seems to reduce subjects to little more than programmable robots. In the theory of hegemony, as will be seen below, subjects are seen in a rather different light.

Moreover, for Althusser, the sphere of ideology appears to encompass all human action and interaction, when surely this cannot be the case. Sometimes individual actions, such as praying, simply do not have an ideological dimension, whether they are performed within ideological state

apparatuses or not. Eagleton also points out this problem: "If the term 'material' suffers undue inflation at Althusser's hands, so also does the concept of ideology itself. It becomes, in effect, identical with lived experience; but whether all lived experience can usefully be described as ideological is surely dubious" (1991, 164). Eagleton further argues that the ideological state apparatuses, such as schools and churches can hardly be seen as existing only to bolster the power of the dominant group (1991, 147). In fact, they might sometimes even work against the dominant group's interests (ibid.). Despite the shortcomings of Althusser's theory, I expect that the Althusserian concepts of interpellation and ISAs will prove useful in my analysis.

Antonio Gramsci is usually credited with the theory of hegemony, even though he did not specifically set out to formulate a theory of it but rather only discussed it in his *Prison Notebooks* in relation to the political situation in Italy and elsewhere in the world at the time of their writing in the 1930s. I will employ both Gramsci's thoughts on the subject as well as ideas of other critics who have developed the concept further.

Stoddart criticises the notion of ideology for being, similarly to what has already been discussed above, "limited in that it seems too unitary, too totalizing, and too abstracted from the everyday social interaction of individual actors" (200). In his view, Gramsci's concept of hegemony is a significant "reinterpretation of the concept of ideology" (ibid.). Hegemony is in many ways similar to ideology, but there are some crucial differences between the two concepts. The most important of these is that hegemony is largely based on the consent of citizens rather than some great illusion that completely misleads the subjects into not seeing the circumstances in which they live. According to Gramsci, "the 'normal' exercise of hegemony . . . is characterized by a combination of force and consent which balance each other so that force does not overwhelm consent but rather appears to be backed by the consent of the majority, expressed by the so-called organs of public opinion" (1992, 156). Furthermore, Gramsci points to the fact that coercion, or "material force," alone is not enough to secure political domination (1992, 137). Stoddart posits that hegemony attempts to make people accept the principles of a system, and this is done through

voluntary consent, not by instilling fear of punishment into citizens (201). Femia (283), however, argues that it is not necessarily consensus that makes citizens obedient but simply the fact that citizens participate in "established forms of activity" without questioning these forms can produce obedient subjects. Here, again, arises the epistemological question of whether citizens under hegemony are aware of the influence their cultural activities have on them or not. As will be seen in my analysis, it may be the case that there is no clear answer to this question, as citizens can have varying awareness of the hegemonic influence.

Eagleton reminds that it is not only capitalism that rests on the consent of the people but all forms of rule require "at least a degree of consent from its underlings" in order to succeed (1991, 116). However, in capitalist societies the role of civil society is particularly prevalent, because of the plurality of different civil society actors. It is more advantageous for a hegemonic leader to employ social control through institutions than to use "direct violence" (Eagleton 1991, 116). As Eagleton aptly puts it:

> It is preferable on the whole for power to remain conveniently invisible, disseminated throughout the texture of social life and thus 'naturalized' as custom, habit, spontaneous practice. Once power nakedly reveals its hand, it can become an object of political contestation (ibid.).

"Conveniently invisible" is not to be taken to mean that the subjects are under the sort of totalising false consciousness that was discussed in relation to ideology. Power may be mostly invisible in the society, but, in this view, it can also be made visible. Direct violence is one way of making power visible, but people are also able to expose it and resist it. This notion shall be considered presently.

Although intimidation and coercion of citizens are strongly present in the society represented in the MaddAddam trilogy, I argue that they are by no means the only methods of maintaining power for the corporations. The corporations do resort to violence, for instance, to quell riots, but they do not use it with wild abandon. It would seem the case with the corporations is exactly as described by Eagleton; they would prefer to rule through the institutions owned by them, but when this fails and they are threatened, they resort to violence. This will be discussed in more detail in the analysis chapters.

Relating to the idea of hegemony being based on consent is the fact that the hegemonic power is not static in the same way as ideological power is. Rather, hegemony must be constantly "renewed, recreated, defended, and modified" (Williams, 112). Williams argues that for this reason there must also be concepts of counter-hegemony and alternative hegemony (112-113). In this view, the simple false consciousness of social reality, which I discussed above, does not exist, as it is possible, albeit difficult, for subjects to question the powers that be. The view that hegemony must be perpetually defended also allows for the existence multiple actors that fight to be the hegemon, as opposed to the idea of a single, static entity that is usually associated with ideology. Because there are hegemonic forces such as the various corporations, institutions owned by them, and the Church of PetrOleum as well as counter-hegemonic forces such as the God's Gardeners in the MaddAddam trilogy, I see hegemony as a more fruitful concept than ideology when analysing the different institutions and groups in the novels.

Eagleton points out another notable difference between ideology and hegemony; the fact that ideology is concerned with the "the *dominant* level by which rule is sustained" (1991, 113, emphasis in original), while hegemony is "a broader category than ideology: it includes ideology but is not reducible to it" (1991, 112). Hegemonic power can operate in a range of different forms in society, for instance, economic or political forms (ibid.). This view of hegemony existing on every level of society is a more recent idea, because for Gramsci, it is mainly "civil society" where hegemonic power is produced (Anderson, 31). This civil society includes institutions such as the Church, the mass media and educational institutions (Stoddart, 201). This view is, of course, very closely related to ISAs, which I considered above. Munck (66) further argues that civil society has had an important role in legitimising neoliberalism, as it "has been mobilised by the neoliberal project in its crusade against 'big government'" and "all non-state actors are encouraged to supplant or rein in the state, from NGOs (non-governmental organisations) to the trade unions." I will not limit my analysis of hegemony in the trilogy simply to the institutions of civil society, but I shall also examine the other ways in which power is maintained.

Hegemony also presents itself as "common sense" to individuals, which affects their "understanding of the world" (Stoddart, 201). Eagleton, too, notes this aspect of hegemony as a "custom, habit, spontaneous practice" (1991, 116). This makes the hegemonic power very effective, as there are few people to question it. Those who do challenge the hegemon have a difficult time mustering support against it, because most citizens have thoroughly internalised its rule and see it as the only viable alternative, even if they are aware of other alternatives. This can be seen in Atwood's trilogy, for example, in the way the God's Gardeners are not taken seriously by most other citizens, but rather regarded as somewhat simple fanatics, eccentric cultists or dangerous terrorists, even though they are the ones who are eventually, for the most part, correct about the direction their society is going.

I concisely discussed discourse in relation to ideology above and will now consider it in more detail. Because examining the language and discourse in the MaddAddam trilogy will not be the main focus of my analysis, I will limit the discussion here to the main points of discourse. However, I argue that taking discourse into consideration is necessary, because social control is often manifested through language and discourse. For instance, the culture ideology of consumerism mentioned in the previous section can be revealed, among others, in the discourse of advertising. Discourse is a concept with several meanings even within a single discipline, as Sara Mills points out (3). A general definition of discourse for the purposes of this thesis can nevertheless be arrived at. A discourse can be understood as an aggregate of statements and utterances that perpetuate certain ideas and values in society. Mills argues that "a discourse is not a disembodied collection of statements, but groupings of utterances or sentences, statements which are enacted within a social context and which contribute to the way that social context continues its existence" (7). She also points out the importance of institutions for discourses (ibid.), and, as I pointed out above, institutions figure largely into my analysis of the society in Atwood's trilogy. Mills (41-42) claims that theorising on ideology is distinct from theorising on discourse because in Marxist theory the focus is "on the nature of the oppressive power relations" without much regard to how the

oppressive powers are opposed. This is not entirely true, as Marxist theory, particularly neo-Marxist theory, also includes the study of hegemony, one of the main focuses of which is specifically the possibility of resisting the oppressive powers, as I discussed above. Relating to this, the shortcomings of ideology were already considered above and there is no need to reiterate them here.

Having outlined the theoretical framework in this chapter, I shall consider the MaddAddam trilogy in more detail from these theoretical perspectives in the following two chapters.

3. Maintenance of social order

I will begin my analysis by examining how the social order depicted in the MaddAddam trilogy is upheld. This examination will be divided thematically into four sections: entertainment, consumption and media; religion; science and education; and force and coercion. I hypothesise that these are the most notable domains through which social control is exercised in the novels. While the first three domains can clearly be understood as belonging to hegemonic or ideological practices, realised principally through institutions and civil society, the last involves direct power and is usually seen as part of repressive state apparatuses rather than ideological apparatuses. Although force and coercion appear distinct from the other three themes presented, it would be an oversight to disregard such noteworthy factors in the maintenance of the social order. Furthermore, none of the critics discussed earlier deny the importance of force and coercion, but they rather point out that it is the *combination* of both hegemonic (or ideological) means and coercion that makes a social order particularly enduring (see, for instance, Merrington, 14).

For the sake of maintaining thematic coherence, I shall refrain from analysing the novels chronologically. Another reason for doing so is that some of the themes are more prevalent in some novels than others. It is also to be noted that the thematic division presented here is artificial by necessity, because the maintenance of social order is a complex phenomenon, and many forces, such as consumerism, education and religion intertwine and operate simultaneously.

3.1 Entertainment, consumption and media

Entertainment, consumption and media admittedly cover a wide range of matters. Television, internet, advertising, news, accumulation of material goods, and conspicuous consumption all fall under this rubric. These are arguably all part of the culture ideology of consumerism, considered in section 2.1.

Consumption is described throughout the MaddAddam trilogy, usually through the protagonists' internal monologue, but there is some variation between the protagonists in their attitudes towards the ubiquitous marketing and consumerism. For instance, Jimmy's thoughts

related to consumption are often portrayed as rather matter-of-factly, without overt criticism of the way things stand:

> She [Jimmy's stepmother] was getting little creases on either side of her mouth, despite the collagen injections . . . Pretty soon it would be the NooSkins BeauToxique Treatment for her – Wrinkles Paralyzed Forever, Employees Half-Price – plus, in say five years, the Fountain of Yooth Total Plunge, which rasped off your entire epidermis. (*OC*, 175)

Although the tone of the passage is somewhat sarcastic, mostly because Atwood satirically exaggerates the names of the services (which shall examined in more detail below), there is no explicit denouncing of the practice of cosmetic surgery, which seems to take quite extreme forms. Toby, on the other hand, views consumer items in a different light, as evinced by her attitude toward a popular brand of coffee denounced by the Gardeners: "'We're drinking Happicuppa?' said Toby. 'Gen-mod, sun-grown, sprayed with poisons? It kills birds, it ruins peasants – we all know that'" (*YF*, 185). However, Toby's views are at this point in the novel heavily influenced by the beliefs of the Gardeners – or the Gardener ideology. Prior to her joining the group, her attitude to consumption is described as being similar to Jimmy's, or indeed, similar to what the attitudes of most people in the society presumably are. Jimmy and Toby, before she joins the Gardeners, are fairly indifferent towards consumerism; they acknowledge many of the faults of the system but do not actively condemn or attempt to change it. This sort of attitude appears to be predominant among the citizens. This is not to say that people are under a total false consciousness and incapable of seeing what could and should be improved; even Jimmy is not completely passive and oblivious to the problems of consumerism and maximising of profits, as will be discussed in section 4.1.

Ren differs from Toby and Jimmy in that she mostly embraces consumerism. Ren's case is particularly interesting, as she is originally from a compound owned by the HelthWyzer Corporation, spends most of her youth with the Gardeners, is taken back to the compound by her mother, Lucerne, and after the Waterless Flood ultimately re-joins the remaining Gardeners, or more specifically, the MaddAddamites. This shifting between the groups causes her to be effectively subjected to both the hegemonic culture of the Corporations and a counter-hegemony.

She is interpellated by both ideologies, perhaps more successfully by the ideology of the ruling

class, and especially consumerism. Despite being a member of the Gardeners, who are adamantly

against consumer goods, she remembers yearning for such items as a child:

> The street kids – the pleebrats – were hardly rich, but they were glittery. I envied the shiny things, the shimmering things, like the TV camera phones, pink and purple and silver, that flashed in and out of their hands like magician's cards, or the Sea/H/Ear Candies they stuck into their ears to hear music. I wanted their gaudy freedom. (*YF*, 66)

This envy felt by Ren could perhaps be attributed to her age and the fact that the other children

mock and even physically abuse the Gardener children. For a child, especially one who is originally

from a Compound, the need to fit in with their peers can be more pressing than for adults. However,

Ren never absorbs the Gardener ideology the way Toby, for example, does. Notably, Ren attributes

material possessions to freedom, which demonstrates the effect that neoliberal discourse of 'free'

consumer choice has had on her. As was discussed in the theory section, neoliberalism operates

under the assumption that free, unhindered markets provide citizens freedom, and it appears that

Ren has accepted this as the truth. Harvey (42), too, points out the significance of freedom in

neoliberalism and the neoliberal need for "a populist culture of differentiated consumerism and

individual libertarianism." For Ren, following the Gardener beliefs appears to be like going through

the motions, without much regard to the reasoning behind the doctrine, and Toby describes Ren as

"overly pliable – she risked always being under somebody's thumb" (*YF*, 176).

