

Survival and Postcolonialism in Timothy Findley's *Not Wanted on the Voyage*

Riikka Antikainen
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literary Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
May 2013

Tampereen yliopisto
Englantilainen filologia
Kieli-, käännös- ja kirjallisuustieteiden yksikkö

ANTIKAINEN, RIIKKA: Survival and Postcolonialism in Timothy Findley's *Not Wanted on the Voyage*

Pro Gradu -tutkielma, 68 sivua
Toukokuu 2013

Tarkastelen tutkimuksessani postkolonialismia ja selviytymistä Timothy Findleyn romaanissa *Not Wanted on the Voyage* (1984). Kyseistä romaania on tutkittu verraten vähän, vaikka eri tutkijat ovat päätyneet mitä erilaisimpiin tulkintoihin sen merkityksistä. Itse käsittelen sitä kanadalaisena, postkolonialistisena romaanina, jonka tärkeimmäksi teemaksi nousee selviytyminen. Lähtökohta tälle tulkinnalle on Margaret Atwoodin kirja *Survival*, josta on mahdollista löytää paljon yhtymiskohtia Findleyn romaaniin ja jonka sidon postkolonialistiseen käsitykseen itsestä ja toisesta.

Keskeisimmät tutkimuskysymykseni ovat miksi selviytyä, miten selviytyä ja mitä tapahtuu selviytymisen jälkeen. Näiden kysymysten pohjalta pohdin tarinaa myös kolonialistisen ja postkolonialistisen ajan allegoriana. Keskityn tutkimuksessani ensin henkilöihin ja olosuhteisiin, jotka luovat uhreja ja pakottavat selviytymään, minkä jälkeen käsittelen yksittäisiä hahmoja erilaisina uhreina. Lopuksi pohdin selviytymistä ajan ja maailman, tai yhteiskunnan, kannalta pyrkien sitomaan Findleyn romaanin laajempaan, postkolonialistiseen viitekehykseen.

Margaret Atwoodin mukaan kanadalaisen kirjallisuuden keskeisin teema on selviytyminen, joka on ollut välttämätöntä maan luonnon haastavissa olosuhteissa. Tämän seurauksena kanadalainen kirjallisuus on täynnä uhreja ja pyrinkin pohtimaan erilaisia uhripositioita Findleyn tekstissä. Sidon nämä positiot postkoloniaaliin käsitteisiin itse ja toinen, sillä jonkun näkeminen toisena, erilaisena omasta itsestä, mahdollistaa alistamisen ja sitä kautta uhri-aseman syntymisen. Tämä jako aiheuttaa myös binäärioppositioiden (*binary opposition*), kuten mies-nainen, elossa-kuollut, rakenteen, johon patriarkaalinen yhteiskunta perustuu.

Not Wanted on the Voyage korostaa solidaarisuuden ja monimuotoisuuden merkitystä selviytymisessä ja kritisoii sortoa, väkivaltaa ja toiseuden ylläpitämistä. Tärkein syy selvitä löytyy juuri yhteisöllisyydestä ja läheisistä huolehtimisesta. Muutoksen puolesta tulee taistella alistamisen sijaan, mutta on myös tärkeää muistaa ja oppia menneisyydestä. Tässä näemme yhteyden postkolonialistiseen maailmaan, jolle olisi tärkeää pyrkiä yhdistämään erilaisia ihmisiä ja ryhmiä saman tavoitteen alle. Tämä tavoite voisi olla se maailma, josta Findleyn romaanissa huhutaan: maailma, jossa kaikki saavat päättää omasta identiteetistään ja joka sallii ja iloitsee monimuotoisuudesta.

Avainsanat: postkolonialismi, kanadalainen kirjallisuus, Findley, selviytyminen, uhrit

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Defining postcolonialism and victimhood.....	7
2.1 Canadian literature and postcolonialism	7
2.2 Colonial Victimhood	14
3. Yaweh and Noah – colonial victimisers	22
3.1 A world of binary oppositions.....	22
3.2 Justifying the end of the world.....	29
4. Victims and survivors	34
4.1 Japeth – A victim in denial.....	34
4.2 Mottyl – Bare survival.....	37
4.3 Mrs Noyes – Transforming victimhood	41
4.4 Lucy – Refusing victimhood	45
5. Beyond survival.....	50
5.1 Solidarity and diversity	50
5.2 The past, the present and the future.....	54
6. Conclusion	62
Bibliography:.....	66

1. Introduction

Timothy Findley is a Canadian author who has written several novels, plays, memoirs and short story collections. He has also received several awards for his work, the most notable of these being the General Governor's Award for *The Wars* (1977) and again for his play *Elizabeth Rex* (2002) (Duffy&Johnson 2012). He was born in 1930 in Toronto, and first studied to become an actor (Brydon 1998, xiii). In fact, his writing career did not start but in the 1960's, after years of working as an actor (ibid.). Findley declared his homosexuality as a teenager, and though he married Janet Reich in 1958, the marriage was annulled on the same year (ibid.). In 1964, he moved in with writer William Whitehead who remained his partner until his death in 2002 (Brydon 1998, xiii). For years, they lived in Stone Orchard, a farm with trees and many animals like cats and horses (O'Malley&Potash).

Findley's first novel, *The Last of the Crazy People*, was published in 1967, but his writing career really kicked off in 1977 with the publishing of his third novel, the award-winning *The Wars*, establishing him also as an international writer (Duffy&Johnson 2012). It seems to be Findley's most researched novel and it tells us the story of Robert Ross, a young Canadian soldier in World War I through descriptions of images and moments. His next novel, *Famous Last Words*, consolidated his status as an important Canadian author (Brydon 1998, 53). *Famous Last Words* depicts the experiences of a fascist sympathiser during World War II (ibid.). In 1984, Findley published *Not Wanted on the Voyage*, a retelling of the story of Noah's ark, which is also the primary source of this thesis.

Findley's work has been interpreted as discussing themes like fascism, imperialism and the holocaust and their effect on sexuality, gender, mental health, environment and nature (Brydon 1998, vii-ix). Many of the latter themes are typical of the Southern Ontario Gothic genre, a sub-

genre of the Gothic novel that also includes writers like Margaret Atwood or Alice Munro (Hepburn&Hurley 1997). In Findley's novels, there are often animals and other "marginalized figures" like women and children as protagonists and the threat of the end of the world "shapes everything that Timothy Findley has written" (Brydon 1998, 9). This is also the case in *Not Wanted on the Voyage*.

In *Not Wanted on the Voyage*, Findley retells the story of Noah's ark by highlighting everything that is lost because of the flood. In this tale, Noah is not the hero, but the tyrant who decides who is wanted on the voyage and who is not. Focus is to great extent on the animals and characters who do not step into the ark, as well as the ones who have to live inside its monstrous, dark pit. The novel raises questions about power and the value of life and it centres on the survival of both different characters and the world itself: Who and what survives and who is not wanted on the voyage?

The novel is split into a prologue and four books. The prologue begins with "Everyone knows it wasn't like that" and contrasts the excursion "they make it sound [like]" and "the end of the world" it actually was (3). In the first book, Yaweh, outraged by mankind, visits the Noyes family and is struck by the idea of the flood. In Book Two, we follow the loading of the ark and the struggle of different characters when the rains begin. The book ends with the ark's door being closed from the Faeries and the rest of the world, leaving them all for dead. In the third book, we witness Noah's despotic rule on the ark and in the final book, there is first an attempt and then a successful revolution against Noah that changes power relations on the ark. However, we do not receive a decisive conclusion to the story: the ark is left drifting on the sea, with Noah's wife, Mrs Noyes, praying for more rain.

The cast of characters in *Not Wanted on the Voyage* is broad and diverse and it divides itself more or less to humans and animals. Yaweh, the creator of the world, turns out to be a frail, tired and irritable old man, who is fed up with the world he has created and especially the malcontent humans living in it. His friend, Doctor Noah Noyes, is the patriarchal, conservative head of the family, who becomes more and more violent towards other characters during the novel. His wife, the obedient and loving Mrs Noyes, is the protagonist of the story, who transforms into the defender of the weak when Noah's actions become too much to bear. They have three sons, the strong, but simple Shem, whose wife is the intimidating, cold Hannah, the scientific Ham, who marries Lucy the angel and the humiliated, insecure Japeth, whose young wife Emma refuses to sleep with him. Lucy is in fact Lucifer, but according to Findley, instead of falling down from heaven, she jumped herself to be able to choose her own identity. Her fellow angel, Michael Archangelis is Yaweh's protector who cannot understand Lucy's decision.

Just like Mrs Noyes is the protagonist in the world of humans, Mottyl, her cat, is that of the animal world. Mottyl is twenty years old and suffers from everything through cataracts to gout. In the forest, she has friends like the bird Crowe, the lemurs Bip and Ringer and the Unicorn with his Lady. We also meet the Faeries, dragons and demons, who do not survive to the world after the flood. Mrs Noyes's sheep do, but they lose their ability to sing. The Noyeses also have many other animals like peacocks and cows, though all farm animals seem to belong to Mrs Noyes, who dearly loves them all. Japeth, in his quest for manhood, has wolves.

As we can see, *Not Wanted on the Voyage* is very rich in characters, events and themes. It is possible that this is one of the reasons it has been analysed less than Findley's other novels. However, Donna Pennee suggests that this may be because the text's messages may have been considered too clear to need explanation, as her quote from Wilfred Crude reveals: "it is

ultimately not too difficult to point to the moral of this well-adorned tale, a beast fable emerging as Greenpeace epic in the nuclear age'” (quoted by Pennee 1993, 22-23). However, Pennee also reminds us that Findley is doing this deliberately to achieve "clarity obscured by facts" (Findley, quoted by Pennee 1993, 23). Findley's novel can definitely be read in many ways and making the decision between these ways is the challenge. As for a more personal motivation in choosing my subject, I first became interested in French-Canadian literature and then found Findley through searching for English-Canadian authors. His novel struck me immediately as unique and even baffling at times, which I believe to be a very good reason to research the novel.