At first, when Ren is taken back to the HelthWyzer Compound, the place feels alien to her:

> But nothing felt right. All that faux marble, and the reproduction antique furniture, and the carpets in our house – none of it seemed real. It smelled funny too – like disinfectant. I missed the leafy smells, of the Gardeners, the cooking smells, even the sharp vinegar tang; even the violet biolets. (*YF*, 209)

As can be seen in the passage, Ren has trouble adapting to life among the compound people after

long exposure to Gardener beliefs. It turns out that the world she yearned after as a Gardener does

not only *seem* unreal but actually *is* artificial. The passage, with the fabricated surfaces and

property, appears to suggest that the life lived in the Compounds is itself superficial and fake. The

false/artificial dichotomy is more broadly visible throughout the trilogy, as citizens consume food

substitutes that are attempts at producing 'the real thing,' watch fabricated news and entertainment, and participate in religions that are blatantly fraudulent. Furthermore, the gene splices of various animals, including the Crakers, which are created for commercial purposes, are man-made and artificial, while the natural animals have largely become extinct. The trilogy appears to suggest that consumerism has turned most of the society into an artificial structure, where the citizens are encouraged to fulfil their false desires with false goods.

As Stavrakakis (86) notes, the view of people's false desires being stimulated by "advertising discourse, which sustains the *false consciousness* required for their acceptance" has often been taken by "many radical critics of advertising and consumption." Here, again, arises the problem of the false consciousness hypothesis that was discussed in section 2.2, and Stavrakakis (91) argues that focusing on "the truth/falsity issue" serves to hinder the discussion of how advertising works and how the "organization of desire guarantees the reproduction of market economy and capitalism." Drawing from Lacanian analysis, he (93–94) suggests that people seek to fulfil a lack everyone feels and to achieve unattainable enjoyment through acts of consumption, even though the enjoyment received from these acts is only partial. In other words, consumerism relies on the fact that people are never happy with what they have and always need more to satisfy their desire, even if this desire can never be sated. People are usually aware of the fact that promises made by advertisements are exaggerated, but since the goods consumed only provide partial enjoyment, people feel encouraged to consume more and find new products in an attempt to finally discover the one that satisfies the desire (Stavrakakis 94–95). Stavrakakis (97) further posits that "desiring and buying" itself can become a source of enjoyment, instead of the enjoyment received from an object to be consumed. Thus, an "*economy of desire*" is created, on which "the hegemony of capitalist market" depends (Stavrakakis 98).

One might ask why advertising matters, and how the discussion above is more widely related to social control. Stavrakakis (99–100) argues that there is "a tripartite nexus connecting *economy* (capitalist market economy), inter-subjective *desire* (a particular *socio-cultural* administration of

desire, and *power* (a particular power regime)" and consumerism and advertising are the forces that "[knot] together our present economic, cultural and political structures." Following McGowan (1–2), Stavrakakis (100) points to the transformation "from a society of prohibition into a society of commanded enjoyment." This transformation, McGowan (31) argues, happened with the emergence of monopoly capitalism, which resulted in a consumer culture, and finally,

> [i]n the epoch of global capitalism, the rise of the superego and of the society of enjoyment finds its apotheosis, allowing the transition toward the duty to enjoy to occur with incredible rapidity. Rather than living in a society that prohibits enjoyment, we are increasingly living in one that commands it. (McGowan, 34)

McGowan (ibid.) further argues that people "who are under the sway of the command to enjoy become perfect global capitalist subjects" as they attempt to find enjoyment through consumption, while the credit economy enables them to do so increasingly effectively. In the contemporary society of enjoyment, argues McGowan (40), "symbolic authority" is less visible to people, although it has a "constitutive role in our lives." As a result, the enjoyment experienced by people is nothing more but "imagined enjoyment" (ibid.).

The power of advertising and consumer culture is highly visible in the MaddAddam trilogy. Despite their differing situations, nearly all of the protagonists have been subjected to the language of consumerism and advertising, which they remember long after the society has collapsed. During her refuge from the Waterless Flood in her former workplace, the beauty parlour AnooYoo, Toby recalls the company's advertisements: "*Do it for Yoo*, AnooYoo used to croon. *The Noo Yoo*" (*YF*, 237, italics in original). Here can be seen the imperative mood – "Do it" – typical of advertisements, which, Stavrakakis (101) argues, is "seemingly innocent and benevolent" but which is nevertheless linked to "power and authority." The command to enjoy is palpable in the imperative mood, even though it appears, at first, innocuous.

Later on, thinking about Mo'Hairs, a sheep splice with human hair instead of wool, Toby remembers the old society:

> Every time one of those Mo'Hairs shakes itself it's like watching the back view of a TV hair beauty: the shining mane, the flirtatious ripple and swirl. At any minute, thinks Toby, you expect them to come out with a product spiel. *Every day a bad hair day? My hair was driving me crazy, but then. . .* (*MA*, 205, italics in original)

The kind of advertising language depicted here can be seen to satirise beauty product advertising observable in contemporary Western capitalist societies. It is worth pointing out that the advertisements function through interpellation; they hail at the individuals, inviting them as addressees. Pajnik and Lesjak-Tušek (279) note the importance of interpellation in advertising and argue that "advertising, as an ideological practice, interpellates individuals as subjects." For instance, in the AnooYoo advertisement above, the word Yoo (or 'You') invites to the reader/hearer of the advertisement to recognise him/herself. Similarly, the slogan for SecretBurgers, "*SecretBurgers! Because Everyone Loves a Secret!*" (*YF*, 33) makes use of interpellation by arguing that 'everyone,' including the reader/hearer, by definition loves a secret and thus the product. Therefore, to resist and to elect to not consume the product is, in effect, to be 'no one.' Advertisements thus serve to form identities of citizens as consumers and to reinforce these identities.

Having worked as a "furzooter" (an apparent mangling of the words 'fursuiter' and 'zoo'), advertising products for different companies, Toby is no stranger to the language of advertising. But Zeb, who has not been in the business of advertising, also demonstrates having been effectively exposed to the same discourse. Zeb remembers, for instance, advertisements for various virtual reality pornography services word to word (*MA*, 117-118, 183). Significantly, Ren's internal monologue does not contain references to advertisements or company slogans in the same manner as the monologues of the other protagonists do. This could indicate that Ren has internalised commodification and consumerism to the extent that she does not regard the language related to it worth mentioning, or does not perhaps even acknowledge it, while Jimmy, Toby and Zeb treat advertisements and slogans in a somewhat sarcastic manner.

The protagonists in the series also refer extensively to names of fast food products, such as HappiCuppa coffee, SoYummie ice cream and SoyOBoyburgers, suggesting that these products or

the companies selling them are ubiquitous and very commonplace in the society. This mirrors the contemporary world, where few people have never heard of such multinational corporations as *McDonald's* or *Coca Cola*. The global nature of the corporations in the novels is further underlined when the Happicuppa riots erupt around the world (*OC*, 179); these riots will be discussed in more detail in section 3.4. The prevalence of the same products and companies may imply that there is very little choice for the characters and consumers in general, despite capitalism's promise of individuality and broad consumer choice. Soy-based food appears to be the norm, while animal products have become rare and available only for the most privileged – an apparent reason for this is environmental destruction and extinction of various animals. Thus, for most citizens, the neoliberal promise of freedom is not fulfilled in the material sense.

Relating to the discussion on language and discourse, language in the trilogy is often used to draw the reader's attention. Language in the MaddAddam trilogy would merit a detailed analysis of its own, but I shall be content here to mention the aspects most relevant to the topic under discussion. Language is used to a humorous effect, but it also serves to underline and satirise commodification, as is the case with the names of the products and companies, such as "ChickieNob," "BlyssPluss," and "Perfectababe" as well as the names of the products mentioned above. The SecretBurgers hamburger chain in which Toby works for a time is downright ridiculous with its business policy of serving hamburgers that contain meat that is of "secret" origin and with its slogan, which was already discussed above. Although bordering on the absurd, the brands and slogans bear resemblance to the language of advertisers in contemporary Western societies.

Returning to Ren, she also has problems when she encounters computers and notebooks, as the Gardeners teach against writing anything down permanently because enemies might get their hands on potentially seditious material. This practice, which is rather reasonable for a resistance movement, is initially blown out of proportions in Ren's mind:

> I had a *built-in* fear of those: it seemed so dangerous, all that permanent writing that your enemies could find – you couldn't just wipe it away, not like a slate. I wanted to run into the washroom and wash my hands after touching the keyboards and pages; the danger had surely rubbed off on me. (*YF*, 216, my emphasis)

Ren recognises that she has internalised a fear for things used to record ideas, but it is not obvious whether she realises how much of this built-in fear is actually "built" by her Gardener upbringing.

Nonetheless, Ren soon forgets many of the Gardener teachings and realises that in order to gain popularity with the compound children, she can produce a fictitious account of her "cultish life" (*YF*, 217). Relating to this figurative betrayal of her old friends she observes: "How easy it is, treachery. You just slide into it" (ibid.). This remark can also been understood more broadly as referring to Ren's compromising of the principles she previously adhered to. When she begins spending time with Jimmy, she succumbs to the allure of consumerism: "The first time, I told him Happicuppa was the brew of evil so I couldn't drink it, and he laughed at me. The second time I made an effort, and it tasted delicious, and soon I wasn't thinking too much about the evilness of it" (*YF*, 221). There is little indication here of explicit ideological forces being at work, and it appears that Ren forgets Gardener teachings simply for hedonistic urges. It could be the case, however, that at this point Jimmy and other people at the school as well as life in the Compound have had an influence on her. Moreover, she was never completely subjected solely to the Gardener doctrine during her time with the Gardeners, as she stayed with her mother and was best friends with Amanda. As a former pleebrat, Amanda never accepts the Gardener teachings but simply participates in the community life, and Lucerne always yearns for Compound life during their years in the rooftop garden.

Eventually, when she is older, Ren takes up a job as a "dancer" at Scales and Tails, a corporation-owned establishment that offers legal prostitution services, although Ren convinces herself that "it wasn't like being a prostitute" (*YF*, 294). In order to survive in the society, that is, to be an active consumer, Ren practically becomes a commodity herself, to be consumed by anyone willing to pay the price. Although Ren applies for the Scales and Tails job seemingly out of her own volition, her employment opportunities are, in fact, drastically limited as a result of her education. The commodification of human beings is also globally prevalent, as human trafficking appears common; Oryx tells Jimmy how she was bought from her parents in her country of origin

somewhere in Asia, and eventually ended up in the San Francisco area. Even though the children bought from the villages are very young, they understand that they have "money value," that "they represented a cash profit for others" (*OC*, 126). Their observation is true, as whoever happens to possess the children earns money through them, whether it involves employing them as flower sellers, baits for paedophiles, or actors/actresses in pornography. The trilogy does not comment on what the extent of legislation prohibiting the abuse of children is in the society, but if such legislation exists, it is not actively enforced, because human trafficking is not in direct conflict with the interests of the Corporations. Again, the trilogy criticises the unsavoury developments, child labour and human trafficking, happening in the name of profits in the contemporary global world.

Ren does not forget the Gardener doctrine altogether – she often reminisces her time with the Gardeners and even the teachings of Adam One – but she virtually disregards all teachings that relate to the denouncing of consumerism. She appears to be either unaware of or simply indifferent to the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic forces that influence her. My analysis would suggest that she does not understand the extent to which the ideology of the ruling class or, for that matter, the ideology of the Gardeners, affects her. However, she does acknowledge, for instance, her betrayal of the Gardeners, which indicates that she is not under a totalising false consciousness. Eagleton (1991, 39) points out that "[t]he new kind of ideological subject is no hapless victim of false consciousness; but knows exactly what [s]he is doing; it is just that [s]he continues to do it even so." In this view, Ren is fully aware of her "transgressions" of the Gardener doctrine, but chooses to no longer resist the ruling ideology. As Eagleton suggests, 'falsity' then "lies on the side of what we *do*, not necessarily of what we say" (1991, 40, emphasis in original). Therefore, I argue, Ren is not under a false consciousness but knows what she is doing. That is not to say that the ruling hegemony or the counter-hegemony of the Gardeners does not affect her in any way. Eventually, her practical need to survive in the society simply overrides the counter-hegemonic influence of the Gardeners.

Establishing the significance of entertainment and media in the trilogy is somewhat more difficult, as passages related to entertainment and media are fewer than, say, those related to consumer goods. References to entertainment and media mostly appear in Jimmy's reminiscence of his and Crake's leisure time together back when they were in the same school. They surf the Internet and watch, for example, "open-heart surgery in live time," "Noodie News" (news with nude news anchors), animals being killed in a brutal manner, executions of people, or assisted suicides (*OC*, 81–83). Many of these are described as being available for anyone online, while "the more disgusting and forbidden sites – those for which you had to be over eighteen . . . you needed a special password" (*OC*, 85). One of these is a child-porn site HottTotts which "claimed to show real sex tourists, filmed while doing things they'd be put in jail for back in their home countries" (*OC*, 90).