Before 1993, there was little academic criticism on the novel except for intertextual criticism (Pennee 1993, 18). Michael Foley, for instance, finds parallels between the character Mrs Noyes and the medieval English mystery plays, in which Noah's wife is often portrayed as a drunk, gossiping woman, who causes Noah troubles (1991). However, later there has been interest in different kinds of readings, such as postcolonial and queer readings. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin use *Not Wanted on the Voyage* as an example of a postcolonial text in their influential *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures* (1989). What many critics have agreed upon since then is that the power of Noah and Yaweh is based on binary oppositions that create a patriarchal system of domination (Pennee 1993; Jefferess 2000; Lamont-Stewart 1997). Carinne Demousselle also compares male and female characters and their actions in the text, but from the viewpoint of antifascism (1995). There has been some ecological critique as well: Dorothy Nielsen discusses the novel as “an exemplary eco-feminist text” (1998) and Vincent Guihan concentrates on the animals and how they are treated (2009). Peter Dickinson (1998) and Cecilia Marteli (1996) analyse Findley's use of camp humour in his writing. Both Donna Pennee's book *Praying for Rain: Timothy Findley's Not Wanted on the*

Voyage (1993) and Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (1989) concentrate on language in the novel. Pennee (ibid.) explores different texts inside the novel, comparing especially patriarchal and alternative texts. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, on the other hand, argue that knowledge communicated through language is the main tool of power in the novel (1989, 98).

I will situate my thesis in Canadian studies and not simply because Findley is a Canadian author. In my thesis, I will comment and develop the discussion on *Not Wanted on the Voyage* as a postcolonial novel and then discuss how Findley's novel portrays Canadianness, or rather, the themes of Canadian literature. This is because of the connection I perceive between Findley's novel and Margaret Atwood's *Survival – A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature* (1973). Before the 1970's, Canadian literature was somewhat invisible even in Canada itself but this changed with the publication of the controversial *Survival*. It is a book about what is, or rather was, in the 1970's, characteristic of Canadian literature. *Survival* paints a grim picture of Canadian literature, as Atwood claims that the central question of Canadian literature is whether a character survives or not, and very often does not (1973, 33). Canadian literature is full of victims, suffering through hardships in nature and in their families, innocent animals being hunted by cruel humans and so forth (ibid.). This same kind of view had already been brought forth by other writers, including Northrop Frye (1971) and W. L. Morton (1961), but Atwood's easily approachable, polemical writing really ignited the discussion about Canadian literature. Findley's novel has many elements that are typically Canadian, like the catastrophe of the flood, the suffering animals and the question of who survives and who does not. I wish to explore these issues and figure out what makes *Not Wanted on the Voyage* a Canadian novel, even though it takes place in a non-realistic world with angels, dragons and Faeries.

The central questions I will be answering are, as regards to the story, how to survive, why survive and what happens after survival. My idea is to unite postcolonial analysis with Atwood's model of victimhood and different victim positions. In the theory section, I will discuss what is typical of Canadian literature and how victimhood is connected to it. I will also define the central terms of postcolonialism, such as the Other and binary opposition, which are essential to the analysis of the novel. In chapter three, I will examine the system in the novel that creates victims and thus, the need to survive. This system consists of the power structures Yaweh and Noah uphold by means of language, knowledge and tradition. In the next chapter, I will concentrate on certain individual victims who portray Atwood's different victim positions and different roles of the Other. The chapter will include the humiliated Japeth, who turns to violence, the suffering Mottyl, the mother-figure Mrs Noyes and the androgynous Lucy. In chapter five, I intend to consider survival on a broader level, discussing survival strategies that are used by different groups of characters, concentrating on the importance of solidarity and diversity that Findley seems to underline in his novel. I will then discuss survival in terms of time and place and compare the juxtaposition of endings and beginnings to the idea of infinity, both of which are present in the novel. I will attempt to show how central the theme of survival is in *Not Wanted on the Voyage*.

2. Defining postcolonialism and victimhood

In this section, I will discuss the theoretical background of my thesis, concentrating on Canadian literature as postcolonial literature and then moving on to postcolonial theory on a more general level. I am especially interested in the terms *victim* and *the Other*, and how they relate to each other.

2.1 Canadian literature and postcolonialism

Canada's history is not that of revolution and new frontiers, as that of its southern neighbour, the United States. Instead, its road from colonial dependence to self-government and freedom has been a slow evolution (Morton 1961, 31). Officially Canada is still part of the British Commonwealth and Queen Elizabeth II its monarch. For Canada, allegiance to the Crown was for long a "social and political necessity of national existence" (Morton 1961, 111). This allegiance extends to Canadian way of life itself: there are as many ways of life as there are Canadians, yet everyone is united under the Crown (*ibid.*). This forms the Canadian "cultural mosaic".

This diversity also affects the nature of Canadian government. Instead of the American ideals of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, the Canadian ideals are peace, order and good government which enable everyone to pursue their own happiness and liberty in different ways (Morton 1961, 111). This allows both the Canadian "cultural mosaic" and the different regions to flourish. In fact, Canada is the only country in the world with multiculturalism mentioned in its constitution (Richter 2011, xiii). However, there have been calls for separation especially in the French-speaking Quebec and this debate between the two founding nations of Canada is the biggest threat for Canadian unity (Richter 2011, 29). Nowadays, it is often considered that there

is a third community inside Canada in addition to the Anglo-Canadians and the Québécois, and that is First Nations.

Canada's history is characterised by European settlement and, thus, by colonialism. Colonialism can be defined as "the conquest and control of other people's land and goods"(Loomba 1998, 2). Decolonisation is the process of unravelling the imperial centre's power in the colonised country. The situation of Canada is therefore interesting, since its process of decolonisation has been very gradual and it is still officially part of the Commonwealth. One may ask whether Canada is a postcolonial country or not and more specifically why this should be. Postcolonialism has been defined in different, though partly overlapping, ways and that is where the answer to the question of Canada's postcoloniality may be found.

The widest definition of postcolonialism is that of Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, who include all cultures "affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day" (1989, 2). What postcolonial literatures have in common, then, is the concern with imperial power and the need to demonstrate the difference between the assumptions of the colonial power and the colony itself (ibid.). After all, ex-colonies will be affected by their history even after the actual process of decolonisation. In the same way, this definition would then include some of the literature written in the colonising country as well, since they have also been affected by colonialism. However, because of this definition, the scope of postcolonial studies has grown to such width that the field is hard to define (Ronning&Johanessen 2007, vii). If we still define postcolonial literatures in this manner, Canadian literature would indeed be included, since the discussion about Canadian literature was, for a long time, centred on just such a concern about what made it Canadian as opposed to English, or even American, as American literature was seen as its own entity much before

Canadian literature was. Because of the slow process of becoming autonomous from Britain, Canada slowly began to define itself as separate from it, which shows for instance in the way the Canadian government supports art and literature (Bumsted 2001, 27).

However, as Ania Loomba points out, Canada is not a postcolonial state in the same sense as many African or Asian countries (1998, 9-10). After all, while the Canadians may feel detached from their British or French roots, they have not suffered genocide or economic exploitation as some other cultures have (*ibid.*). While the literature of the First Nations, who suffered in Canada as much as natives did elsewhere, is more easily classified as postcolonial literature, it is a good question whether the descendants of European settlers can be considered postcolonial subjects. Similarly, Stephen Slemon also argues that Canadian literature is not postcolonial in the same way as that of some other countries, because Canadians have not had the stable illusion of the binary division between self/other, with a clear cut division between the coloniser and the colonised, but instead the resistance and struggle has been internalized (1996, 80). However, he still decisively places Canadian literature under postcolonial writing, since this internalised struggle creates a different kind of postcolonial writing characterised by the ambivalence of internalised struggle between the Self and the Other (1996, 80-82).

Above all, I believe that Canadian literature can be considered postcolonial because Canada is, by its nature, a postcolonial state, as opposed to a nation with a unified culture (Reid 2008, 205). As Canada is a collection of cultures, and thus, more of a state instead of a nation state, it might well serve as a model for other postcolonial countries with its emphasis on allegiance or federation instead of national unity (Reid 2008, 206). Consensus would be difficult to base on cultural orientation and can instead be found in the "fundamental conviction among its people that its political organization is best equipped to serve its needs" (Reid 2008, 65-66). Reid

calls this hybridity the "foundation of the elusive Canadian identity" (2008, 71) and, indeed, Canada has slowly evolved from a colony to an independent state with multiculturalism written in its constitution, the 27th section of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms:

27. This Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians.

("Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.")

Therefore, Canadian literature should reflect this diversity. Nevertheless, or precisely because of this diversity, Canadian identity has been under lively discussion throughout Canadian history.

The slow process of becoming autonomous from Britain delayed the need for a Canadian identity in beginning, since Canadians were British subjects (Richter 2011, 27). Throughout this evolution, the nationalists veered from right to left politically, thus slowly creating the Canadian welfare state (Bumsted 2001, 18). In the 19th century, the discussion was mostly centred on Canadian nationalism and deciding the nature of Canada (ibid.). From 1920's to 1960's, with the diminishing British influence, the debate concentrated on defining a Canadian identity through Canadian culture and resisting the American influence (ibid.). During this period, the state started subsidising different forms of culture, such the arts and literature, to hold on to Canadian culture (Bumsted 2001, 27). According to Richter (2011, 28), the discussion that has had the most impact has been going on since the 1950's, including writers such as Northrop Frye, W. L. Morton and Margaret Atwood.

Northrop Frye (1971, iii) and Staines (1977, 2) both point out that life is very different depending on where in Canada one lives, whether in a city like Montreal or somewhere in the Prairies. It is therefore arguable that there really is no such thing as a Canadian identity, for there are simply too many ways of being a Canadian (Morton 1961, 111; Frye 1971, ii). While there

have been many calls for and attempts at defining Canadian identity, there has never been one single, uncontested definition of what the Canadian national identity might be (Bumsted 2001, 17). Frye draws our attention to the significant difference between identity and unity: identity is by nature local and connected to one's imagination, whereas unity is national and connected to politics (1971, ii). According to Frye, this "tension between this political sense of unity and the imaginative sense of locality is the essence of whatever the word 'Canadian' means" (1971, iii). Thus, identity is necessarily something personal and with Canada's diversity, it is better to concentrate on creating national unity through allegiance instead of probably futile attempts at defining a national identity. Still, possibly because of this difficulty Canadians have had at defining what is Canadian, attempts at it have been many throughout Canadian history and there are some factors that appear in most accounts.

In 1950, Northrop Frye and other editors set out to find out what was Canadian about Canadian literature (Frye 1971, 213). During a period of almost 30 years, he wrote several articles and reviews discussing Canadian poetry, which were published together in *The Bush Garden* (1971). In this book, one can also find the Conclusion to a *Literary History of Canada* (1965) where he describes their findings on Canadian literature. He comes to the conclusion that there are indeed particular features about Canadian literature and that they have to do with the unique nature of Canadian society, geography and history. Margaret Atwood continued his line of thinking with the controversial *Survival* (1972), which discussed the themes and tendencies in Canadian literature in an easily approachable form. What they concluded had an enormous effect on the discussion about Canadian literature.

Survival's impact on reading Canadian literature was so huge that by now, it may be assimilated to the general understanding of it (Wells 2011). However, the thematic approach of

Frye and especially Atwood has also been criticised to a great extent. One grave accusation is that it has had a prescribing effect on Canadian literature, especially since *Survival*, and thematic criticism, was so widely used in the 1970's (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 134). Atwood herself claims in her new introduction to *Survival* (2003) that her aim was not to prescribe Canadian literature, but that she was instead trying to create a starting point for the discussion and to define a Canadian tradition of writing. After all, she herself claims that she would not need to write *Survival* today, because Canadian literature is now alive and so diverse, it would be practically impossible (2003). So, while Atwood's book might not be current for present-day Canadian literature, it is interesting to apply it to Findley who wrote in its aftermath. *Survival* is also relevant to the study of *Not Wanted on the Voyage*, which, while being on the surface a retelling of Noah's ark, has many themes and features that appear in Atwood's book.

Another criticism was that Atwood's work took a sweeping statement about Canadian literature which did not apply to it all, or even most of it. Atwood herself denies being a proper critic and she also states her argument in a provocative fashion intended to rouse a discussion, but Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin argue that there is, indeed, a conflict between the way Canadian literature has often been read, and the cultural mosaic Canadian culture has been perceived to be (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 36): Canadian literature should be considered as part of that cultural mosaic, instead of trying to define common themes that can never apply to all of it. On the other hand, we may ask whether Canadian literature itself has changed after the beginning of the 1970's and whether, at the time of Atwood's writing, there was a group of Canadian texts that had certain themes and ideas in common. Today, Canadian literature is being read and discussed all over the world, but this was not the case before *Survival* (Atwood 2003). In fact, Atwood's aim in *Survival* was to define Canadian literature, so that it would be perceived as existing and

valuable apart from its English or American counterparts (ibid.). In this, she succeeded, at least in the sense that her book created great amounts of interest in and discussion about Canadian literature.

According to Wells (2011) Canadian literature should not be read through any kind of ideas of what is Canadian, but instead, Canadian literature should define what being Canadian means. This view is also brought forth by Miriam Richter, who concludes that not only does literature reflect a culture, it also "play[s] an active role in shaping it" (2011, 10).

What are these themes that Atwood and Frye found in Canadian literature then? The answer can be found in the history of Canada which took place in unique geographical conditions. For the settlers, Canada was a vast country with empty, unknown places, harsh winters and wild animals. Nature was not kind, but instead something that had to be survived and often was not. According to Morton, Canadians' common experience has created a "psychology of endurance and survival" (Morton 1961, 112). It is more important to survive than to triumph and the only real victory is that over defeat (ibid.) For Atwood, this is the very core of Canadian literature, it being often preoccupied with obstacles that threaten survival (1972, 32-33). And if the characters survive, their survival is indeed the only victory they gain (1972, 33). Frye's impression of Canadian literature is also "undeniably sombre and negative" and he points out that a character who succeeds instead of barely hanging on to survival is an exception in Canadian literature (1971, 245-246). This idea of survival reminds one of *Not Wanted on the Voyage*, with the flood killing most creatures and leaving the ones on the ark barely alive and with no knowledge of the future.

This same idea of bare survival and bleak existence can be seen in the various ways that Canadian literature depicts its characters, be it families, settlers, animals or artists (Atwood

1973). Settlements either fail or manage to destroy nature (often in the form of a woman) in some way, families are both inescapable traps and a way to survival through group preservation, and animal stories are told from the point of view of the animal being hunted by humans (ibid.). Atwood's idea of Canadian literature is based on the concept of Canada as "a collective victim" (1973, 36). This comes back to Canada's history as a colony: colonies were exploited for the profit of the empire and thus victims of colonisation (ibid.). Another reason for this victimhood might be a failure in language: Dennis Lee argues that Canadians did not have the words for their colonial experience, since the language belonged to another place, to another people (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 142). This is an interesting view, since while Canadians were not robbed of their language, English did not have the words or the expressions to describe Canadian wilderness. According to Lee, this "inauthenticity" generates the Canadian victimhood (Lee quoted in Ashcroft&al. 1989, 141). In the next section, I will consider the definition of a victim in both general and postcolonial terms by examining the process of colonisation and that of decolonisation and how victims may empower themselves and survive victimhood.

2.2 Colonial Victimhood

As already mentioned, Atwood (1972, 35-36) claims that Canada is a collective victim, not only because of its exposure to "Nature the Monster", but also because of its history as a colony, as the object of imperial exploitation. This, on its turn, leads to an abundance of individual and collective victims in Canadian literature (ibid.). In fact, victimisation was part of the process of colonialism anywhere, with colonisers exploiting the colonised land and people, and while Canada may have suffered less in terms of exploitation than African or Asian countries, it was still under Britain's rule, in addition to harsh natural conditions. Since *Not Wanted on the Voyage* is the story of the destruction of the world, it is full of victims, as I will attempt to show in my

thesis. I will combine several different ways of looking at victims and concentrate especially on the dichotomy between the Self and the Other, which are central terms in both postcolonial and feminist criticism. The Other may or may not be a victim, which I will discuss as well.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines *victim* in two different ways, with subcategories for each definition:

- 1.a. A living creature killed and offered as a sacrifice to some deity or supernatural power.
- b. Applied to Christ as an offering for mankind.
- 2.a. A person who is put to death or subjected to torture by another; one who suffers severely in body or property through cruel or oppressive treatment.
- b. One who is reduced or destined to suffer under some oppressive or destructive agency.
- c. One who perishes or suffers in health, etc., from some enterprise or pursuit voluntarily undertaken.
- d. In weaker sense: One who suffers some injury, hardship, or loss, is badly treated or taken advantage of, etc. (victim, OED 2013)

The first broader definition is that of a sacrificial victim, and is in fact an older meaning of the word, whereas the second definition is what we recognise as the normal use of the word today. Victim is the object of some action, be it a sacrifice, an assault or an accident, and the difference between the definitions can often be found in the victimiser: in some, victimisation is almost a destiny, or somehow vague, whereas in others there is another person doing the victimising (Naqvi 2007, 2-3). The role of the victim, on the other hand, ranges from passive (2.a, b, d.) to active, where the victim is victimised via their own decision (2.c.) (ibid.). There is also a difference in the scope of victimisation: the victim may or may not survive it, but is somehow harmed in the process, either physically or mentally. In fact, all of these definitions apply to one character or another in Findley's book, since Noah also kills sacrificial victims for Yaweh.

According to Atwood, Canadian literature is full of victims, both active and passive, though she does not define them in these terms. Instead, Atwood defines four basic victim positions defined by the mental state of the victim:

"Position One: To deny the fact that you are a victim.

Position Two: To acknowledge that you are a victim, but to explain this as an act of Fate, [...] the dictates of Biology [...] or any other large general powerful idea.

Position Three: To acknowledge [...] that you are a victim but to refuse to accept the assumption that the role is inevitable.

Position Four: To be a creative non-victim." (1972, 36-39)

These positions apply to individuals, groups and nations. The writer is automatically in Position Four, because of the creative activity they are performing. These roles can change and vary according to the situation, even rather quickly. Atwood places many of the literary characters or groups in these positions, finding evidence of all positions used in Canadian literature. While this may be Atwood's own categorisation, we can still consider these different positions and how they relate to the concept of the Other. To do this, we will first discuss the process that creates the Other in the first place and therefore we must look at the Self, or, correspondingly, the victimiser.

The human mind always searches justification for its actions. When it has its justification, humans are capable of sadistic behaviour (Miller 2004, 27). When it comes to hurting another person, deidentification plays an important role: it is much easier to hurt someone anonymous than a person with a name and identity (Miller 2004, 29). Thus, to justify the colonial rule with its exploitation of people and land, the colonisers had to somehow distance and objectify the colonised people, so as not to identify with them (Loomba 1998, 52-53; 58). This need for justification created the divide between the Self and the Other. The victimisation can happen, because the Other is not seen as a human victim in the same way as another European would be. Still, to justify control over this Other, the Self has to "maintain sufficient identity" with it, meaning that "the Other can be constructed from 'the self', yet the self must also articulate the Other as inescapably different" (Ahscroft&al. 1989, 103). The paradox is that the Self resists any kind of mention of this ambivalence, as it sees the Other as separate and inferior (ibid.).

Another reason for this divide between the Self and the Other can be found in the pair *us* and *them*. As social beings, humans tend to divide their social world into ingroups and outgroups (Kruglanski&Higgins 2007, 695). The ingroups are associated with positive markers, whereas there may be prejudices against outgroups (ibid.). This brings us back to the difference between a nation with a clear, unifying culture behind it and a state with only a contract of trust in the state's capability between different individuals. The state does not discriminate as clearly between us and them, whereas belonging to a nation may be a part of one's identity. However, in colonialism, this same human trait was unconsciously used to justify the "civilising" and the controlling of the colonised people and their land.

In *Orientalism* (2003, 2-3), Edward Said defines the Orient as "one of [Europe's] deepest and most recurring images of the Other" that "has helped to define Europe [...] as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience". This definition shows us one meaning of the Other: it is something that the Self does not wish to recognise in themselves. During the period of colonialism, the image of the Other was necessary to justify the coloniser's own behaviour and attitude towards the colonised culture, and their quest to "civilise" them. According to Said, the colonised were seen as being in possession of qualities that were undesirable in European culture, or in other words, as problems to be solved (1996, 35). The Other is therefore necessarily inferior and stereotyped, because that allows for the coloniser to imagine themselves as superior. This relationship between "the Self" and "the Other" is by nature dichotomous and thus it reduces the colonial experience to dichotomy (Gandhi 1998, 76). This dichotomy is apparent in binary oppositions that are typical of colonial discourse.

Binary opposition is a "pair of terms that although opposed to one another are necessarily bound together as each other's condition of possibility" (Buchanan 2012). There is no middle

ground, as can be seen in pairs such as "dead/alive", "good/bad" or "yes/no". Colonial discourse was often structured on these pairs, all deriving from the Self-the Other dichotomy that led to a division between West and non-West (Gandhi 1998, 15). The Other can then be associated with all the attributes the Self does not want to have, like laziness or violent behaviour, and thus "postulated as the inverse or negative image of the coloniser" (ibid.). In colonialism, this led to racism and to the idea that the Western civilisation had a responsibility, or a mission, to civilise the colonised people. However, in reality, this led to a tragic paradox, as Aimé Césaire claims: instead of civilising the colonised, colonisation decivilised the coloniser and, in fact, made him violent and racist, while degrading the human value of the colonised (Jasen&Nayar 2010, 11). Nevertheless, the colonial rule demanded this justification to its actions and to support this idea of the superiority of the European culture, science needed to prove it as well.