Similarly, when Zeb is young, he secretly accesses pornographic websites and convinces himself that the videos he watches are harmless because they are already made and "[h]e wasn't *causing* anything" (*MA*, 116). He also visits websites with highly violent content, such as "the historical re-enactment beheading sites" where the user can decapitate historical women and, for an additional fee, do so while they are naked (*MA*, 118). He wonders whether the decapitations are real, but rationalises that they must be not, because "reality online was different from the everyday kind of reality, where things hurt *your* body. And they wouldn't be allowed to murder real women right onscreen: surely that was illegal" (ibid., my emphasis). Zeb's way to rationalise away his unease related to the things he witnesses online serves to criticise the selfish logic on which a great deal of entertainment online operates; 'if it does not hurt *me*, it must be not real,' 'surely the violence I witness is not allowed,' 'it has already been produced, so I am not contributing to its creation.' All of these arguments are used to remove responsibility from the individual. Notably, this logic can be expanded to the global consumerist society, where the unpleasant realities of environmental destruction and cheap labour force are conveniently out of consumers' sight, where conscience can be relegated to authorities, and where consumption can always be justified with the

fact that the product was already manufactured, so why let it go to waste? Furthermore, as is apparent to the reader at this point in the trilogy, it is quite possible that the decapitations Zeb commits are real, whatever the legal status of them are. What is also under critique here is the aspect of male dominance over the sexualised female, discussion of which must be deferred for further studies, as it is beyond the scope of this thesis.

The trilogy thus criticises the wide array of increasingly grotesque content available both on the Internet and on TV today, and suggests that with the emergence of corpocracy such content is practically liberated from the few restrictions that are currently in place in our society. Because surveillance of the vast Internet is virtually impossible, many of the things described by Atwood can already be found online. However, there are yet, in contemporary Western societies, at least attempts to prevent children from accessing harmful content and to impede the dissemination of the most harmful content, such as child pornography, and the Internet is, as of yet, policed in order to discover and remove illegal content. In the trilogy, however, all content seems to be legal (even if there is an ineffective age restriction for some of the websites) as long as it does not disturb the activities of the Corporations.

The consumption of entertainment in the trilogy is notable, not for its capacity to spread propaganda of the ruling bloc (in fact, the characters all seem to be aware of the possibility of everything being faked in the shows) but for its tendency to enable passivity and complacency, as Eagleton points out:

> What is politically important about television is probably less its ideological content than the act of watching it. Watching television for long stretches confirms individuals in passive, isolated, privatized roles, and consumes a good deal of time that could be put to productive political uses. It is more a form of social control than an ideological apparatus. (1991, 49–50)

This point can be extended to the Internet and online entertainment, which can be seen as serving a function similar to television. Even if consuming the entertainment provided does not function as an ISA as such, it is nevertheless in the dominant group's interests to provide citizens with various kinds of entertainment in order to keep them occupied and to discourage dissent.

The case of the media differs from that of entertainment, as the media can be seen as belonging to the communications ISA. The media is depicted as being untrustworthy because all of the media outlets are owned by the Corps:

> As for the adverse publicity they could squelch it at source since the media Corps controlled what was news and what wasn't. And the Internet was such a jumble of false and true factoids that no one believed what was on it any more, or else they believed all of it, which amounted to the same thing. (*YF*, 293)

The fact that news is controlled by the ruling class in a manner that is obvious to practically all citizens goes beyond hegemonic rule. News can be used to buttress the dominance of the ruling class and to effectively mould public opinion, but this usually occurs in a manner that is not immediately obvious to viewers or listeners. Here, however, news no longer has the potential to efficiently influence citizen opinion, as it is implied that most people do not believe any of it. Therefore, news has a role similar to entertainment consumed by citizens; the citizens do watch it, but its ideological content hardly affects them. Therefore, news, like entertainment, serves to passivise citizens instead of indoctrinating them. The protagonists are not extensively described as following the news, with the exception of Jimmy who watches the aforementioned Noodie News with Crake – although they appear to watch it less for the purposes of being informed than being entertained.

The manner in which news is censored and fabricated in the trilogy is similar to totalitarian strategies of social control, often seen in classical dystopias, such as *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Moreover, entertainment in the trilogy is described in a manner akin to the passivising entertainment in some classical dystopias, such as *Fahrenheit 451*, where the main activity of most citizens consists of watching vapid entertainment which keeps them from being interested in the oppressive nature of the society around them. However, a difference lies between the MaddAddam trilogy and classical dystopias in that the latter do not either overtly criticise the consumer culture or if they do, they tend to trace the critique of consumerism to the state – whether it is the Party in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the World State in *Brave New World* or the unnamed government in *Fahrenheit 451*. As Moylan (2003, 136) argues, "[t]he critical logic of the classical dystopia is . . . a

simplifying one; it doesn't matter that an economic regime drives the society; it doesn't matter that a cultural regime of interpellation shapes and directs the people; for the social evil to be named, and resisted, is nothing but the modern state in and of itself." The MaddAddam trilogy, in contrast, points out the problems of "the extensive and intensive power of the economic-cultural system" (Moylan 2003, 137) by demonstrating how consumer subjects are created through the discursive practices of advertising, among others.

In this section, I have, through my analysis, endeavoured to demonstrate the extent to which consumption, advertising, entertainment and media contribute to the hegemony of the Corporations. Next, I will consider the effects of organised religion in the maintenance of social order.

3.2 Religion

Religion and religious institutions can be a notable source of power for those that can harness them, and Althusser lists religious institutions as one of the ideological state apparatuses. In the MaddAddam trilogy, religion plays a role both in the corporate hegemony as well as the counter-hegemony of the Gardeners. I will discuss the role of religion in the counter-hegemony later. In this section, I shall focus on how religion is used to support the power of the corporations.

Religion as a vehicle for the maintenance of the social order is most readily apparent in *MaddAddam*, as the other two novels of the trilogy only feature brief references to organised religion. *MaddAddam* recounts the story of Zeb and Adam, whose father was, in their youth, the Reverend of the Chruch of PetrOleum – a church dedicated to the worship of oil with a Christian twist. The feeble theology invented by "the Rev" rests on the arguments that *Peter* in Matthew 16:18, refers to rock from which oil is extracted and that the Bible abounds with mentions of the holiness of *oleum*, or oil (*MA*, 112). According to the Rev's theology, the modern word, *petroleum*, thus has its origins in the Bible. Despite the fact that his theology only rests on a pseudo-etymological explanation tied to a few passages from the scripture, the Rev is successful in attracting people to his church. Zeb notes that many similar cults or churches existed in his youth:

> The Rev had his very own cult. That was the way to go in those days if you wanted to coin the megabucks and you had a facility for ranting and bullying, plus golden-tongued whip-'em-up preaching . . . Tell people what they want to hear, call yourself a religion, put the squeeze on for contributions, run your own media outlets and use them for robocalls and slick online campaigns, befriend or threaten politicians, evade taxes. (*MA*, 111)

Organised religion, like almost everything else, has been commodified and is described here as another means for profit. Cults and churches, like the one lead by Zeb's foster father, lack solid theological foundation because their principal purpose is to make profit, not offer actual spiritual guidance. The trilogy can here be seen criticising the development, particularly in the United States, of churches and religion turning into businesses in recent decades, which Murray and Worth (740) point out; they note that "the charismatic Christian movement" has for some time been driven by business logic where "the individual church [is framed] as a business and the preacher as a chief executive officer" (ibid.). The Church of PetrOleum, which makes its revenue "with a dozen sophisticated online social media and donation sites skimming the cash from the faithful 24/7" (*MA*, 117) could arguably be construed as a business and the Rev as its CEO.

There are other religious groups with shoddy theological foundations in the trilogy, such as the Known Fruits who see being wealthy as "a mark of God's favour" (*YF*, 288), the Wolf Isaiahists who believe the wolf is the one to lie down with the lamb when God's Kingdom comes on Earth, and the Lion Isaiahists who believe it will be the lion instead of the wolf (*OC*, 39). However, the Wolf and Lion Isaiahists do not appear to serve the interests of the Corporations, and the Wolf Isaiahists actually work against the established order rather than cooperate with it, as they eventually bomb a restaurant chain that serves liobam, a sacred animal in their doctrine (*YF*, 270).

In addition to profit-making, the cults and churches serve an important function: they are effective in moulding public opinion. The Church of PetrOleum engages in criticising environmental organisations, because their interests are in direct conflict with those of the Church and, by extension, the Corporations:

> The Rev, and the whole Church, and their religious joined-at-the-hippers like the Known Fruits, and their political pals – they were all death on ecofreaks. Their ads featured stuff like a cute little blond girl next to some particularly repellent threatened species, such as the Surinam toad or the great white shark, with a slogan saying: *This? or This?* Implying that all cute little blond girls were in danger of having their throats slit so the Surinam toads might prosper. (*MA*, 182, italics in original)

The Church of PetrOleum, among other religious organisations that support the existing environmentally detrimental modes of production, attempts to paint a negative picture of environmental organisations and their supporters whom it regards as "hell-bent on sabotaging the American Way and God's Holy Oil" (*MA*, 183). Even if the advertisements are crude and exaggerated, it appears that such disparaging has an effect on people, as the Rev is capable of embezzling a sizable sum out of the donations received by the Church (*MA*, 121).

The moulding of public opinion done by the Church often coincides with the goals of the Corporations and downright supports the ruling class by providing a theological basis for the environmentally destructive lifestyle. Petrobaptists and Known Fruits can be understood as practising "prosperity gospel," which, according to Murray and Worth (740–741), moulds public opinion towards accepting neoliberal and free market objectives:

> [Prosperity gospel] is producing sets of truly 'hegemonic' structures and agents in the wider context of globalisation as it successfully merges a specific lifestyle and popular world view with the larger macroeconomic policies often associated with the concept of neo-liberal hegemony.

Murray and Worth further argue that "[t]he message of the movement is that Christian faith and individual wealth are intertwined, with one leading to the other" and "[b]usiness investments are promulgated as acts of faith" (740). As shown above, the Church of PetrOleum doctrine explicitly proclaims this sort of message. Murray and Worth (ibid.) also claim that related to the prosperity gospel and the idea of church growth is "the aspiration of becoming a 'mega-church,'" which is what the Rev has achieved: "the Rev had a megachurch, all glass slobbery and pretend oak pews and faux granite, out on the rolling plains" (*MA*, 111).

Moreover, when Zeb suggests they call the CorpSeCorps after finding out that the Rev murdered Adam's mother, Adam points out that doing so would be dangerous because there were

several "Petrobaptists" in the CorpSeCorps and some members of the OilCorps belonged to the Church board (*MA*, 124-125). The reason for this, Adam explains, is that the interests of the Church and the OilCorps overlap because it is advantageous for both of them and because of "the need to crush dissent" (*MA*, 125). Similarly, when Toby asks Adam why the CorpSeCorps do not let pleebmobs attack the Gardeners, he explains that "'[i]t would be bad for [the CorpSeCorps] to eviscerate anything with God in its name' . . . 'The Corporations wouldn't approve of it, considering the influence of Petrobaptists and the Known Fruits among them'" (*YF*, 48). Organised religion, represented in the trilogy by Petrobaptists and the Known Fruits, is mainly depicted in a negative light, because of its potential to become, under neoliberalism, little more than another means to promote the ruling ideology and to make profit instead of providing spiritual guidance.

In this section, I have attempted to show that the religious groups described in the novels hold power in the society and contribute to the hegemony of the ruling class. The trilogy provides regrettably little detailed commentary on the workings and influence of organised religious groups, which renders further analysis impractical. However, the role of religion is more significant in the resistance of the hegemonic order, as will be seen in section 4.1. In the following section, I will examine how science and education function to serve the interests of the hegemon.

3.3 Science and education

As mentioned in the theory chapter, educational apparatuses belong to the ISAs and are seen as one means for the hegemon to maintain its power. I will add science and research to this category, as it can be argued that scientific discourse considerably affects what people support and believe in. For example, when Toby's mother falls ill, her family counts on the HelthWyzer Corp to cure her, although it is the supplements sold by the corporation that made her ill and eventually kill her.

Science in the trilogy is employed to turn in bigger profits, while ordinary people place their trust on doctors and science: "No doctor could give her a diagnosis, though many tests were done by the HelthWyzer Corp clinics . . . They [HelthWyzer] arranged for special care, with their own doctors. They *charged for it*, though . . ." (*YF*, 25, my emphasis). Despite her knowledge of the

Corporations, Toby does not suspect that it was the very medicine provided by HelthWyzer that caused the death of her mother until Pilar, a former Corp scientist, reveals her the truth (*YF*, 104). Scientific objectivity has been compromised; Pilar assures Toby that the data and scientists provided by the Corporations cannot be trusted and that the doctors have "all been bought" (*YF*, 105). Similarly, Crake reveals to Jimmy that the *modus operandi* of HelthWyzer is to create diseases and cure them in a manner that ensures "maximum profit" (*OC*, 211). Crake regards HelthWyzer's ethically questionable actions as "brilliant" and the distribution of viruses a "fine calculation" (ibid.), which foregrounds his appalling decision to eradicate the humankind (Crake's solution will be considered in more detail in section 4.2 when violent insurgency is discussed).