Said argues that knowledge equals power, or in other words, the one who has the right to dictate what is knowledge is the one in power (2003, 13). He quotes Gramsci, who introduced the idea of hegemony, meaning that the European culture is based on certain cultural consent instead of overt domination (2003, 7-8). The colonial discourse, then, is the playground of power and knowledge where European writers created an image of the colonised people to withhold their position of rule. When every writing upheld the notion of the Oriental, or the colonial subject, as inferior, stupid and in need of formation, Europeans in both the colony and at the centre of the Empire could accept the situation without much further thought and even encourage it, since "[t]o have such knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it" (Said 2003, 33). This idea of European superiority was often true for the colonised as well, since, as Leela Gandhi argues, power is a mix of the more obvious coercion and seduction (1998, 14).

This effect we can see in the first writings of (post)colonial authors, who often imitated and fell back on European models and ideals of writing (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 5-6).

Language is the main tool for this creation of "knowledge" and also in the sense that the European languages were written and used in administration, whereas the native languages of the colonised were either marginalised or even destroyed (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 7). During the process of decolonisation, the formerly colonised had the problem of having to express anti-colonial sentiments in the language of their oppressors (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 38). This same issue can be found in feminist writing where feminists have tried to recreate language, so that it would not unconsciously uphold the patriarchal view of the world (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 174-175). In fact, gaining access to knowledge and the making of it has been an important part of feminist activism since the nineteenth century (Gandhi 1999, 43). As we can see, feminism has much in common with postcolonialism, as both "movements needed to challenge dominant ideas of history, culture and representation" which were the Western, patriarchal structures of power (Loomba 1998, 40). Women were seen as the Others in much the same way as colonised people were, this time as the opposite of man (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 175). Once again, the Other offered the image of what a man was not, thus creating the idea of the weaker sex.

The discussion throughout the study of postcolonialism, and feminism, has revolved around how to escape the position of the Other. Is it even possible or is it necessary to take on some of the values or ways of the coloniser? How to empower a colonised people who do not have their own language anymore but only the language of the coloniser? Because of the seductive nature of European power, the colonised could be tempted by taking over the position of the European coloniser (Gandhi 1999, 21). Instead, both Leela Gandhi and Fanon proposed that the first step towards independence is for the colonised to see themselves as separate from

the coloniser, not in their place (ibid.). Otherwise, colonialism would continue, only the roles would be reversed. Another way of empowering the Other is through imagination: Wilson Harris agrees that imagination is the key to liberating cultures from “the destructive dialectic of history” and while the texts may be about oppression and division, they contain “the seeds of ‘community’ that will defeat this “apparently inescapable dialectic of history (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 35). Indeed, postcolonial literature had to “challenge colonialism not only at a political or intellectual level, but also on an emotional plane” (Loomba 1998, 185-186). This also meant creating a feeling of a community with a shared past in order to create national and cultural identities for the colonised people (Loomba 1998, 195).

If we come back to Atwood's victim positions, we may find certain connections to different phases of colonialism and postcolonialism. Position One, with the idea of denying one's victimhood and possibly blaming other victims' suffering on them, reminds one of the first wave of postcolonial writing, where colonial writers bowed to European conventions and wrote according to European forms of literature (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 5-6). These victims possibly agreed with the European thoughts of civilising the colonial people and were indeed "civilised" to the European way of thinking. They no longer considered themselves victims in the same way as other colonial subjects, who might be considered as being in Position Two, since the European "knowledge" of natives proved through biological and religious arguments that Europeans were superior. However, the process of decolonisation was characterised by struggle and resistance (Sendhi 2011, 9), which reminds one of the transformative nature of Position Three. The colonised finally start fighting for their independence and against their oppressors and the oppressors' culture. This period sees the writing of critics such as Frantz Fanon, Aimé Césaire and others, who write about the injustice of colonialism and present a call for arms for all

oppressed people. According to Atwood's definition, all these writers leave their victim position when they write and become creative non-victims. I would argue that writing may be an action somewhere between the positions and it is possible to be creative while struggling against oppression. There is also the question of language and to leave one's victimhood one must be able to use one's own language, or a language that one has made into one's own. Then again, imagination and creation are indeed ways to empower oneself: Paula Anca Farca argues that Indigenous people robbed of their land and family can create and recreate important places and, via them, their culture, through storytelling, memories and journeys (2011, 2).

What must be remembered with decolonisation and this kind of evolution of victimhood though, is the inescapable connection between the past and the present. While many called for a revolution and expected a utopian postcolonial world, in reality, the process of decolonisation will take a long time, and postcolonialism still has the word colonialism in it, just as colonialism still exists today (Gandhi 1998, 6-7). The past cannot be erased and the structures of power change slowly. At the same time, this reminds us of the importance of trying to change them, which may be the slow, lasting way for the ex-colonies to become non-victims. Postcolonial literature itself is a sign of this evolution and it has already spread and helped the process of decolonisation through empowering victims to recognise their victimhood and to resist it.

3. Yaweh and Noah – colonial victimisers

Before considering the victims in *Not Wanted on the Voyage*, I will first analyse the victimisers, Yaweh and Noah, and the patriarchal system that constructs their power. I will discuss the binary social structures and relations between different characters and groups and then move on to the tradition of religion that holds them in place. After that, I will look into the underlying structures of power that Yaweh and Noah use to create their authority over other characters. In the second sub-chapter, I will consider how Yaweh and Noah justify their cruel actions by raising themselves above others, that is, seeing them as the Other. Lastly, I will try to argue that Findley's novel can be read as an allegory of colonialism, decolonisation and postcolonialism.

3.1 A world of binary oppositions

Yaweh's world is hierarchically structured, with binary, unequal pairs that reveal the power relations between them (Pennee 1993, 22; Pearson 1998/1999). This means that God is above his angels, God is above men, men are above women, humans are above animals and so forth. These binary oppositions are held in place through the power that tradition, religion and knowledge can create and uphold (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 100).

There is a speech Yaweh gives at his feast that reveals his idea of the world most clearly:

"love is the one true bond..."
 [...] "Between God and his angels..."
 [...] "God and man..."
 [...] "King and subject..."
 [...] "Lord and vassal..."
 [...] "Master and slave..." (87)

What we notice first, is the different definition of love Yaweh has. It is in fact, as David Jefferess writes, "the hierarchical and dichotomous structure that maintains an exploitative power relationship in which those who are dominant demand subservience and honour from those who

are deemed "lower" or "other" (2000). In a world such as this, God or king or master automatically has the justification for their position, while the inferior side of the pair is marginalized (Bailey 1998, 134). Yaweh's rule is based on this idea of unchangeable, incontestable status quo, just as heaven is "perfect and predictable" (102).

Noah is the image of God, Yaweh's truest friend who is over 600 years old (47). In fact, we first see Yaweh through the eyes of Emma, who poignantly thinks: "*God sucks lozenges! [...] Just like Doctor Noyes!*" (66). Therefore, Noah has more power and wealth than other humans. Peasants work on his fields as well as their own (10), and he also has the means and the power to hire workers to build him an ark (115-116). Apart from God himself, Noah always places himself on the superior side of a binary opposition.

He also structures his very family on these dichotomies and even his family name, Noyes, is a dichotomous pair, no-yes (Aschroft&al. 1989, 100). He is the head of the family, just as God is the master of humankind, with his sons under him and the women under the men. Also, in Noah's view, the strong, manly Shem is definitely above the humiliated Japeth, just as the dignified Hannah is above the wailing Emma. Japeth suffers especially, because he cannot fill the role of man that these social structures demand of him. However, him I will discuss more closely in the section 4.2.

The division between men and women is very clear in this world (Bailey 1998, 132; Demousselle 1995, 45). When Noah first receives Yaweh's message at the beginning of the novel, we quickly understand the relationship between him and his wife. In the scene where Mrs. Noyes tries to sway Noah from forcing Ham to perform the sacrifice, he forces his authority over her when she challenges his interpretation of the peacock's cry as a sign from Yaweh:

“He is only calling for his mate, for God’s sake!” said Mrs. Noyes.

“How dare you!” Dr. Noyes was livid. “How dare you take the name of God in vain! How *dare* you!” (13)

The situation ends by Mrs. Noyes having to apologise to both Yaweh and Noah. However, as we will find, when we concentrate more on Mrs. Noyes in chapter 4.3, the power Noah holds over her transforms over the course of the novel from a more mental power to a physical power that is in fact much weaker in nature. Another noticeable example on the attitude towards women comes from Yaweh’s story about four men entering the Garden, that is, paradise and being tempted in different ways. Yaweh says that “the wisest of wise – were tempted, even as Eve was tempted – though, being men, they had more powers of resistance” (100). The casualness of the remark emphasizes how obvious this statement is to both Yaweh and his audience. As men in this world “wield the absolute power”, it is no coincidence that the two protagonists, Mrs Noyes and Mottyl, are both female, counteracting the violence in men with hope and warmth (Keith 1987).

Lastly, there is the relationship between humans and animals. From Noah’s point of view, humans and animals form a clear binary pair in the long line of other similar social pairs (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 100). He has no qualms about using Mottyl or her kittens for his “experiments” (18-19). In the same way, he sees sacrificial animals as the means to thank Yaweh, not recognising the terror that Mrs. Noyes sees in their eyes in any way. It is also noticeable that Yaweh’s edict orders that most animals enter the ark in pairs. In a way, Yaweh understands the importance of diversity, but it must be in his own terms only. And still, as Dorothy Nielsen puts it, Yaweh’s edict “actually limits diversity, by leaving out those not wanted because they are of the wrong race, or culture, or religion, or because they are physically weak or old, or simply because they are considered redundant” (1998).

This structure of hierarchies is the basis of Yaweh's and Noah's power. These hierarchies are rigid and based on ritual and tradition, meaning that the word is passed on from God to Noah, from him to men, then to women and lastly to animals (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 100). While defending his decision about Ham's sacrifice, Noah remarks to Mrs. Noyes: "The only principles that matter here, madam, are the principles of ritual and tradition" (13), to which she answers "The only principles that matter here are *yours!*" (ibid.). Her comment clearly reveals the arbitrariness of these traditions, but it does not destroy or even shake them. The conservative, traditional nature that is the basis of Yaweh and Noah's world can also be seen in the feast for Yaweh (Bailey 1998, 113). The food is prepared by Mrs. Noyes, whose seat is the most distant from Yaweh, whereas Yaweh is entertained by Dr. Noyes, who sits near Yaweh, as does Hannah, whose company pleases Yaweh. The seating order reflects the social structures Yaweh and Noah wish to uphold (Pennee 1993, 34). In addition to these examples, Noah's conservative nature can be seen in the scene where he remembers the "good old days" (47-49). The description of the time when everyone worshipped Yaweh only gives the process of sacrifice a pompous, arbitrary context and enjoying the pleas of already doomed lambs is even crueller than the ritual Noah goes through with his family.

Findley shows us the arbitrariness and the unfounded nature of tradition that requires the killing of innocent lambs, underlined by the actual process of the sacrifice. The proper ritual markers, like the tolling of the bell, the hammer and the stone, and so forth, seem hollow and empty when we also experience the thoughts of Mrs. Noyes and the actions of Ham (25-27). Mrs. Noyes grieves for the lamb whose mother she has taught to sing and wishes she had the bravery to stop the sacrifice. Ham, on the other hand, has the courage to show solidarity: "A shining moon-shaped wound had sprouted on his arm where the arm had pressed against the

lamb – and the blood that flowed into Noah’s basin was as much his son’s as it was the slaughtered beast’s” (27). Ham performs the ritual, yet breaks tradition by siding with the lamb instead of Yaweh. He is “committed to finding a nonviolent way to achieve his alternative vision of social order” (Brydon 1998, 86), using this symbolic act to confirm his alignment with nature (Jefferess 2000).

As already mentioned, Yaweh acts on the same principles of tradition as Noah, though while Noah becomes angry, Yaweh also becomes sorrowful and even shocked when these principles are not followed. In a way, he plays on the guilt reflex of all his followers. For Yaweh, there is danger in all kinds of questioning, even in words themselves. Therefore, Lucy/Lucifer is such a distress to him, for she cannot help asking “why” (108).

At the feast, Yaweh tells a story about the fall of three wise men when they visit the Sacred Garden, even when warned by the wisest of them all, Rabbi Akiva:

“And Rabbi Akiva – being the wisest of the wise [...] told of all the dangers – and he told of all the pitfalls. Above all, he cautioned his fellow wise men of the dangers that lie in words... in the injudicious and incautious use of words... in the prideful use of words; those words that even We do not utter” (99)

Still, all but Rabbi Akiva fail in the Sacred Orchard, because of they cannot keep their minds from curiosity:

“Ben Azai put his hand to the creation of man – and died. Ben Zoma turned no more than his mind to the forbidden word – and lost his reason. Elisha Ben Abuya fell to the ground and , lost in the wonder of the plants and herbs beneath his fingers, he began to tear them from their place in that sacred earth and to eat them – and in doing so, disrupted the temper of his system and was crippled and useless all the rest of his days. Only Rabbi Akiva emerged intact from that journey beneath the trees. Only he, who knew not to reach out with his hands; who knew not to dwell upon the word; who knew not to fall upon the ground and eat – only he – only he...” (100)

Yaweh’s story is a lesson about the importance of obedience and indifference to all knowledge and temptation. Therein also lies the foundation to his power. David Jefferess explains this process clearly: “Yaweh and Noah create a climate of fear and domination in which the act of

wonder and a difference of opinion, never mind a difference in sexuality, can be regarded as nothing other than ‘evil’”(2000). With the help of conservative values, Yaweh can explain, why a thirst for knowledge is undesirable and dangerous. Noah establishes the same idea with his comment on the principles of ritual and tradition, because one can always invoke them in order to justify one’s actions. Also, it gives the few who have knowledge, more power.

On her porch before the sacrifice, Mrs Noyes reflects on her fear of knowing too little (21). She feels things that she does not know, or understand, and that scares her. Noah, on the other hand, seems to know too much, as he claims to know everything. This is how the power structures are revealed behind the social structures. Noah can claim to know anything that is necessary to uphold his position of power. In fact, it seems that Noah sees himself as a learned doctor, a great authority, like the ones he remembers from his youth (48). As a woman, Mrs Noyes does not have access to the knowledge that would validate her feelings, since Noah claims to have all knowledge to himself. Mrs. Noyes’s problem reminds one of the settlers’ problems with using a language not made for the new environment, meaning that there simply are no words to express what one sees or, in Mrs Noyes’s case, feels (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 142).

When needed, Noah’s arbour can be “an alchemist’s study, a theatre of magic and a laboratory” (18-19). Noah does scientific experiments with Mottyl’s kittens, but in Noah’s case, there is a curious contradiction between science and alchemy and magic, as we can all agree that alchemy is closer to magic than science. Yaweh, too, calls his creation “the Great Experiment”, which once again underlines the similarities between the two friends. While the world is a much better result than Mottyl’s cataracts and dead kittens, ultimately Yaweh turns out to be just as sadistic as Noah: when his Experiment turns out as something different from what he had thought it would, he decides to destroy it for good. This play-like, unfeeling quality of both

Yaweh's and Noah's experiments becomes even more clear, when we compare them to Noah's son, Ham, who respects and studies the world around him enthusiastically, without seeking to change it. As Dorothy Nielsen (1998) puts it: "Noah objectifies the Other, and has no hesitation killing and maiming in his experiments with Mottyl's kittens, whereas Ham treats the Other as a subject, with its own innate worth."

Still, Noah and Yaweh are the ones who decides what the "truth" ultimately is, as in this incident:

Small white flakes of something had fallen from the sky and everyone had crowded onto the porch to watch. Doctor Noyes at once had proclaimed a miracle and was even in the process of telling Hannah to mark it down as such, when Ham went onto the lawn and stuck his tongue out, catching several of the flakes and tasting them.

"Not snow," he had said. "It's ash."

Ham, after all, had the whole of science at his fingertips and Mrs Noyes was inclined to believe that it had been ash – but Doctor Noyes had insisted it was snow – "a miracle!" And in the end he'd had his way. Hannah had been instructed to write: TODAY – A BLIZZARD. (21)

Since the ash comes from the cities outside of Yaweh's control, calling it snow and a miracle allows Noah to place the situation into his own system (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 100). This same use of power through language also happens when dolphins come greet the ark and its passengers. Because Noah insists that they are pirates, they are slaughtered by Hannah and Japeth, even while Mrs Noyes is trying to make Noah understand that "they want to be *friends*" (236). Similarly, he keeps the letter Yaweh sends him to himself and thus has "sole interpretative control of events" (Ashcroft&al.).

So, the authority of Noah and Yaweh is created through language, as in the examples above (Bailey 1998, 132). He who has the last word may decide what the truth is and what is considered to be knowledge (Pennee 1993, 31). While Ham's science may be much more accurate than Noah's claims, Noah is above him in social hierarchy and will therefore ultimately decide on matters. We can also reconsider Yaweh's speech at the feast once again. His definition

of love upholds the structures that his world is built upon, for it is the love of a slave towards his master, making him, as God, the ultimate head of this structure. In addition to this, there is a curious moment at the very end of the speech, when he says “Thus We throw Ourselves upon your...” and everybody is horrified to think that God would throw himself on their mercy, when they should be throwing themselves on his mercy (90). Noah asks him to stop and cries: “Tell us only what You would have us do. But do not speak of our mercy. Only show us thine” (ibid.). We are then revealed that Yaweh was going to say hospitality instead of mercy, but the misunderstanding of the others suits him fine, because it grants him more power in the situation than he initially had. Thus, words and how one defines and uses them, are powerful tools, when one can control them.

As I have shown, the power structures that uphold Yaweh and Noah’s social positions are very similar to colonial power structures. The basis for this is in who decides on “knowledge” and who can use language to their advantage. In this case, it is *known* that women are below men in intelligence and capability and that normal men in the Cities are shameless and simple compared to Noah’s wisdom. It is difficult to rebel against this kind of hegemony and, in fact, before the end of the world changes everything, only Lucy tries to, with varying results.

3.2 Justifying the end of the world

In this chapter, I will discuss the process that leads to Yaweh’s decision to drown the world and how Noah becomes the executor of this decision. I will also compare this process to the periods of colonialism, decolonisation and postcolonialism.

Yaweh’s problem is that his creations, humans, are malcontent with him. Instead of giving him the love (or subservience) he feels he deserves, they throw “[s]words and axes – rocks and firebrands – vegetables, fruit and eggs and...[...] *ordure*” at him (70). Yaweh is “the object of the

world's derision [...]. Mocked at and scorned in the streets. *Attacked*" (ibid.) He cannot understand how his experiment, a world he created, could treat him thus. This reminds one of any parent with a teenager: suddenly the child has a mind of its own and refuses to listen to their parent, or as we will later see, of a coloniser, whose colonised people refuse to be oppressed any longer. Something in the world Yaweh has created or something that he represents renders humans angry and while we are only told of this through Yaweh's perspective, we can still consider the reasons for their anger.

As we concluded in the previous chapter, the power of Yaweh and Noah is based on the control of knowledge. Yet, when that power is not constantly upheld with religious practices for instance, people will start questioning it. As we saw in Noah's memories of the past, everyone worshipped Yaweh in older days, but at the time of the novel, they seem to worship Baal (47-49). We are not given much information about Baal, except that there are huge Festivals where people worship the Bull, Baal's incarnation, by even letting a chosen woman mount a bull (49). To Noah, this seems monstrous, yet at the same time, we must compare that to the sacrifices to Yaweh, which are cruel instead of just being lewd. For Yaweh and Noah, the worship of Baal is problematic, for it shows that people do not listen to their truth, their knowledge anymore, but that of someone else's (Guihan 2009, 259-60).

Yaweh does try to win the favour of his people by showing around different beasts, as if in a run-down circus, with "barely discernible" banners: "THE SEVEN DA- -ONDERS! [...] GREAT MYSTER--S OF LIFE!" (65) However, the people are not excited by them, but instead abuse Yaweh and his procession. Findley seems to underline Yaweh's sinking power by describing the dusty caravan that is falling apart and the ancient Yaweh, who is dirty, frail and depressed (65-66; 69). Even Noah's entertainments cannot lift his spirits, until Noah finally

performs the trick that launches the idea of the flood in Yaweh's mind: Noah makes a penny disappear by pouring water into a bottle on top of it (95-96). At that moment, Yaweh's power is restored to him, but it is a different kind of power. While before the power of Noah and Yaweh has been the control of knowledge, now the power becomes physical. In a way, Yaweh has no other choice if he wishes to uphold his power over humans, for he has lost the power based on hegemony. By drowning the world and destroying his rebellious creations, his experiment that is, his authority will be whole again. Yaweh considers Noah and his family as separate from the horrible creatures he meets on his travels and thus chooses them to start another world based on his values and his truth.