Scientific research in the Compounds knows no ethical bounds, as anything is allowed in order to accumulate profits; advances in biotechnology enable scientists to create gene splices of not only animals but also of human beings. RejoovenEsense's secret Paradice project, which Crake oversees, aims at marketing eugenics – "babies that would incorporate any feature, physical or mental or spiritual, that the buyer might wish to select" (*OC*, 304). Crake succeeds in creating the Crakers; whole new beings with features of both humans and animals. Neither Crake nor Oryx, and not even Jimmy at first, consider the ethical questions of this venture. Gene splicing of animals has been done long before the Crakers, but ethics are not considered even when it comes to redesigning human beings.

In addition to gene splices and medication, scientific innovations are marketed to consumers in the form of beauty treatments (discussed in section 3.1) and cryogenic preservation services, among others. CryoJeenyus is a corporation that offers cryogenic preservation services for bodies and heads in order to potentially revive their customers in the future – a practice which, according to Zeb, is successful because of "gullibility and unfounded hope" (*MA*, 315). Again, the trilogy not only warns the reader of potential future developments but also criticises circumstances and practices in the contemporary society, where companies such as *Alcor* already provide costly

cryonics services.[5] However, capitalising on death in the trilogy is not limited to selling lethal

medication and providing cryogenic preservation; death is effectively profited on throughout

society by making it entertainment (Appleton, 67–68; see also section 3.1 above) and by utilising

corpses for organ trade and burning them for energy (Narkunas, 6).

Althusser (146–147) regards the educational ISA as the most significant apparatus in

capitalist exploitation, as the School as an institution, in his view,

> takes children from every class at infant-school age, and then for years, the years in
> which the child is most 'vulnerable', . . . it drums into them, whether it uses new or old
> methods, a certain amount of 'know-how' wrapped in the ruling ideology (French,
> arithmetic, natural history, the sciences, literature) or simply the ruling ideology in its
> pure state (ethics, civic instruction, philosophy). (147)

The educational system has a significant role in the trilogy, as can be glimpsed at through Jimmy's,

Toby's and Ren's memories of their time at school and in higher education. Education is practically

oriented and Jimmy, for instance, studies subjects such as "Life Skills," which involves, among

others, "[d]ouble-entry on-screen bookkeeping, banking by fingertip, using a microwave without

nuking your egg, filling out housing applications for this or that Module and job applications for

this or that Compound, family heredity research" (*OC*, 42) or "Nanotech Biochem," which involves

splicing genes – a practice that has gained popularity and is regarded as one of the profitable fields.

After Jimmy graduates from HelthWyzer High he is selected, due to his poor success in

mathematical subjects, into Martha Graham Academy, which "had been set up by a clutch of now-

dead rich liberal bleeding hearts from Old New York as an Arts-and-Humanities college . . . with

special emphasis on the Performing Arts" (*OC*, 186-187). The Academy is viewed as a place for

people who cannot do any better, and the studies provided are considered well-nigh useless: "a lot

of what went on at Martha Graham was like studying Latin, or book-binding: pleasant to

contemplate in its way, but no longer central to anything" (*OC*, 187). Because of the demand for

more "endowment . . . in more down-to-earth quarters" the Academy has had to adapt to offer more

contemporary studies from which "money could still be made" (*OC*, 188). The original motto of the

---

[5] See Eveleth (2014).

Academy, "*Ars Longa Vita Brevis*" has been replaced by one that better illustrates the Academy's

new orientation: "Our Students Graduate With Employable Skills" (*OC*, 188). Jimmy studies

"Problematics," which is "considered – at the decision-making levels, *the levels of real power* – an

archaic waste of time" (*OC*, 195, my emphasis). Studying Problematics enables students to work in

advertising and not much else (ibid.). Relating to this discussion, Aronowitz warns of the

developments visible in contemporary Western societies:

> As scientific discourse permeates state and civil society, scientific culture spills over
> beyond the laboratory. Business dares make no decisions that are not grounded on
> mathematical calculation that provides projections . . . In schools, the idea of the liberal
> arts slowly gives way to occupational education. "Functional" literacy becomes the
> criterion of success for no-frills state school systems that are stripped of their music and
> drawing curricula and which reduce English and history to service departments for the
> technical-oriented programs. (9–10)

Similarly, Pritchard (5) contends that "traditional ideas of the university [such as academic and

intellectual freedom] are now profoundly under challenge from the political pressures of

neoliberalism in the United Kingdom, Germany and the wider world." Aronowitz (10) further

claims that "beefing up science and math in schools has become a matter of high government

priority since these disciplines are understood to be vital for a country's economic and military

position." What Aronowitz and Pritchard are warning about has taken place in the trilogy's society;

scientific discourse has attained tremendous importance, which has resulted in the eradication of

any fields that are seen as unprofitable and thus useless, such as the humanities. Mathematics and

other 'hard' sciences are, due to their profitability, the fields that ensure success for some students

in the trilogy, while students like Jimmy have to be content with whatever employment they can

find. In the trilogy, the austerity policies, commercialisation, and the pressure to run universities

like businesses – developments which have recently been protested against by students in several

countries[6] – have been taken to their extremes, as the dystopia warns the reader of the path the

current situation may lead us.

---

[6] See Ratcliffe (2015).

Ren also studies at Martha Graham at the same time as Jimmy, and it is mentioned that Toby, too, has studied "Holistic Healing" at the Academy (*YF*, 32). Ren studies "Dance Calisthenics" and "Dramatic Expression" (YF, 286) and hopes to gain employment in "leading the in-corp noon-hour exercise programs," but ends up, as mentioned above, working as a stripper/prostitute. Thus, it is apparent that degrees from universities like Martha Graham do not prepare the graduates for very desirable, or well-paid, occupations. However, it is important to bear in mind that Ren, Toby and Jimmy are, despite their limited educational alternatives, privileged in comparison to pleeblanders whose education is not depicted in any great detail in the novels. Young pleeblander children are described as belonging to street gangs instead of spending their time at school, which suggests that compulsory elementary education is perhaps a thing of the past. Employment available to people in the pleeblands appears to include mostly low-paid, low-status 'McJobs,' as Toby's experiences as a SecretBurger employee and a furzooter reveal. It can only be surmised that the education available to pleeblanders, if any, is probably very limited both in scope and content.

Martha Graham Academy is in stark contrast to Watson-Crick Institute, which is where Crake is selected for his further studies. The Institute is very wealthy and provides its students luxuries and services unheard of at Martha Graham Academy, or indeed at most other institutions; the services include prostitution services, among others. The Institute has very practical goals with its scientific research on various things that could be profited on, for instance, "Smart Wallpaper that would change colour on the walls of your room to complement your mood" (*OC*, 201), "ChickieNobs," or chicken growth units that produce exclusively chicken breasts or drumsticks (*OC*, 203), and "wolvogs" – ferocious wolf and dog mixes – to replace ordinary guard dogs (*OC*, 205). Moreover, Crake tells Jimmy that the students studying at Watson-Crick receive "half the royalties from anything they invented there," which is "a fierce incentive" (*OC*, 203). Similar developments were already taking place in the real world over twenty years ago, as Aronowitz points out: "MIT has . . . forged an extensive series of arrangements with some major *biotechnology* firms. In return for huge grants for research, the university has agreed that the patents for

discoveries will belong to the corporations" (15–16, my emphasis). The idea of scientific research as a means to benefit humankind has, for the most part, been forgotten in the profit-driven dystopia.

Furthermore, Zeb recounts how Adam studied "PetrTheology, Homiletics, and PetrBiology" at a university. The last-mentioned subject "required you to learn biology in order to disprove it" (*MA*, 120). Similarly to Crake, Adam had the possibility of attaining a profitable occupation. Although not mathematical subjects, the studies taken by Adam nevertheless could have enabled him to work as a preacher "in the old man's fraudchurch biz" (ibid.). What the fields of study taken by Adam and Crake have in common is that both can serve the interests of the ruling class; Crake's by creating profits for the corporations, and Adam's by training people who provide a moral basis for the actions of the corporations, as was shown in section 3.2. As can be seen later in chapter 4, Adam does put his education into use, even though it is for counter-hegemonic rather than hegemonic purposes.

The students in educational institutions do not appear to be fed explicit ideological propaganda as such, but neither do they appear to be taught critical thinking – arguably one of the most important skills in the academia. Lack of critical thinking ensures that there will not be many people to question the neo-liberal hegemony. Moreover, the division between the superior and inferior institutions may not be seen as acceptable by everyone, but it is tolerated as the way of how things simply stand. It is notable that Jimmy divides people into "numbers people" and "word people" and sees himself as belonging to the latter (*OC*, 25). This division is visible throughout the novels especially between Jimmy and Crake, as Crake can be seen as representing numbers people with his cold rationality and affinity to mathematics. Numbers people are the ones who are selected to the best higher education institutes like Watson-Crick, are allowed to live in the best Compounds and have the highest-paid jobs because of the profitable work they do. Word people like Jimmy, however, have to settle for run-down institutions like Martha Graham Academy and to accept whichever job they are offered after graduation. The division into numbers and word people invokes the rather long Western tradition of separating 'hard and soft sciences,' and the tendency to

value hard sciences over soft ones for their capacity to offer empirical and measurable data. The attitude towards word people is well illustrated by Snowman when he finds a *Norton Anthology of Modern Poetry*, a thesaurus and a dictionary in a house he is scavenging: "The [deceased] striped-pyjamas guy upstairs must have been a word person, then: a RejoovenEsense speechwriter, an ideological plumber, a spin doctor, a hair-splitter for hire. Poor bugger, thinks Snowman" (*OC*, 233). This ironic remark could refer to both the current state of the man and his occupation prior to the collapse of society.

In addition to its ideological content, education affects the material conditions of citizens by determining their place in the society, as Althusser (147) also points out. Thus, pleeblanders are the underclass with little to no education, who work in low-status jobs with no possibility of social mobility, while citizens born in the Compounds are divided into either a sort of middle class or a higher class depending on their success in mathematics and life sciences. The most successful in these fields, like Crake, belong to the highest strata of society. Gramsci (1971, 40) notes that a system where various vocational (or practically oriented) schools designed to "perpetuate a specific traditional function" of "each social group" is democratic in appearance, but in reality serves to maintain "traditional social differences." In terms of the trilogy, this means that the citizens have the illusory 'freedom' of selecting whichever job they can within the confines of their education, which means that the pleeblanders, or word people, for that matter, will never be able to attain managerial positions because the limited educational choices available for them.

Profit-making defines the content of science and education in the trilogy, and the Corporations decide what is to be researched and what is not. As Toby points out, "[i]f you wanted a job in research, you had to work for a Corp because that was where the money was. But you'd naturally be focused on projects that interested them, not on ones that interested you" (*MA*, 240). Thus, by determining what is allowed and deemed useful, i.e. profitable, the corporate hegemony operates through science and education, effectively suppressing potential opposition. In the

following section, I will consider force and coercion employed by the Corporations to maintain their position in the society.

3.4 Force and coercion

As noted earlier, force and coercion are not strictly part of hegemonic means and can, in fact, be seen as being in direct opposition to them. Nevertheless, hegemony is rarely, if ever, the only means through which power is maintained, which is why I shall here examine the actual physical control and coercion employed by the ruling corporations. Violence and coercion are also typically associated with dystopian fiction and particularly classical dystopias.

Coercion is mostly apparent in the actions of the CorpSeCorps, which is responsible for policing the society after "the local police forces collapsed for lack of funding" (*YF*, 25). However, the CorpSeCorps does not function only as the police force in the society but is practically responsible for most of the things that fall under repressive state apparatuses, and acts as the judge, jury and executioner. It doles out harsh penalties and carries them out: "Shooting was only for treason. Otherwise it was gas, or hanging, or the big brainfrizz" (*OC*, 258). An alternative for execution is to participate in the deadly game of painball, the few survivors of which are released, often with aggravated mental problems (*YF*, 98-99). The CorpSeCorps also acts as the border guard, for example, to keep out Texan refugees who are attempting to escape droughts (*YF*, 84-85), functions as an intelligence agency that monitors citizen activities (*YF*, 115), and is responsible for upholding the public order, for instance, by doing "public-service patrol telling people to put their trash in the containers provided" (*YF*, 149). The public-service patrolling, however, is simply a facade for CorpSeCorps' many illicit activities.

As the CorpSeCorps is a private firm and there is no division of powers in the society, it holds a tremendous power and is able to look after the corporations' interests as well as its own, with little regard to the well-being of citizens. This is not to say that the CorpSeCorps can get away with anything; it has to at least have an excuse, however feeble, for its actions. Toby asks Zeb about this issue when the Happicuppa riots become more frequent: "[W]hy didn't the CorpSeCorps move in

openly, blitz their opponents right in plain view, and impose overt totalitarian rule, since they were

the only ones with weapons? They were even running the army, now that it had been privatized"

(*YF*, 266). Zeb's answer epitomises the importance of hegemony in maintaining social control:

> He'd said that officially they [the CorpSeCorps] were a private Corporation Security
> Corps employed by the brand-name Corporations, and those Corporations still wanted
> to be perceived as honest and trustworthy, friendly as daisies, guileless as bunnies. They
> couldn't afford to be viewed by the average consumer as lying, heartless, tyrannical
> butchers. "The Corps have to sell, but they can't force people to buy," he'd said. "Not
> yet. So the clean image is still seen as a must." (Ibid.)