This separation that Yaweh draws between the Noyes and the other humans is the separation of the Self and the Other. For Yaweh, Noah belongs to his inner circle, whereas he distances the rebellious, discontent humans from himself. They are not "his image", in the same way as Noah is. In fact, he associates greed and madness to them, thus creating a counter-image to his self-image, which is characterised by piety and learnedness (ibid.). When humans are seen as something separate and inferior, the decision to drown them becomes a decision just like any other. They are objects, only existing through Yaweh's goodwill and can therefore be easily destroyed by him.

Noah already uses this same kind of process with his family when he positions himself as the head of the family, the authority over everyone else. As we discussed in the previous chapter, he considers women to be weaker than men and thus, inferior to himself. Animals are objects for him completely in the same way as humans are to Yaweh. This allows him to perform the second sacrifice to Yaweh when he burns all the farm animals that are not taken on the ark (123-125). On the ark, as it becomes clear that Yaweh has died, Noah slowly takes over his role, becoming

more and more separated from the rest of the survivors. Still, he faces the same fate as Yaweh, for the more his physical power grows over the other characters, in the sense that he ultimately decides who embarks on the ark, his mental power, the hegemony Yaweh and Noah have created, is slowly crumbling apart.

The ark is dichotomously structured as well, with Noah, Shem, Japeth and Hannah living on the deck in cabins and with Mrs Noyes, Lucy, Ham, Emma and the animals living inside the ark. There is a binary opposition of light and darkness between the two, but also, from a reader's point of view, an opposition of coldness and warmth. The characters on deck are all lonely, doing things on their own, while the characters inside the ark live together, creating solace and companionship during the hardships (Brydon 1998, 85-86). Also, the ark is very strictly structured, just like Noah's world before the storm. In the middle, there is the Well of Darkness which is surrounded by three decks full of different animals, organized according to their size, so that the biggest animals are at the bottom. This reminds me of Dante's idea of hell that Lucifer created by falling from the sky with different levels of suffering ("Divina Commedia"; "Lucifer"). Similarly, the animals at the bottom level have the least light and suffer from constant dampness. Above these three decks and on the outside of the ark are the open deck and Noah's quarters, marking his place at the top of the structure.

Throughout the novel, the process of Césaire's paradox is in motion: colonisation decivilises the coloniser instead of civilising the colonised, making him violent and racist, while degrading the human value of the colonised (Jasen&Nayar 2010, 11). Noah becomes more violent as the story progresses: in the first sacrifice, he makes Ham kill one lamb, whereas in the second, he burns dozens of animals alive (26-27; 125). On the ark, Noah's actions include killing

curious dolphins who jump on board to say hello and killing the unicorn by using its horn to rape Emma of her virginity (235-236; 264-265).

The story Findley tells reminds one of the period of colonialism. Already in the prologue, we encounter images of “the Edwardian period the height of the British Empire” (Brydon 1998, 78): “a band playing Rule Britannia! and Over the Sea to Skye. Flags and banners and a booming cannon... like an excursion” (3). Yaweh has created humans, just like colonial power created the colonial subject as the counter-image of the Western culture. Instead of admiring their creator, Yaweh's subjects are dissatisfied and angry for they are not content with the world of he has created nor their position in it. This would correspond to the resistance the colonisers met with in their colonies or even the resistance that started the process decolonisation, when the colonised started expressing their disillusionment with the colonisers.

However, since God can do so, Yaweh decides to drown all the ungrateful, godless men and be rid of them once and for all. He chooses the ones who survive on the ark, the ones who are "acceptable" but then leaves them on their own. If we continue with the colonial metaphor, we can argue that the holocaust would be the destruction of the colonised culture (or the colonised people, as in the case of Indians), whereas the ark corresponds to the colony, finally becoming independent from the Empire, but left stranded in the storm, its passengers having to fend for themselves. Noah's weakening power would then correspond to the weakening power of the colonisers' culture, but just as postcolonialism includes the after-effects of colonialism, we are left with an open ending, with the ark floating endlessly on the waters.

4. Victims and survivors

In this chapter, I will look into some individual characters and especially how they relate to Atwood's victim positions. There are many victims in *Not Wanted on the Voyage*, but here I have decided on four characters who each portray some aspect of victimhood. I will start with Japeth who is plagued with low self-esteem and cannot face his own victimhood. Mrs Noyes's cat, Mottyl, on the other hand, is above all a survivor, suffering through hardships and yet clinging to life. Mrs Noyes is the heroine of the story who finds her courage through helping others. Finally, I have decided to discuss Lucy and her constant refusal to remain a victim.

4.1 Japeth – A victim in denial

In *Survival*, Margaret Atwood says that in Canadian literature, family is “a trap in which you're caught”, and that the protagonist “feels the need for escape, but somehow is he is unable to break away.” (1972, 131). This reminds me of the character of Japeth. Japeth is Noah's youngest son who is desperately trying to find himself and his manhood especially. To accomplish this, he sets out from his home, but ends up coming back dyed blue, shamed and with even a greater need to prove himself. During Yaweh's visit, he becomes a great admirer of Michael Archangel, the soldier angel, but whether his mission to become a soldier himself succeeds, is questionable. By denying his own victimhood, he also joins the victimisers, becoming one himself. I will now discuss Japeth's need to prove himself and what it tells us of him and of the society and the family he lives in.

At the beginning of the novel, we are introduced to a blue, insecure young man, who does not enjoy the respect of his father. We are told that a sacrificial animal once almost escaped when Japeth could not make a clean cut, thus leading Noah to refuse Japeth's wish to perform the sacrifice for Yaweh (11-12). Also, Japeth's wife, the young Emma, still remains a virgin,

which increases Japeth's feelings of shame and malcontent (23). Even though "[a]s a boy, there was none more trusting and none more eager to find all the pleasures of life", Japeth is now more aware of the power structures of his family and cannot accept his own lack of power, which leads to him "turning more and more to violence and petulance" (ibid.). This is because "he has not yet conformed to his masculine role" (Bailey 1998, 139). The society's binary structures of man and woman, and the connotations they carry, do not allow for any weakness in men, and for Japeth, especially his wife's virginity is a marker of weakness in him.

"[T]o find his manhood once and for all", Japeth leaves on a quest towards the Cities (ibid.). As in a proper Canadian family, if we take Atwood's definition of it, his escape fails and he returns home ashamed, dyed blue. We are revealed the cause for this in a passage later on: on his way, Japeth meets a band of ruffians, who cook and almost eat him. Only a well-timed lightning strike saves him, giving the ruffians their burnt comrade to eat instead and giving Japeth the means to escape (82-83). This trauma changes Japeth's view of the world, making him a victim in his own eyes. However, he does not understand that he might have already been a victim of the binary social structures of his family, the other to Noah's Self. To escape the feeling of fear that his trial has awakened in him, he is even more determined to find himself at the top of this power structure: he wants to be like Michael Archangelis, whom he greatly admires, to learn to be a soldier (77). As Dickinson remarks: "Japeth's anxiety about his masculinity translates into an extreme fascination with that of another dragon slayer in the text, Michael Archangelis" (1998). By becoming a soldier, he would become a man who would be acknowledged by his father, that is, the leader of the family. Otherwise, Peter Dickinson's reading of Japeth even claims that Japeth's experience with the ruffians implies a homosexual and even sadomasochistic awakening (1998). Linda Lamont-Stewart (1997) also brings forth

Japeth's homosexual infatuation to Michael Archangelis. Japeth's homosexuality might indeed make his need to prove himself a man even stronger, especially as he knows he should sleep with Emma but is not able to.

So, Japeth becomes a soldier on Noah's ark and the executor of many of Noah's most sadistic deeds. Killing Lotte, the ape-child Mrs Noyes is trying to save, seems to mark the final change in Japeth, his agreement to Noah's rule, for after this, he becomes part of the division of us and them on the ark (168). This is followed by other acts of horror: Japeth kills the dolphins and the demons on Noah's orders, even though in the case of demons, he already seems eager for destruction, filling Noah's order to his brother Shem (237; 305). The explanation for his actions can be found in the following passage:

“He was trying very hard to copy the manner of the ruffians who had captured him on the road and who had wanted to turn him into chowder. He had been so afraid of these men that he now took it for granted all he had to do was make a passable imitation and everyone would fall down before him, quivering with fear.” (201)

Japeth's control over his life and his right for self determination, were taken, though momentarily, by the ruffians, and now he needs to ensure that he will never feel that fear again. Since the ruffians were the ones in control when he was not, he tries to imitate them instead of seeking help from others, which, once again, would be unmanly.

However, Mrs Noyes and the others living inside the ark do not recognise Japeth as a powerful soldier. Instead, Mrs Noyes treats him as her son, reminding him of his manners and asks him to call Noah Father and use the word *please* (ibid.). Lucy makes fun of his commanding them and Ham reminds him that “[it]’s only us, for heaven’s sake” (202). Noah treats him as a soldier, more or less, but in any case more an employee than a respected son. Emma, his wife, remains below in the ark and Japeth is to some extent successful in refusing to think about her. Nevertheless, Noah finally takes the matter of Emma's virginity into his own hands, solving the

problems “[Japeth] could not solve” by using the Unicorn’s horn to rape Emma (265). We are not given Japeth’s thoughts per se, but his actions: he uses his sword to detach the already loose horn from the already dying Unicorn’s head (266). It is still clear that Noah’s actions do not in any way solve Japeth’s problems, because Emma will not sleep with him any more than before, even though she is forced to live above the deck, Japeth claiming her as “one of us now” (276). Thus, Japeth’s quest to find himself in his family, in his society, remains unfulfilled, making him cover it up by acting even more in the way of the ruffians, violent and cruel.

Like Noah, Japeth becomes more and more decivilised as he tries to find the soldier in himself and fit in the world of Yaweh and Noah. Unlike Noah though, he is also a victim of this world and of its power structures that force him to act violently to prove himself as a man. Like Atwood’s victims in denial (1972, 36), Japeth uses a lot of energy to convince himself that he is not a victim, acting like a soldier, in his opinion, should. He treats the people and the animals inside the ark as below him, which also coincides with Atwood’s definition of a victim who is afraid to recognize their victimhood and thus ends up disparaging his fellow-victims (1973, 36). When he kills the demons, Lucy sets upon him a curse (308), but in a way, Japeth is already cursed. His unhappiness and insecurity show through in all his actions, because when he creates the bridge between the Self and the Other, he distances himself from the people that would love and esteem him, Mrs Noyes especially. Still, in a true Canadian fashion, Japeth survives, with festering wounds that will plague him for all eternity, but he still lives.

4.2 Mottyl – Bare survival

As *Not Wanted on the Voyage* tells us the story of Noah’s ark, it has many animals in it. These animals think, speak and act, and are, story-wise, just as important for its continuation as the human characters. There is a parallel here to Atwood’s book, and that is Atwood’s description of

the Canadian Animal Story: this kind of story, which often ends in the tragic death of the animal, is also told “*from the point of view of the animal*” (1972). We follow the story through the eyes of different animals throughout the book and all animals but for most of the ones inside the ark, die. The animal protagonist is Mottyl, Mrs Noyes’s old, impaired cat who seems to suffer through all possible troubles from illness, rape and accidents to the murdering of her kittens. In a way, she embodies the Canadian victim, left only with her life and almost not even that by the end of the novel.

If we consider Mottyl’s victim position, she falls somewhere between Positions Two and Three. Both positions acknowledge victimhood, but in Position Two, victimhood is taken for granted, as something natural, whereas in Position Three, the victim refuses to accept the inevitability of their victimhood (1973, 37). On the one hand, Mottyl tries to fight against her victimisers, Doctor Noyes and Abraham the cat especially, but on the other, she ends up having to accept her victimhood and bear with it. For Noah, Mottyl is a powerful image of the Other, crippled, blind, and thus useless in his eyes, except for her kittens whom he uses in his experiments (18-19). Here we can see a strong connection between the Other and victimhood, since Noah’s seeing Mottyl as the Other allows him to victimise her. Still, Mottyl suffers in many other ways too than just through Noah’s or Abraham’s actions. I will now explain why Mottyl is indeed an excellent example of Canadian victimhood and endurance.

When we are first introduced to Mottyl, we learn that her other eye is blind from cataracts, caused by Doctor Noyes and his experiments in which he has also killed all of Mottyl’s kittens (ibid.). We also learn that she is twenty years old and suffering from heat and its side effects, restlessness, itch and general discomfort (28-29). With the heat comes also the fear of Doctor Noyes and Mottyl dreams of being able to stop having babies, so that Doctor Noyes would not

have any more kittens to kill. However, in terms of suffering, this is only the beginning for Mottyl.

When Yaweh arrives, he brings with him his two cats, Sarah and Abraham whom he also chooses to accompany Noah on the ark. Abraham manages to catch Mottyl during the last phase of her heat, just when she rejoices having survived the whole heat without males (91-92). We are not given the information whether Abraham rapes Mottyl or not, but what is certain is that she has no wish to have babies and that by making her pregnant, Abraham manages to create another litter of kittens Mottyl needs to fear and care for. Even though Mottyl and Abraham are cats, Findley still seems to underline the same binary opposition between male and female as he does with man and woman. Abraham plays by Yaweh's rules, not those of the forest and can therefore see her as inferior, his to do with as he wishes.

Another moment of suffering and the ultimate victimisation by Doctor Noyes is the great sacrifice, when he sets fire on all the farm animals that are not allowed in the ark (124-25). Mottyl is supposed to burn with the other animals, but is saved by Ham (*ibid.*). During the argument that ensues between Noah and Mrs Noyes, Mottyl escapes, blind and injured, only to be drenched by rain and then injured again when she is trying to hunt a starling, but instead hits the orchard wall with sharp edges of glass. When she and Mrs Noyes are finally reunited, Mrs Noyes does the only thing she can to save her cat: she smuggles her to the ark, going against Yaweh's edict and deceiving Noah (187-89). Somehow, Mottyl becomes the symbol of the world Yaweh is trying to destroy. She is not in the edict and yet she survives and with her, the richness of communication and the solidarity between animals, connecting them to Mrs Noyes and the other characters below the deck.

Mottyl's actions are governed by her whispers, her instincts that tell her what to do in different situations. She is in constant dialogue with them, sometimes listening, sometimes not. On many occasions, she makes the wrong choice, leading to an accident or other form of suffering. Sometimes her whispers cannot even help her, as when she jumps into the orchard wall (137-38). Another time she simply ignores them, when she is trying to find a place for her scat and ends up falling all the way to the bottom of the ark, cracking a rib and turning her shoulder (216; 224). Above all, Mottyl's survival seems to hang on physical survival, for that is what she must fight for all the time. She does fear Doctor Noyes because of her babies, but still her survival is most of all physical, as a breath of life is all that she, barely, has in the end. In this following quote from the novel, the whispers rather sarcastically answer Mottyl's question for help, illuminating the extent of Mottyl's suffering:

“Why can't I move?

[The whispers:] *You are twenty years old. You are starving. You have worms, fleas, mites and an abscess behind your ear and another on your hip. You have a cracked rib that won't knit. You have a torn tendon, a twisted bowel and a total depletion of vitamins. You are blind. You are going deaf. You have stepped on a nail. Can't you hear yourself breathing? Possible pneumonitis is setting in. You are partially dehydrated and we would suggest that the first thing you do – if, as and when you are able to rise – should be to drink water. You are distressed, depressed and short on red blood cells. You are also suffering from oxygen depletion and you have a heart condition. Lastly – rheumatism of the left rear leg and a liver condition we cannot describe because it is not yet fully declared. And you ask why you cannot move? We suggest you are also crazy.” (316-317)*

Since Mottyl's other means of survival are shared to a great extent by the other animals as well, I will discuss them more closely in chapter 5. At this point, I will mention that for the animals, constant surviving is the only way to live and the only way to survive is through communication and knowledge. Another essential element to Mottyl's survival is Mrs Noyes, who is the saviour of both Mottyl and many others. She will be the object of our attention in the next chapter.

To conclude this chapter, however, I wish to look more closely into the opposite of survival, death. Mottyl is the one character who is present to witness and recognise the deaths of

Barky, Yaweh and the Lady, the Unicorn's mate (56; 112; 295). What all these deaths have in common is the crown of flies that Mottyl is quick to recognise, for one of her kittens, weakened by Noah's experiments, died that way (56). Therefore, we receive the news of Yaweh's death through Mottyl's eyes, who wonders whether anyone else even notices the significance of the flies in his carriage. It is also significant that all three characters die somewhat differently: Barky is violently killed by Lucy, Yaweh consents to his own death as an old, weary man and the Lady dies of sorrow, simply fading away. Apart from the victims of the flood or violence though, Yaweh, the Lady and Mottyl herself, when she sings her final song, experience their own death as the continuum of the death of their world. The world Yaweh created exists no longer in the way he wanted it, the Lady has lost her mate, the Unicorn, and Mottyl can see the world she was born into only in her mind. For Mottyl, "her children, her Crowe and her whispers [have] all died before her", leaving her exhausted, blind and with only a little breath left in her (332). Even though Mrs Noyes resolves to keep her alive, it is clear that Mottyl is near her death, for while Mrs Noyes may be her saviour, all the creatures really dependent on Mottyl are gone.

4.3 Mrs Noyes – Transforming victimhood

Mrs Noyes is Noah's wife, the real hero of the story, who finds herself through opposing to the threat towards her loved ones. Her transformation from an obedient wife into a defender and comforter of anyone in need mirrors well the fluctuation between different victim positions. In this chapter, I will present this transformation and its development through key moments that change Mrs Noyes and the way she experiences herself.

The fact that we are never given any other name but Mrs Noyes reflects the situation at the beginning of the story: Mrs Noyes exists to great extent in relation to her husband and she ends up obeying him, even when she disagrees (Bailey 1998, 133). As I already pointed out in chapter

3, for Noah, Mrs Noyes is the Other, inferior to Noah, and she submits to this position. This can be seen especially in the feast for Yaweh, for Mrs Noyes works and works in the kitchen, making everything suitable for Yaweh, yet finds herself misunderstood and shamed when he finally arrives (*ibid.*; Pennee 1993, 34). To drown out her frustration, Mrs Noyes drinks gin and sits on her porch, enjoying the almost-free moments at her disposal. Being known to drink gin weakens her position of authority even more: when she sees the Faeries, she asks them to stay because “Noah never believes [her] about the Faeries” (37).

Mrs Noyes lives for her family and her animals. She has taught her sheep to sing and knows all the other animals’ habits as well. She has a place in her heart for everyone from her husband Noah to her young daughter-in-law Emma, even if she is sometimes abrupt with her. We learn that Shem, Ham and Japeth are not the only children she has given birth to, and what is more, she has given birth to an ape-child whom she drowned because Noah forced her to. For Noah, ape-children, or Lotte-children, are something unholy, a mark of his own deficiency which can simply not exist and must be concealed. Because Emma has an ape-child for a sister, she is ordered to become Japeth’s wife, since Noah could then blame her if she gave birth to such a child. For Mrs Noyes, Emma’s sister Lotte is the symbol of all she lost. She has seen her playing with her loving parents in the woods and sees that she is a child like any other, missing her own.

At the beginning of the story, Noah claims a sacrifice in the name of religion, and Mrs Noyes simply grieves internally. We see only small glimpses of Mrs Noyes’s inner rebellion burst out against Noah at this point and they are all subdued by him. She also suffers during Yaweh’s dinner, she sits as far away from Yaweh as possible and Sarah the cat even attacks her. At this point, I would argue, Mrs Noyes is in Position Two on Atwood’s scale of victimhood,

meaning that she knows that she is a victim, but cannot see any way out of her victimhood. However, this quickly begins to change.

Emma's father is one of the builders of the ark. In the first proper act of rebellion, Mrs Noyes takes Emma to see him, and they ride in the cart with him. This only happens once though and Mrs Noyes is just as engaged in preparations as other members of the Noyes household. However, Noah makes the mistake of setting all the animals not coming to the ark on fire, claiming it to be a grand sacrifice for Yaweh. For Mrs Noyes, killing so many of her loved ones spurs her into action and she refuses to board the ark, unless Mottyl can come with her. This marks the moment of her moving from Position Two to Position Three, meaning that she recognises that her victimhood is not inevitable and that she can oppose to her victimiser, the sadistic Noah. This begins her transformation from a scared, oppressed wife to a strong, maternal helper of others, putting others before herself (Bailey, quoted by Nielsen 1998).