Although Zeb's explanation is based purely on economics and corporate greed, it is apparent that

the corporations as the ruling class need – if not the consent of the people – at least their uneasy

acquiescence. As was discussed in section 2.2, use of "direct violence" (Eagleton 1991, 116) entails

risks for the ruling class, because it is easier for people to recognise and fight against it than

ideological power, which is not as easily discerned.

As was pointed out earlier, the MaddAddam trilogy differs from many classical dystopias in

that it features a seemingly free society, there is no visibly violent authoritarian rule imposed, and

the citizens do not have a clear idea as to who exactly holds the true power in the society. In the

trilogy, power is not held by a single authoritarian government (even if the CorpSeCorps would

initially appear to fill such a role), but it shifts between the most successful corporations and is thus

difficult to locate. Vials (242) also points out the lack of any "identifiable centre" in the trilogy, and

attributes this to "the self-regulating market." Nor is there, in the trilogy, a "Grand Inquisitor scene"

(Reid, 275) typical of many classical dystopias, and found in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen*

Eighty-Four (Gottlieb, 51), where the ruler or the representative of the ruling class gives face to the

oppressor in confronting the protagonist(s) and explains why the system is brilliant and why

resistance is useless. It is the new, critical dystopia that unmasks the power of institutions outside

the state, and in the case of the MaddAddam trilogy this dimension is particularly prevalent, as the

state is virtually non-existent.

The role of coercion only increases and becomes more visible once the corporations start

treating the God's Gardeners and other similar organisations as a threat and once the virus

unleashed by Crake starts decimating the population. These events can be understood as the organic

crisis described by Gramsci, which "is manifested as a crisis of hegemony, in which the people

cease to believe the words of the national leaders" (Bates, 258). According to Bates, an organic

crisis often occurs when "the ruling class" fails in "some large undertaking . . . for which it

demanded the consent and the sacrifices of the people" (ibid.). The Happicuppa riots can be seen as

a precursor to the organic crisis, which causes the ruling corporations to resort to violence more and

more:

> [T]he Happicuppa coffee bush was designed so that all of its beans would ripen
> simultaneously, and coffee could be grown on huge plantations and harvested with
> machines. This threw the small growers out of business and reduced both them and their
> labourers to starvation-level poverty.
> The resistance movement was global. Riots broke out, crops were burned, Happicuppa
> cafés were looted, Happicuppa personnel were car-bombed or kidnapped or shot by
> snipers or beaten to death by mobs; and, on the other side, peasants were massacred by
> the army. (*OC*, 179)

Notably, it is pointed out that "[t]here hadn't been anything like it since the first decade of the

century. Crake said it was history in the making" (ibid.). The excerpts reveal that Happicuppa is a

corporation that acts globally in several societies and that the hegemony of the global ruling class is

being challenged for the first time in decades. The trilogy does not provide an explicit reason as to

why Happicuppa sparks such a reaction from the populace when gross injustice appears to occur

daily in the society. The reason for the exceptional reaction might lie in the fact that the introduction

of Happicuppa affects thousands of people at once, and directly and noticeably influences their

livelihood, while other victims of the Corporations tend to be exploited or abused in a more

inconspicuous manner. The exploited individuals are generally unable to muster support or organise

resistance against these violations due to the plurality of citizens' conditions and a lack of unifying

cause; individualism, economic competition, and ideological forces ensure that people are simply

too focused on their own survival and lives to participate in resistance that carries personal risk.

One of the few exceptions to this is the God's Gardeners, whose acts of resistance I shall examine

in the following chapter.

Eventually, the CorpSeCorps starts viewing the God's Gardeners as "a resistance movement in the making" and begins rewarding the pleebmobs for attacking them (*MA*, 332). Finally, after MaddAddam causes disease outbreaks and infestations with malicious intent, and particularly after the Wolf Isaiahists bombings, the CorpSeCorps move in and begin destroying resistance groups, including the God's Gardeners' main base of operations. The Gardeners are outlawed and the remaining members hunted down, tortured and executed. Whether the organic crisis would have eventually led to a totalitarian society similar to those described in classical dystopias or whether the Corporations would have been able to eliminate all resistance and regain a trustworthy image are questions left unanswered, because before either development can take place, Crake's virus begins destroying the humankind.

In this chapter, I have considered the various ways in which the dominance of the Corporations is maintained and how the depiction of the society functions as a social critique of contemporary Western societies. In the following chapter, I shall examine how these resistance movements and other actors challenge and subvert the hegemony of the ruling corporations.

4. Subversion of social order

In this chapter, I will continue my analysis by turning to the ways in which the social order in the novels is subverted. Successful subversion of hegemony is a feature found in critical dystopias, as classical dystopias tend to deny the possibility of toppling the dystopian ruler. In the MaddAddam trilogy, subversion and opposition to hegemony is most readily apparent in the actions and thoughts of the characters, which is why my focus here will be on the God's Gardeners and MaddAddamites as well as some of the other characters in the novels. This chapter is divided into two sections. In the first one I will consider the counter-hegemonic, non-violent means of subverting and questioning the social order and in the second I will analyse the violent measures taken by citizens to oppose the dominance of the Corporations.

4.1 Counter-hegemony and non-violent resistance

In this section, I will first discuss the God's Gardeners, whose dissent against the established order is most apparent to the reader. Then I will consider some of the other characters, such as Jimmy, whose opposition against the social order is not as readily apparent, but who nevertheless display signs of resisting the hegemony, if not in their actions, at least in their thoughts.

The God's Gardeners is featured mainly in *The Year of the Flood* and *MaddAddam*, while in *Oryx and Crake*, the group is only mentioned in passing. Nevertheless, it is the God's Gardeners that constitutes the most notable non-violent counter-hegemonic actor in the trilogy. What appears to be a simple, harmless religious group is, in fact, a widespread organisation with people from various backgrounds, including Compound scientists. Only the top members of the Gardeners, the Adams and Eves, know the extent of the organisation and the dangers it potentially faces from the Corporations. Regular members are taught the doctrine, the antimaterialist theology formulated by the charismatic leader of the group, Adam One. As was mentioned in section 3.3, Adam's education included Homiletics, the study of homilies and sermons, which enables him to apply the rhetoric of leaders of religious communities and deliver religious sermons effectively:

> Remember the first sentences of those Human Words of God: the Earth is without form, and void, and then God speaks Light into being. This is the moment that Science terms "The Big Bang," as if it were a sex orgy. Yet both accounts concur in their essence: Darkness; then, in an instant, Light. But surely the Creation is ongoing, for are not new stars being formed at every moment? . . . As we are told, "Thou sendeth forth thy Spirit, they are created: and Thou renewest the face of the Earth." (*YF*, 11–12)

The excerpt above includes rhetorical devices, such as urging in the form of an imperative, a rhetorical question and invocation of the Scripture. Moylan (2000, 149) notes the importance of language in "dystopian resistance" and argues that "control over the means of language, over representation and interpellation, is a crucial weapon and strategy." Language is used by the Gardeners, Adam One in particular, to impart the counter-hegemonic ideology and values to his listeners. Even though Adam One's sermons have their basis on the Bible and Christianity, he has come up with a doctrine of his own that combines religious belief and scientific theories. The doctrine is not particularly sympathetic towards scientific discourse, or, as Adam One calls them, the "scientific fools who say in their hearts, 'There is no God'" (*YF*, 51), but it does attempt to reconcile religion and science:

> [God] could have also formed [humankind] from the dust of the Earth, which in a sense He did, for what else can be signified by "dust" but atoms and molecules, the building blocks of all material entities? . . . He made us "a little lower than the Angels," but in other ways – and Science bears this out – we are closely related to our fellow Primates . . . (*YF*, 52)

The doctrine thus accepts a scientific world view, but sees God as the driving force behind everything – similarly to the idea of intelligent design. Furthermore, the doctrine denies superiority of humans over animals and denounces greed. The decline of humanity is attributed to the ongoing, "multidimensional" Fall of Man, which is, according to the doctrine, less figurative than is generally thought: the ancestor species fell from the trees, vegetarianism was replaced by meat-eating and instinct by reason, and, deriving from the idea of the Original Sin, endless desire for knowledge is seen as a cause for unhappiness (*YF*, 188). The Gardeners are vegetarian, reject the scientific research based on profit-making (the only kind of research available in the society), and accept practices that have an instinctual basis rather than a basis on reason (e.g. the chemically-

induced overnight Vigil that Toby does [*YF*, 170-171]). Thus, the creed of the Gardeners is in direct opposition to the values around them in the society.

The education and self-improvement the Gardeners engage in can be understood as being similar to Gramsci's notion of revolutionary activity that Femia discusses:

> it falls upon an organized *élite* of professional revolutionaries and communist intellectuals to instill the in the masses the 'critical self-consciousness' which will enable them to overthrow the existing order and develop a *morally reintegrated society* based on proletarian, collective principles. (269, latter emphasis mine)

Although the Gardeners do not promote communist ideology or attempt to develop a society based on proletarian principles, they can be viewed as revolutionaries, or at least rebels, who endeavour to inspire citizens' critical self-consciousness in order to morally improve the society. The Gardeners do not actually plan a revolution, as their doctrine encourages pacifism, but they can be seen as a sort of an 'élite' group whose goal is a morally reintegrated society after the apocalyptic prophecy of the Waterless Flood – for which the members prepare under Adam One's leadership – has destroyed the old, corrupt order (*YF*, 47). Thus, the Gardeners rely on a more or less divine intervention to overthrow the existing order after which their improved society can take hold. However, some of the Gardeners who are not content to wait for the Waterless Flood form the group MaddAddam and actively attempt to overthrow the existing order. I will discuss the MaddAddamites in more detail in the following section.

The Gardener education goes beyond simple preaching and indoctrination, and the Gardener children are taught Gardener history and saint days (comparable to feast days of Roman Catholicism) as well as scientific subjects such as "Mental Arithmetic" and "Mycology" (*YF*, 61). However, education mainly focuses on practical skills, which include, among others, "Fabric Recycling," "Culinary Arts," sewing, "Holistic Healing with Plant Remedies," "Predator-Prey Relationships," and "Emergency Medical" (ibid.). The education reinforces the Gardener values of anti-consumerism and living off the land, but it is, at the same time, essential in order to prepare the members for the time after the Waterless Flood. It is notable that the practical orientation of the

Gardener education mirrors the practical education in the Compounds discussed in section 3.3, with the difference lying in the ideological focus and content of the education.

The Gardeners spend a considerable amount of time learning the names of the species that have gone extinct. Adam One encourages the Gardeners to act as "a plural Noah," to prepare for the oncoming catastrophe and "ferry [the] priceless knowledge" of species "over the face of the Waterless Waters" (*YF*, 91). The Gardeners also learn by heart numerous names of the "Saints," or historical environmentalists, naturalists and scientists, who have contributed to protection of wildlife throughout history. The memorising of species and the names and deeds of the Saints serves a function beyond commemorating martyrs and extinct animals or the need to provide the Gardeners with holidays. Baccolini (115) considers the importance of memory and history in resistance and maintenance of hope for the dystopian protagonists and argues that "history, its knowledge, and memory are . . . dangerous elements that can give the dystopian citizen a potential instrument of resistance." She (116) further maintains that, in critical dystopias, history is necessary so that resistance can be developed and hope maintained. The activity of memorising historical species destroyed by humans and commemorating environmentalists thus constantly reminds the Gardeners of the destructive nature of the society around them and warns them of the consequences of ignoring the doctrine they are being taught. As Baccolini (119) notes, in dystopian fiction, "[o]nly those who choose to remember are capable of taking responsibility for their actions and being accountable." In the MaddAddam trilogy, the Gardeners assume this responsibility and accountability.

The question of how the Gardeners are so certain of the arrival of the Waterless Flood is a significant one. After the virus has destroyed most of the humanity, Toby reveals to Zeb her suspicions relating to the fact that Crake knew some of the Gardeners and received the pills containing the basis for the virus from them:

> "Do you think Pilar knew what use [Crake would] make of those microbes or viruses or whatever they were?" she asks. "Eventually?" She remembers Pilar's wrinkled little face, her kindness, her serenity, her strength. But underneath, there had always been a hard resolve. You wouldn't call it meanness or evil. Fatalism, perhaps.

> "Let's put it this way," says Zeb. "All the real Gardeners believed the human race was overdue for a population crash. It would happen anyway, and maybe sooner was better." (*MA*, 330)

Zeb does not reveal more about the issue, but his remark raises the question of whether some of the Gardeners, Adam One included, knew for a fact that the end of humankind was indeed on its way, and whether they knowingly aided in its realisation. Other evidence pointing to the fact that some of the Adams and Eves, or Adam One at least, knew about the nature of the Waterless Flood is that Adam One, in one of his sermons, underlines the importance of hand-washing and avoiding people who are sneezing (*YF*, 92). This advice alone does not prove that Adam One is warning his listeners of anything other than the myriad of diseases roaming in the pleeblands. However, Adam One constantly reminds his listeners that the Waterless Flood is on its way (*YF* 126, 234, 312) and is convinced that the disaster will be caused by humans: "[The Waterless Flood] will be carried on the wings of God's dark Angels that fly by night, and in airplanes and helicopters and bullet trains, and on transport trucks and other such conveyances" (*YF*, 91). Again, Adam One could be simply imbuing his sermon with details to make it more interesting for the listeners, but the fact that the virus is distributed in BlyssPlus pills, which are delivered by the means described by him, appears more than a coincidence. Adam One attributes the human cause of the Waterless Flood to God's promise to Noah's progeny according to which he will never again eradicate most of the Creation (*YF*, 90), but there is a distinct possibility that he has factual knowledge to support his view.

Despite their resentment of the ways of the society around them, the God's Gardeners share many features with the Corporations in their effort to educate people and spread their own ideology. They employ the apparatuses of religion and education to further their own cause, and only allow access to the 'truths' of the Gardener doctrine by prohibiting computers and other media. Language and history are employed to instil counter-hegemonic consciousness in the members. Adam One is well aware of the fact that the group he leads is more a resistance group than a religious community and it can be argued that it was designed to be one from the beginning. He openly admits that the Gardeners "should mould young minds" by recruiting children (*YF*, 78). He tells Toby – who feels

it would be hypocritical of her to join the upper echelon of the Gardeners, the Adams and Eves,

because of her lack of faith – that it is more important that she acts "as if" she believed (*YF*, 168).

Importance placed on action over faith supports the notion that the Gardeners place less importance

on the matters of religion and more on the political action of resistance. Toby also questions Adam

One about the necessity of discussing and debating minute theological questions and he concedes

that the tendency of humans to believe in gods "must confer an evolutionary advantage" (*YF*, 241)

and can be made use of:

> "The strictly materialist view – that we're an experiment animal protein has been doing on itself – is far too harsh and lonely for most, and leads to nihilism. That being the case, *we need to push popular sentiment in a biosphere-friendly direction* by pointing out the hazards of annoying God by a violation of His trust in our stewardship."
> "What you mean is, with God in the story there's a penalty," said Toby.
> "Yes," said Adam One. "There's a penalty without God in the story too, needless to say. But people are less likely to credit that. If there's a penalty, they want a penalizer. They dislike senseless catastrophe." (Ibid., my emphasis)

Thus, Adam One practically acknowledges that religious beliefs can be used to mould popular

opinion and that in modifying people's behaviour, the factual penalty of materialist lifestyle –

environmental destruction – is less effective than invoking God's wrath. Therefore, it appears that

religion is used mainly as a tool to attract members and create a sense of community, and spiritual

guidance provided is but an added benefit.

It is pointed out that "[Adam One] always seemed to know if there was something unusual

going on. Amanda said it was just like he had a phone" (*YF*, 151). He does not necessarily have

one, because phones are seen as a liability among the Gardeners, but the Adams and Eves do have a

secret laptop, as Toby discovers after rising in the ranks (*YF*, 188). Adam One also engages, with

other Adams and Eves, in censoring news "for wider consumption" (*YF*, 172). For instance, after

Pilar's death, he asks Toby not tell others about the fact that Pilar died by her own hand:

> Final self-journeying is a moral option only for the experienced and, I have to say, only for the terminally ill, as Pilar was; but it's not one we should make widely available – especially not to our young people, who are impressionable and prone to indulge in morbid sulking and false heroics. (*YF*, 182)

After notifying the Gardeners about Pilar's death, Adam One apologises to Toby for lying about the cause of death and says that "I must sometimes say things that are not transparently honest. But it is for the greater good" (*YF*, 184). Lying and "editing" the truth are thus seen as necessary to protect the community from unfavourable influences.

The Gardeners or even Adam One himself are not quite so adamantly against violence as the sermons and education suggest; relating to poisoning someone, Pilar tells Toby that "[y]ou never know . . . [w]hen you might have to" (*YF*, 101), and Adam himself counts on Zeb to murder the Rev, his (Adam's) own father, by using the pills smuggled from HelthWyzer and appears to be unabashed after his death:

> "I counted on you to act as the situation would dictate," said Adam. "Nor was my confidence misplaced."
> Zeb was outraged: his cunning bastard of a big brother had set him up, the shit! . . .
> "Regrettable," said Adam. "And I do regret it. But may I point out that, as a result, that man is permanently off our case." (*MA*, 308)

Zeb later tells Toby that "Adam depended on" Zeb's lack of "goodness," because Adam himself "never would have turned the Rev into a raspberry soda with his own two hands" (*MA*, 333). Zeb believes Adam "was going to do the Rev thing himself, but do it right – everything the Rev had pretended to be, he would be in reality. It was a tall order" (*MA*, 333). Although Adam One's intentions may be good, he appears to be a great deal more calculating and manipulative than what his role as the leader of a religious community would at first suggest, and his methods do not differ very much from those of his father. He condones at least one murder (that of his own father), he knows about the lethal bioforms that Zeb uses to kill the Rev and entrusts Crake with them (possibly knowing what the repercussions may be), he uses religion to advance his cause and allows a hierarchy of organisation, where the upper strata (Adams and Eves) control which news and information regular members receive. It can, then, be asked whether the God's Gardeners are any better than the Corporations – whether their ends justify their means. Even if what the Corporations do is wrong and false from the moral realist perspective, and militancy may be the only means to resist the dystopian ruler that violently quells all opposition, surely resistance does not require

deceit and elimination of the humankind. MaddAddam, for instance, is a radical activist group, but they do not resort to the methods of the Corporations (this will be considered in the following section). However, the Gardeners are, on the surface, adamantly against violence and advocate non-violent means to the extent that they separate from the MaddAddamites.

The Gardener activities of teaching values that undermine the ideology of the Corporations can be understood as belonging to Gramsci's notion of the "war of position," which refers to the long-term "process of siege warfare" waged by the counter-hegemonic actor against the civil society after which the goal is to create a new civil society (Egan, 523). Gramsci views the war of position, once it is won, as "definitely decisive," while a "war of maneuver," a "frontal assault" against the state, can be difficult to win in the field of politics as long as the hegemony does not "fully mobilize" its resources (2007, 109). (The war of manoeuvre will be discussed in more detail in the following section). In other words, if a revolutionary group seeks to overthrow the ruling class by means of a frontal assault, they are likely to fail if they do not gain the consent of the citizens through civil society. Thus, the Gardeners engage in a war of position where they attempt to create a new civil society and gain support and consent for their values. The war of position relates to Femia's point above about the need for professional revolutionaries whose responsibility it is to educate the masses and create a new society. However, in order to change the rulers, a war of position would need to be combined with a war of manoeuvre, a frontal assault. As the Gardeners do not condone violent means of resistance, they do not engage in a war of manoeuvre, and there is no actual possibility of revolution. The success of the Gardeners largely hinges on the Waterless Flood to turn the situation in their favour, because shortly before the virus is distributed by Crake, the Gardeners become outlawed and it seems that had the virus not caused the collapse of society and the CorpSeCorps, the Gardeners would have eventually been eliminated. This leads to the following conclusions: either Adam One was indifferent to the fact that the Gardeners faced elimination or trusted that they would somehow survive by staying hidden, or he knew that the virus would soon enable a new beginning. If the latter is the case, justification for allowing Crake to

create and release the virus is difficult to provide. The answer to whether the God's Gardeners would have provided a utopian or a dystopian society for its members once the Corporations were gone is left unanswered, because the Gardeners under the leadership of Adam One do not survive the aftermath of the Waterless Flood.

Many of the characters who are not subjected to counter-hegemony in the form of a unified doctrine nonetheless exhibit thoughts and actions that are contrary to the values of the existing order. Jimmy and his mother as well as Toby prior to her life with the Gardeners all display signs of resisting the existing order – of thinking that something about the society is unacceptable. They do not necessarily act in opposition of the Corporations, but they do not readily accept their ideology, either.

Jimmy, despite his sheltered Compound life, feels disturbed or even outraged over some of the things he witnesses. For instance, when he visits Crake at Watson-Crick and is introduced to the chicken growth unit, he is horrified: "The thing was a nightmare. It was like an animal-protein tuber" (*OC*, 202). At the end of the Watson-Crick tour Jimmy has difficulties in listening to what Crake has to say because he is "worrying about the ChickieNobs and the wolvogs. Why is it he feels some line has been crossed, some boundary transgressed? How much is too much, how far is too far?" (*OC*, 206). Jimmy also exhibits rebellious thoughts and behaviour in his defence of his education that is seen as useless by most of the society; he spends a great deal of time in the old-fashioned library of Martha Graham reading physical copies of books: "Part of what impelled him was stubbornness; resentment, even. The system had filed him among the rejects . . . Well then, he would pursue the superfluous as an end in itself. He would be its champion, its defender and preserver" (*OC*, 195). Here, again can be seen the role of preservation and memory in order to "'speak back' to hegemonic power" (Moylan 2000, 149), although Jimmy does not engage in memorising and preservation as systematically as the Gardeners and appears to do it more out of spite rather than in an attempt to inspire counter-hegemonic consciousness.

Jimmy's rebellious thoughts surface again after he is shown his mother's execution: "What he really wanted was revenge. But *against whom, and for what*? Even if he had the energy for it, even if he could focus and aim, such a thing would be less than useless" (*OC*, 260, my emphasis). Jimmy is unable to direct his anger over the execution at any definite power structure, even at the CorpSeCorps who were responsible for the execution, as they only do the bidding of the nearly invisible ruling Corporations. Jimmy also sees resistance as hopeless – an attitude which directly benefits the ruling class, as there is no need for propaganda nor 'Grand Inquisitors;' the citizen does the convincing her/himself.

It is also remarkable that when Jimmy conjures the origin myth of the Crakers after the collapse of the old society, he tells the Crakers that what existed before them was chaos where people were "killing other people all the time" and "eating up all the children of Oryx [i.e. animals] . . . even when they weren't hungry" (*OC*, 103). Even though Jimmy's attitude towards the origin story is not entirely serious, the fact that he feels the need to mention the greed and evilness of humans, particularly as he is in a position in which he could invent nearly anything and the Crakers would believe it, reveals his awareness of the problems in the former society ruled by the Corporations. However, Jimmy appears unable, or unwilling, to trace the source of his unhappiness and discomfort to the systemic level, although he is aware of the wrongdoings of the Corporations and people in the society. Even though Jimmy's problems do not all stem directly from the social order – like his problematic mother-relationship – he fails to see the social order as the root cause for many of the issues. For instance, he does not appear to truly comprehend why his mother is depressed, although he remembers the disagreements between his mother and father he eavesdropped on:

> "It's wrong, the whole organization is wrong, it's a moral cesspool and you know it."
> "We can give people hope. Hope isn't ripping off!"
> "At NooSkins' prices it is. [. . .] Don't you remember the way we used to talk, everything we wanted to do? Making life better for people – not just people with money. You used to be so . . . you had ideals, then."
> "Sure," said Jimmy's father in a tired voice. "I've still got them. I just can't afford them." (*OC*, 56–57)

The dialogue reveals that Jimmy's mother and father were once idealistic scientists who have had to give up their ideals of doing scientific research to help people. Giving up the ideals has proven more difficult for Jimmy's mother, who eventually escapes from the HelthWyzer Compound to the pleeblands. Jimmy and the other children do not understand why their parents "[moan] on about" the world of the past "*when you could drive everywhere,*" "*when everyone lived in the pleeblands,*" "*when you could fly anywhere in the world, without fear*" or "*when voting mattered*" (*OC*, 63, italics in original). Jimmy's generation has no frame of reference and cannot see why the older generations would place value on things like free and fair elections or yearn after the old world. This yearning becomes an object of mockery in Jimmy's popular lunch-time shows at school, where his hand-puppet "Righteous Mom" blames "Evil Dad" for "hemorrhoids, kleptomania, global conflict, bad breath, tectonic-plate fault lines, and clogged drains, as well as every migraine headache and menstrual cramp [she] had ever suffered" (*OC*, 60). As was discussed above, history and memory have an important role in enabling resistance and the fact that Jimmy's generation makes fun of the memories and history of the older generation, but are also generally unable to question and resist the corporate hegemony suggests that memory is vital in enabling resistance. I argue that it is no coincidence that the characters who are the most adamant against the Corporations are the ones who remember how things were before the corpocracy came about. Following Baccolini, Moylan (2000, 149) points out the importance of memory for the people who rebel against the social order in a dystopia and notes that "dystopian subjects usually lose all recollection of the way things were before the new order." The loss of recollection can be seen in Jimmy and his generation, while the older generations, including Toby, Zeb and Adam, can remember the time before the corporate hegemony and have "the ability to draw on the alternative truths of the past" (ibid.).

Although Jimmy mocks his parents, he shares his mother's idealistic qualities. He displays rebellious thoughts, as mentioned above, and also insists on defending the humanist conception of human potential and ingenuity, and resisting the notion that humans are simply comparable to

animals. When arguing with Crake about art, he defends its significance: "Images, words, music. Imaginative structures. Meaning – human meaning, that is – is defined by them. You have to admit that" (*OC*, 167). Similarly, Jimmy advocates abstract human emotions such as love and hope. He refuses to believe that "everything has a price," as Oryx claims, and believes that love cannot be bought (*OC*, 139). He points out to Crake that human beings are "doomed without hope" and is displeased when Crake points out that that only applies to individuals, not the species (*OC*, 120). It is notable that people around Jimmy repeatedly tell him to "grow up," but this is not solely because he acts in a juvenile manner; Crake and Oryx appear to regard him as naïve when he is outraged by the fact that Oryx was sexually abused and forced to act in pornography as a child. These exchanges reveal a great deal not only about Jimmy but about the society in general, where abuse of children has become so commonplace that feeling outrage over it is regarded idealistic.

Although Jimmy is a flawed character, who mistreats women and is prone to drinking, his idealism and silent rebellion against the system appears to be innate. He knows that things are wrong in the society, but he lacks a definite target for his rage unlike the Gardeners, partly because he has not experienced the world before corpocracy and partly because he is constantly bombarded by corporate hegemony and kept complacent with consumerism, which leaves him hollow and depressed. *Oryx and Crake*, and the MaddAddam trilogy as a whole, criticises the view of human nature being reducible to flaws and biological mismatches and the idea that things not measurable by profit are without meaning.

Before joining the Gardeners, Toby displays thoughts similar to Jimmy's about something being wrong in the world: "Surely I was an optimistic person back then. Back there, I woke up whistling. I knew there were things wrong in the world, they were referred to, I'd seen them in the onscreen news. But the wrong things were wrong *somewhere else*" (*YF*, 239, my emphasis). This attitude can be observed in our contemporary world, where people acknowledge that there are many things wrong in the world, but as long as they do not affect our personal lives, they do not require

our attention. It is perhaps here where the cautionary nature of the trilogy becomes the most obvious; it warns the reader against passivity before it is too late to act:

> By the time she'd reached college, the wrongness had moved closer. She remembers the oppressive sensation, like waiting all the time for a heavy stone footfall, then the knock at the door. Everybody knew. Nobody admitted to knowing. If other people began to discuss it, you tuned them out, because what they were saying was both so obvious and so unthinkable.
> *We're using up the Earth. It's almost gone.* You can't live with such fears and keep on whistling. (*YF*, 239, italics in original)

The passivity is here underlined by pointing out that everybody knew about the wrongness, but it was seen as something that is unavoidable and, at the same time, unthinkable. The trilogy warns about the exacerbating environmental situation as well as the increasing power of corporations, and urge to take action. As Moylan (2000, 277) notes,

> [b]y means of their creative speculation, [critical dystopian texts] help to revive and expand the popular political imagination in the name of progressive transformation. They offer the prophetic challenge to go and do likewise, to become aware and fight back, possibly in a world that is not (yet) as bad as the one on their pages.

While classical dystopian fiction serve as warnings of potential bleak futures, critical dystopias, with their utopian impulse, more strongly suggest that the societies described on their pages can not only be avoided, but also that the societies which gave them rise can be improved towards a utopia. Dystopian fiction rarely gives explicit answers as to what should be done in order to avoid the situation described in it and the MaddAddam trilogy is no exception. Rather, dystopias aim to raise awareness about the issues, allowing the readers to act, to discuss and to resist detrimental development.

In this section, I have examined counter-hegemonic and (mainly) non-violent resistance against the established order in the novels. In the following, and the final section before the conclusions, I will consider the violent insurgency opposing the Corporations.

4.2 Violent insurgency

Violent strategies of opposing the existing social order, are not, similarly to the force and coercion employed by the Corporations, strictly part of the (counter-)hegemonic means of influence. However, as force and coercion are used to support the power of the elite, so are violent or forceful reactions *against* the existing order a notable means of dissent. In this section, I will discuss the MaddAddamites, the renegade Gardener group established by Zeb, and Crake's extreme 'solution,' which goes beyond the strategies used by other groups or organisations. Although Crake's terrifying plan is easily dismissible as simply the work of a 'mad scientist,' there are notable connections between Crake's logic and the ideas of the Gardeners, as was already briefly considered in the previous section. These connections will be considered in more detail presently.

The MaddAddamites are the result of a split within the Gardeners following the disagreements over the acceptable activities of the group. As was discussed earlier, the Gardener doctrine is, at least on the surface, pacifistic. There is, however, a significant number of members within the group who feel that what the Gardeners do is ineffective by itself and that more radical steps need be taken. Toby, during her time as an Eve, notices Zeb's "lurking insubordination" in his behaviour, as he mocks Adam One's way of speaking when he is not present (*YF*, 242). Toby also considers the fact that Zeb has, as Adam One's right-hand man, a notable amount of power among the Gardeners:

> The soft hammer of [Adam One's] word carried a lot of weight at the Gardener conventions, and since he was rarely there to use that hammer himself, Zeb wielded it for him. Which must be a temptation: what if Zeb were to jettison Adam One's decrees and substitute his own? By such methods had regimes been changed and emperors toppled. (*YF*, 243)

Zeb's insubordination does not lead to a change of regime or toppling of Adam One, but after Zeb and some of the younger Gardeners get into a fight with a SecretBurgers manager, disagreements between Zeb and Adam One escalate further:

> "Ours is the way of peace," said Adam One, frowning even more.
> "Peace only goes so far," said Zeb. "There's at least a hundred new extinct species since this time last month. They got fucking eaten! We can't just sit here and watch the lights blink out. . . ."

> "Our role in respect to the Creatures is to bear witness," said Adam One. "And to guard the memories and the genomes of the departed. You can't fight blood with blood. I thought we'd agreed on that." (*YF*, 252–253)

In this passage, the preservation and memorisation aspect of the Gardener doctrine can again be seen. Eventually, due to their ideological disagreements, Zeb and Adam One end up leading MaddAddam and the God's Gardeners, respectively.

The MaddAddamites take a less pacifistic approach than the Gardeners, but their activities do not involve killing people. Former MaddAddamites Shackleton, Crozier and Oates tell Ren and Amanda that the aim of the group was to "destroy the infrastructure" so that "the planet could repair itself" and that "Zeb didn't believe in killing people, not as such" (*YF*, 333). Similarly, Crake points out to Jimmy that the MaddAddamites "[are] after the whole system, they want to shut it down" (*OC*, 217). Attacks on the infrastructure are carried out by using various bioforms created by the scientist-members of MaddAddam: "a tiny parasitic wasp had invaded several ChickieNobs installations, carrying a modified form of chicken pox" (*OC*, 216), "a new form of the common house mouse addicted to the insulation on electric wiring had overrun Cleveland, causing an unprecedented number of house wires" (ibid.), "the splice porcubeaver that was attacking the fan belts in cars, the bean weevil that was decimating Happicuppa coffee plantations, the asphalt-eating microbe that was melting highways" (*YF*, 270). MaddAddam, however, has relatively little time to resist the Corporations before Crake unleashes of the killer virus, and there is no evidence in the trilogy of what the long-term plans of the group would have been, besides the aim of destroying the infrastructure.

MaddAddam's goal of destroying the infrastructure fits under the Gramscian war of manoeuvre mentioned above, which Morton (190) describes as "analogous to a rapid targeted assault targeted directly against the institutions of state power, the capture of which would prove only transitory." As discussed earlier, the transitory nature of the war of manoeuvre means that the war of position, that is, the slow erosion of old civil society institutions, should follow or accompany the direct assault, or the 'victory' may not be lasting. Gramsci (1971, 232) notes that a

war of manoeuvre is essential "for certain classes," but it is politics that should have precedence and that "creates the possibility for manœuvre and movement." In the discussion about the Gardeners above, it could be seen that the war of position alone was not effective against the coercive power of the Corporations. The hegemony of the Corporations could have been successfully overturned, if the Gardeners and the MaddAddamites had waged the 'two wars' in coordination – that is, endeavoured to instil the new counter-hegemonic consciousness into the populace as well as fought against the CorpSeCorps eventually overthrowing the Corporations. As it is, however, the killer virus ultimately decides the outcome.

At first glance, Crake would appear to be the last person to oppose the existing order, as he is educated in a Compound institute in the field of science, works for one of the biggest Corporations, and appears to share the world-view of other corporate scientists. In addition, he betrays the MaddAddamites whom he was informing, and forces some of them to work in his Paradice project to participate in the creation of the Crakers.

However, throughout the novels, there are indications of Crake's plan and his opinion on the need for a change in the world. The hypothetical situations he presents Jimmy with as well as the discussions he has with Ren reveal much about his opinions on the humankind:

> "[H]ow much needless despair has been caused by a series of biological mismatches, a misalignment of hormones and pheromones? . . . As a species we're pathetic in that way: imperfectly monogamous. If we could only pair-bond for life, like gibbons, or else opt for total guilt-free promiscuity . . ." (*OC*, 166)

Crake views the fundamental human emotion, love, as a fault in humans and would prefer humans to act like "other mammals" in terms of sexual intercourse. When Jimmy attempts to defend courtship behaviour and art – which he feels would suffer if humans had no "free choice" over their partners – Crake dismisses art as nothing more but a means for the human males to attempt to attract females, "a stab at getting laid" (*OC*, 168). Female artists he simply terms "biologically confused" (ibid.) without grounds for the argument. Even if the latter statements are aimed at provoking Jimmy, it can be seen that Crake views humans as little more than faulty animals. Things that are often viewed as separating humans from animals, such as art and abstract thought, Crake

considers bereft of meaning other than the biological impetus. In Jimmy's words, "Crake had no very high opinion of human ingenuity, despite the large amount of it he himself possessed" (*OC*, 99). Notably, regardless of the fact that Crake and the God's Gardeners have vastly different views of the world, they share the idea that humans and animals are on an equal standing and refuse the idea of anthropocentrism.

Crake's antihumanist sentiment is further evinced by his views about the cause of the world's problems: "Sometimes he'd say he was working on solutions to the biggest problem of all, which was *human beings* – their cruelty and suffering, their wars and poverty, their fear of death" (*YF*, 305, my emphasis). He also points out the precarious nature of human civilization: "'All it takes,' said Crake, 'is the elimination of one generation. One generation of anything. . . . Break the link in time between one generation and the next and it's game over forever.'" (*OC*, 223). Recovering from the end of civilization, he explains to Jimmy, would be impossible because all the surface metal has been mined and repurposing the metal found in buildings and elsewhere would require skills that the future generations would not be able to attain (ibid.). These views reveal that Crake's attitude is far from the Corporations' goals of continuous profit-making.

Crake's two-step solution to the "problem" facing the world – the human race – is palpably different from anything imagined even by the staunchest critics of the society. Even the Gardeners, many of whom welcome the Waterless Flood, are not prepared for the fact that a new (sub)species of humans was designed to replace the *homo sapiens sapiens*. Crake's solution is coldly logical, a quality that Jimmy's mother, for instance, admires in Crake: "You could have an objective conversation with him, a conversation in which events and hypotheses were followed through to their logical conclusions" (*OC*, 69). Although morally reprehensible, Crake's solution is logical if one accepts Crake's premises that the human race is the cause of all problems to the ecosystem and that humanity in its present form has no inherent value. In this case a logical (but not ethical nor sensible) step could indeed be "to kill the king" (*YF*, 228), that is, to remove the 'faulty' human race. Curiously, Crake is not content with eradicating the human race, but decides to replace it with

an upgraded version of humans that lack all the features that he sees as causing problems. Crake represents extreme scientific positivism and utilitarian thought and acts as a caution of the dangers of unbridled scientism in which no regard is given to the human. In my view, Crake's solution to unleash the virus is violent insurgency taken to the extreme.

However, Crake's solution, despite its supposed brilliance (at least in Crake's mind), does not necessary entail what Adam hopes will become "a new Eden" (*OC*, 345). The remaining God's Gardeners led by Adam are satisfied that they have achieved a new world: "What a cause for rejoicing is this rearranged world in which we find ourselves! . . . [H]ow privileged we are to witness these first precious moments of Rebirth! How much clearer the air is, now that man-made pollution has ceased!" (*YF*, 371). They, as well as the surviving MaddAddamites, soon notice that the 'evilness' of humans has not been eliminated, as the Painballers, who have no empathic qualities whatsoever, capture and rape Amanda and Ren, kill Adam and one of the MaddAddamites, and slaughter several Pigoons (sapient pigs with human tissue in them). When the Painballers are eventually captured, the MaddAddamite community has to address the problem of ensuring the safety of the community and the Pigoons. A trial is held and the decision to execute the Painballers is nearly unanimous. Here it can be seen that even after the Waterless Flood, the old problems of good and evil, and crime and punishment have not ceased to exist and, at the end of *MaddAddam*, it is hinted that strife between humans has not ceased with the execution of the Painballers, as members of a MaddAddamite scouting party are killed by a hostile group of other survivors.

Furthermore, the Crakers are not as perfect as Crake imagined them to be. What Crake called the "G-spot in the brain" (*OC*, 157), the tendency of belief in God and the supernatural, was supposed to be removed from the Crakers, but thanks to Jimmy they adopt a dogma, the main deity of which, ironically, is Crake. They also create an effigy of Snowman (Jimmy) to call him back from his foraging trip – a practice that appears to Snowman as praying. Additionally, Toby teaches one of the Crakers, Blackbeard, to read, and at the end of *MaddAddam* it is revealed that the Crakers have transcribed everything they have learnt from Jimmy and Toby as well as the history of

the Crakers and the MaddAddamite community – essentially creating a holy book. The Crakers thus adopt many of the features that Crake wished to remove: "[s]ymbolic thinking of any kind would signal a downfall, in Crake's view. Next they'd be inventing idols, and funerals, and grave goods, and the afterlife, and sin, and Linear B, and kings, and then slavery and war" (*OC*, 361). It is debatable whether the Crakers are human at all without all of the features Crake viewed as problematic. Even after developing symbolic thought they are highly distinct from the 'old humans,' although biologically they are similar enough to be able to reproduce with *homo sapiens sapiens*.

The ending of the trilogy refuses a clear resolution and leaves the future of human survivors and the Crakers open to interpretation. Whether the human-Craker hybrids will be flawed like humans or retain pacifistic qualities, whether other survivors will eventually take advantage of the Crakers who are not capable of defending themselves, whether 'old humans' will cease to be, and whether the nascent religion of the Crakers will eventually cause dogmatic clashes, conflicts and even war, are all questions that are left unanswered. The reader has to decide whether to read the ending as a return to the road to dystopia or whether a utopian Eden will finally be achieved. The tendency to end the dystopian narrative before the society is rebuilt is common in many dystopias, and can be seen as a means to sidestep the difficult question of how an improved society can actually be built. For Moylan (2000, 199), however, the reason for such open endings lies elsewhere:

> With their . . . open endings that look beyond the last page to other rounds of contestation . . . the critical dystopias do not simply come down on the side of an unproblematized Utopia or a resigned and triumphant Anti-Utopia. Albeit generally, and stubbornly, utopian, they do not go easily toward that better world. Rather, they linger in the terrors of the present even as they exemplify what is needed to transform it.

The MaddAddam trilogy, too, looks beyond its last page and provides the reader with neither utopia nor anti-utopia, but empowers its readers by allowing them to decide what kind of future awaits the characters, thus encouraging the readers to decide what kind of future their own society will have, while warning them of the worrying developments taking place in the society they live in.

In this chapter, I have analysed how the social order in the trilogy is contested by using both non-violent and violent strategies, and what consequences these strategies have. I have examined the anomaly that is Crake's solution to the problem of corporate greed, or what Crake more profoundly sees as the problem of human nature, and considered how the trilogy functions as a critical dystopia.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to demonstrate how power is maintained and resisted in the society described in the MaddAddam trilogy and how the trilogy represents a critical dystopia, which criticises neoliberal tendencies in Western societies. My analysis suggests that the trilogy lends itself to neo-Marxist and neo-Gramscian readings fairly well in terms of hegemony and ideology. The Corporations employ a wide range of hegemonic means, in the form of ideological state apparatuses, to ensure the acquiescence of citizens, and the power of the corporate elite rests mainly on the unawareness and gratification of citizens rather than direct use of force. The trilogy cautions the reader of what might happen if neoliberalism is allowed to run its course by depicting corporate dominance taken to its extreme logical conclusion and by drawing parallels to actual developments in the contemporary world.

In the first analysis chapter I examined how the Corporations maintain their power through the hegemonic institutions and force. My analysis suggests that the most significant institutions in terms of hegemony in the trilogy are consumerism, science, and education, while entertainment and media serve more to induce complacency rather than spread ideology. The analysis of religion revealed that there are fairly few instances of its ideological force in the novels, which lead to the conclusion that, in the society of the trilogy, it has not as significant a role as was hypothesised.

Even though citizens in the trilogy are aware of the problems in the society, most of them, with the exception of the God's Gardeners, either lack the means to dissent or do not know how to direct their discontent. The Corporations do employ physical force to reinforce consent, but doing so is not the primary means of maintaining power and only becomes more significant when a truly threatening counter-hegemony is propagated by the Gardeners.

In the second analysis chapter I considered the forces that subvert the corporate hegemony in the trilogy. The God's Gardeners, as the most notable counter-hegemonic actor, engage in various counter-hegemonic activities, such as preserving and teaching history. The Gardeners also utilise many of the methods and apparatuses that the Corporations do in order to establish a basis for a new

society. The Gardener activities are, from a moral point of view, problematic, particularly if some of the highest-ranking Gardeners knowingly aided in the destruction of humanity by entrusting Crake with the lethal virus. In addition to the Gardeners, the Corporations also meet violent resistance from the MaddAddamites, as they attempt to destroy the infrastructure of the society. Finally, the virus unleashed by Crake destroys not only the Corporations, but nearly all of humankind, enabling an open ending for the narrative.

Throughout my analysis, I considered how the MaddAddam trilogy compares to classical dystopia narratives as well as how it can be seen as criticising contemporary societies for their tendency to adopt policies that attempt to introduce global neoliberalism under the guise of increased personal freedoms. The trilogy can be seen as a break from the classical dystopian literature and representing the new, critical dystopian literature, which does not refuse a utopian reading but which neither imposes one. Rather, the trilogy leaves the decision to the reader by introducing the apocalyptic event and enabling a potential new beginning for humanity.

I shall now briefly consider the limitations of this study and suggest potential further research. Because of the scope of the thesis, my focus has been on what I view as the most significant institutions in the maintenance of corporate power and the most notable actors resisting this power. I am aware that other forces related to power in the trilogy could be considered, and the significance of language and discourse, for instance, could be expounded on in further studies. The hegemonic effects of institutions selected under observation in this thesis could possibly also be examined in more detail in further studies. The theoretical framework used in this thesis rests mainly on the theories of Althusser and Gramsci as well as the discussions of their critics. In future research, other theories and discussions on power could additionally be discussed to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of how power is exercised and subverted in the trilogy. Finally, other dystopia narratives could be used to complement the MaddAddam trilogy in further studies.

With this thesis I hope to have participated in re-establishing the significance of neo-Marxist literary criticism and to have contributed to the study of increasingly popular dystopian fiction as well as the study of Margaret Atwood's literary production.

References

Primary sources

Atwood, Margaret. *MaddAddam*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

——. *Oryx and Crake*. 2003. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.

——. *The Year of the Flood*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.

Secondary sources

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. Ben Brewster. London: New Left Books, 1971. 121–173.

Anderson, Perry. "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci." *New Left Review* 100 (1976): 5–78.

Appleton, Sarah A. "Corp(Se)ocracy: Marketing Death in Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood*." *LATCH* 4 (2011): 63–73.

Aronowitz, Stanley. *Science as Power: Discourse and Ideology in Modern Society*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1988.

Atwood, Margaret. "Margaret Atwood: the Road to Ustopia." *The Guardian*. 14 October 2011. Web. Accessed 12 March 2015. < http://www.theguardian.com/books/2011/oct/14/margaret-atwood-road-to-ustopia>.

Baccolini, Raffaella. "'A useful knowledge is rooted in the past': Memory and Historical Reconciliation in Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Telling*." *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. Ed. Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan. New York: Routledge, 2003. 113–134.

Baccolini, Raffaella and Tom Moylan. Eds. *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Bates, Thomas R. "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony." *Antonio Gramsci: Critical Assessments of Leading Political Philosophers*. Ed. James Martin. London: Routledge, 2002. 245–262.

Bergthaller, Hannes. "Housebreaking the Human Animal: Humanism and the Problem of Sustainability in Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood*." *English Studies* 91.7 (2010): 728–743.

Bouson, J. Brooks. "'We're Using Up the Earth. It's Almost Gone': A Return to the Post-Apocalyptic Future in Margaret Atwood's *The Year of the Flood*." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 46.1 (2011): 9–26.

Bradbury, Ray. *Fahrenheit 451*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2012.

Duménil, Gérard and Dominique Lévy. "The Neoliberal (Counter-)Revolution." *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader*. Eds. Alfredo Saad-Filho and Deborah Johnston. London: Pluto Press, 2004. 9–19.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.

——. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell, 2008.

Egan, Daniel. "Rethinking War of Maneuver/War of Position: Gramsci and the Military Metaphor." *Critical Sociology* 40.4 (2014): 521–538.

Eveleth, Rose. "Cryopreservation: 'I Freeze People to Cheat Death'." *BBC*. 22 August 2014. Web. Accessed 25 April 2015. < http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20140821-i-will-be-frozen-when-i-die>.

Femia, Joseph V. "Hegemony and Consciousness in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci." *Antonio Gramsci: Critical Assessments of Leading Political Philosophers*. Ed. James Martin. London: Routledge, 2002. 263–286.

Fukuyama, Francis. "At the 'End of History' Still Stands Democracy." *The Wall Street Journal*. 6 June 2014. Accessed 20 March 2015. < http://www.wsj.com/articles/at-the-end-of-history-still-stands-democracy-1402080661>.

——. "The End of History?" *The National Interest* 16 (1989): 3–18.

Fulcher, James. *Capitalism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Gottlieb, Erika. *Dystopian Fiction East and West: Universe of Terror and Trial*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Prison Notebooks: Volume I*. Ed. Joseph A. Buttigieg. Trans. Joseph A. Buttigieg and Antonio Callari. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

——. *Prison Notebooks: Volume III*. Ed. and trans. Joseph A. Buttigieg. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

——. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.

Harvey, David. *Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hawkes, David. *Ideology*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Held, David and Anthony McGrew. *Globalisation/Anti-Globalization: Beyond the Great Divide*. Cambridge: Polity, 2007.

Hengen, Shannon. "Moral/Environmental Debt in *Payback* and *Oryx and Crake*." *Margaret Atwood: The Robber Bride, The Blind Assassin, and Oryx and Crake*. Ed. J. Brooks Bouson. London: Continuum, 2011. 129–140.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. London: Vintage, 2004.

Ingham, Geoffrey. *Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity, 2008.

McGowan, Todd. *End of Dissatisfaction? Jacques Lacan and the Emerging Society of Enjoyment*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004.

Merrington, John. "Theory and Practice in Gramsci's Marxism." *Antonio Gramsci: Critical Assessments of Leading Political Philosophers*. Ed. James Martin. London: Routledge, 2002. 7–35.

Mills, Sara. *Discourse*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Morton, Adam David. *Unravelling Gramsci: Hegemony and Passive Revolution in the Global Political Economy*. London: Pluto Press, 2007.

Moylan, Tom. *Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia*. Boulder: Westview, 2000.

——. "'The moment is here . . . and it's important': State, Agency and Dystopia in Kim Stanley Robinson's *Antarctica* and Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Telling*." *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. Ed. Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan. New York: Routledge, 2003. 135–153.

Munck, Ronaldo. "Neoliberalism and Politics, and the Politics of Neoliberalism." *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader*. Eds. Alfredo Saad-Filho and Deborah Johnston. London: Pluto Press, 2004. 60–69.

Murray, Kyle and Owen Worth. "Building Consent: Hegemony, 'Conceptions of the World' and the Role of Evangelicals in Global Politics." *Political Studies* 61 (2013): 731–747.

Narkunas, J. Paul. "Between Words, Numbers, and Things: Transgenics and Other Objects of Life in Margaret Atwood's MaddAddams." *Critique* 56.1 (2015): 1–25.

Neuman, Shirley. "'Just a Backlash': Margaret Atwood, Feminism, and *The Handmaid's Tale*." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 75.3 (2006): 857–868.

O'Neill, John. "Dying in a State of Grace: Memory, Duality, and Uncertainty in Margaret Atwood's *Alias Grace*." *Textual Practice* 27.4 (2013): 651–670.

Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin, 1989.

Pajnik, Mojca and Petra Lesjak-Tušek. "Observing Discourses of Advertising: Mobitel's Interpellation of Potential Customers." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 26.3 (2002): 277–299.

Plehwe, Dieter; Bernhard Walpen and Gisela Neunhöffer. *Neoliberal Hegemony: A Global Critique*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

Pritchard, Rosalind M.O. *Neoliberal Developments in Higher Education: The United Kingdom and Germany*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011.

Ratcliffe, Rebecca. "University protests around the world: a fight against commercialisation." *The Guardian* 25 March 2015. Web. Accessed 25 April 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2015/mar/25/university-protests-around-the-world-a-fight-against-commercialisation>.

Reid, Robert. "The Grand Inquisitor Scene in Dystopian Literature and Film." *Dostoevskii's Overcoat: Influence, Comparison and Transposition*. Eds. Joe Andrew and Robert Reid. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013. 275–296.

Salih, Sara. *Judith Butler*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Sanderson, Jay. "Pigoons, Rakunks and Crakers: Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* and Genetically Engineered Animals in a (Latourian) Hybrid World." *Law and Humanities* 7.2 (2013): 218–240.

Sargent, Lyman Tower. "The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited." *Utopian Studies* 5.1 (1994): 1–37.

Sklair, Leslie. *Globalization: Capitalism and its Alternatives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Stavrakakis, Yannis. "Objects of Consumption, Causes of Desire: Consumerism and Advertising in Societies of Commanded Enjoyment." *Gramma Journal of Theory and Criticism* 14 (2006): 83–106.

Steger, Manfred B. and Ravi K. Roy. *Neoliberalism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Stein, Karen F. "Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*: Scheherazade in Dystopia." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 61.2 (1991): 269–279.

Stoddart, Mark C.J. "Ideology, Hegemony, Discourse: A Critical Review of Theories of Knowledge and Power." *Social Thought & Research* 28 (2007): 191–226.

Storey, John. *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: An Introduction*. 4th ed. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2006.

Suvin, Darko. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Toron, Alison. "The Model Prisoner: Reading Confinement in *Alias Grace*." *Canadian Literature* 208 (2011): 12–28.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Vials, Chris. "Margaret Atwood's Dystopic Fiction and the Contradictions of Neoliberal Freedom." *Textual Practice* 29.2 (2015): 235–254.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.