Mrs Noyes ventures in the orchard, the "symbol of the elitist and misogynist philosophy of patriarchy", which has always been forbidden to her and other women, except for the virtuous Hannah (Demousselle 1995, 51). There, she eats apples for the first time in her life, feeling that "civilization was falling away from her shoulders", abandoning all the oppressing rules and rituals (146). Noah's power over her is slowly unravelling, even if he is her only way to survive. According to Carinne Demousselle, the final moment when Mrs Noyes decides not to follow Noah's rules anymore is the moment when she is consoling the bears, as she finally understands the reason for Noah's behaviour (1995, 52): "Cruelty [is] fear in disguise and nothing more [...] fear itself [is] nothing more than a failure of imagination" (230). This is the case especially for Japeth who, as we have seen, fears facing his trauma over his experiences with the ruffians, but also for Noah who tries to hold on to his position as a leader at all costs, just as Yaweh has done

before him. I would still argue that the process of Mrs Noyes's transformation is largely completed even before her consoling the bears, as we will see in the following.

The suffering of loved ones is what spurs Mrs Noyes into action and this also goes for actions after the orchard. During the flood, she saves, at least for a little while, the Faeries by carrying them across a wide river and tries to bring Lotte, separated from her parents, on the ark. Japeth kills Lotte on Noah's orders which makes Mrs Noyes leave the ark, as she finally declares that "[t]here is no God worthy of this child" (170). She goes to their old house, dresses Lotte up and sings her songs. What is poignant though, are her words when she accepts that she may well drown, but that at the same time, "I'm finally me, *all over*. Like it or lump it" (181). She has found herself and abandoned Yaweh and Noah's society and its structures and no longer wishes to die (Demousselle 1995, 51). And, as befitting her role of defending and saving others, when she returns to the ark, it also is to save Mottyl and Crowe: she hides them in her apron and lies to Noah that there are only apples in her pockets. In this way, she moves to Position Four, the position of the creative non-victim at this point, for she holds power over him for a while, being able to talk him out of checking her pockets.

In fact, the development of power relations between Mrs Noyes and husband does not end there. Even when Noah is her only key to physical survival, he no longer has any mental power over her. Instead, he begins to become dependent on her, when Hannah's cooking skills are lacking, making her come up to his cabin just to command her to help Hannah.

“‘So – you want me to give her my recipe.’
At least he had the decency to be embarrassed.
‘Well – damn it, madam!’ he said. ‘It has always been my favourite dish – and one that you manage supremely well.’” (221)

This shift of power from mental to physical from Noah's point of view applies to Yaweh as well, who finally had no other option but to destroy his creations in order to have power over them.

Mrs Noyes goes through the most radical process of change in the novel, moving from Position Two to Positions Three and Four. She is the image of the Other for Noah and Yaweh, yet, while she rails against them, she is still capable of trying to understand them and trying to live harmoniously with them, even when they mistreat her. She even offers help to Hannah, but Hannah refuses help and thus aligns herself with Yaweh instead of Mrs Noyes's warmth and motherhood. That motherhood is what partly keeps hope alive inside the ark. Mrs Noyes is the one who makes everybody sing to cheer Mottyl (231-32) and sleeps with bears who are weeping (233-34).

4.4 Lucy – Refusing victimhood

Lucy, or Lucifer, is an angel who has jumped from heaven, decides to dress up as a woman and ends up being married to Noah's scientific son, Ham. She is the catalyst in the story (Brydon 1998, 80), the odd one out, who simply does not fit into the strict social pyramid that is the world of Yaweh and Noah. Lucy is also another uniting element in the story. Where Mottyl and Mrs Noyes represent a connection between the world of animals and that of humans, Lucy connects the world of heaven, the world before the flood and the world left on the ark into a continuum, for she is the only character who has experienced all three. These different worlds, or times, are what drive her forward: Lucy believes that someday, somehow, the world she dreams of will come into existence, even though the three worlds she has seen this far have not yet fulfilled her dream. I will refer to Lucy as a "she", like Findley, though I did come across critics calling her a "he", or the "s/he" to highlight her hybridity (Demousselle 1995; Brydon 1998, 80).

Like Japeth and Mrs Noyes, and most other characters, Lucy is a victim of the dichotomous world of Yaweh, even though her victimhood is different from the others. We hear of her time in heaven and learn that she has jumped down to earth because she cannot bear the

monotonous light or the constant harmony of heaven. Lucy's questions of "why?" and her curiosity go against the principles of Yaweh's world (108; Jefferess 2000). Since his power is based on knowledge being in few hands only, with no one being able to question it, Lucy shakes the very foundations of Yaweh's power, thus upsetting him. On earth, the issue is her hybrid identity: she does not fit into Noah's system of binary oppositions (Brydon 1998, 80) and thus Noah cannot approve of her. Lucy's victim position shifts therefore somewhere between Positions Three and Four, for she recognises her victimhood, struggles against it and then turns to creative action to become a non-victim. This pattern keeps repeating itself, with Lucy never accepting her victimhood but instead fighting against it the moment the time is right. She appears as Eve in Noah's *Masque of Creation* (98), flaunting the conservative nature of the play that is meant to celebrate Yaweh. On the ark, she acts twice to bring about a revolution, succeeding on the second.

In addition to these active moments of defiance, Lucy also flaunts the conventions by deciding herself on her looks and even identity. Michael Archangelis points out that Lucy is male, but she replies: "Nothing wrong with dressing as a woman. Might as well be a woman as anything else" (107). Lucy uses her creativity where she can and that is her identity, an identity that she cannot find in the dichotomous world of Yaweh. What she misses is the freedom to choose instead of being dictated to, to be able to be different and diverse. This diversity is the exact thing Lucy is searching for.

Nevertheless, even the world of humans does not quite offer the freedom Lucy is looking for. Findley highlights Lucy's difference by having her dress up as a geisha, which is marked upon by the other characters, especially Michael and Noah, who blames Mrs Noyes for Ham having found her (74). Her make-up and her clothes make even Mrs. Noyes wonder. As Lorraine

York remarks, Lucy is “the Orientalized other” who is “racialized by performing Oriental” and “sexualized when she is described variously as a courtesan and a whore” (1993). She reveals the binary oppositions while struggling to be rid of them. In fact, David Jefferess even asks if Lucy actually strengthens them by not acting before the revolution on the ark but instead deceiving Ham to become his wife and survive the flood (2000). However, if we consider Lucy’s past and her experiences with heaven, I find that simply enjoying the situation of having variety in the world is enough to make her content. She is not altruistic in the same sense as Mrs Noyes is. Her preoccupation with the other world is closely connected to herself and she wants to enjoy that world by imagining and re-imagining her identity.

Still, the death of the Unicorn (280) signifies an important moment for Lucy. She briefly brings the Unicorn back from the dead and her anger at Noah and the black-and-white world they inhabit encourage her to share her dream with the others.

“‘A long time ago,’ she said; ‘in a place I have almost forgotten – I heard a rumour of another world. With all my heart – because I could not abide the place I was in – I wanted to see that world. I wanted to go there and to be there and to live there.. Where I was born – the trees were always in the sun. [...] *Always fair weather!* Dull. I wanted storms. I wanted difference. And I had heard this rumour... about another world. And I wondered – does it rain there? Are there clouds, perhaps, and is there shade in that other world? I wanted somewhere to stand, you see, that would give me a view of deserts and of snow. I wanted *that* desperately. I wanted, too, someone I could argue with. [...] And I wondered... might there be people there, in this other world, who would tell me the sky was green? Who would say that dry is wet – and black is white? And if I were to say: ‘*I am not I – but whoever I wish to be,*’ would I be believed – in this other world?...’” (282)

In this passage, we can hear one of Findley’s most poignant themes in the novel, the right to decide who you want to be, the right for diversity, the right to live in a world with more hues than black and white. It seems that Lucy already almost found it, before Yaweh destroyed that world because it did not agree with him. Below the deck of the ark, with the rest of the world drowned, there is only darkness, especially when Noah decides to extinguish all their lights, whereas before, in heaven, there was only lightness. Neither option is an option Lucy is looking

for, but instead she herself hopes for the right to choose whether one's own world is black or white or something in between. As we can see, Lucy is directly battling against the binary oppositions Yaweh and Noah's world consists of. Lucy wishes for a world with no Self and no Other, no us and them, because only when one is free to see another person as equal to oneself, is one free to accept them as they are, giving them the freedom to decide who they want to be. For Lucy, holocaust means the destruction of diversity, which has indeed already happened in heaven. The reason she wishes to board the ark is not only to stay alive, it is also to help the diversity on the ark survive, because that diversity is the only thing in the postdiluvian world that will keep her dream of "another world" alive.

However, according to David Jefferess, Lucy's actions do not portray her words, but instead she "begins to secure her role as a leader within the community below decks, constructing a hierarchical rather than a relational order" (ibid.). He argues that Lucy desires to have power through knowledge and that the reason for waking up the Unicorn is to have authority over the others (2000). Lucy once again recreates herself, this time back into her feathered gown, with features that resemble a male more than a female. It is arguable that she in a way bows to the binary oppositions of Yaweh and Noah, for she sees them as others, who must be controlled with violence (Jefferess 2000). The division into us and them keeps strengthening on the ark, bowing to Noah and Yaweh's power structures, even if the Other and the Self change places. Linda Lamont-Stewart, on the other hand, claims that Lucy's inability or unwillingness to have only female or male characteristics makes her truly androgynous, destabilizing the binary opposition of especially male/female in Noah's world, interpreting her actions as a complete opposite of Jefferess's analysis (1997). Anne Geddes Bailey's view is somewhat bleaker, for she argues that "effective power remains masculine", leading to Lucy's transformation (1998, 150). I

would argue that Findley reminds us of the consequences of oppression, which lead to othering also on the side of the oppressed. Finally, if the oppressed are strong or determined enough, they may attempt to turn the power structures to their advantage. Right after the revolution, there is less chance of the disappearance of the us/them dichotomy, because the oppressed, just like Lucy, may wish for revenge or at least an entire removal from power for the previous oppressor.

The only question is what actually happens after Lucy's revolution? Lucy craves for another world, but does she reach it? Or is she trapped in the same structure of power she tried to destroy, only taking the role of the oppressor (Jefferess 2000)? I believe the situation is very much like that of postcolonialism: even though there is a wish for a perfect world free of oppression, in reality the development is slow and has setbacks. It is still development though and the situation at the end of the novel is more hopeful than before the successful Revolution of the Lower Orders.

5. Beyond survival

In this chapter, I will explore different survival strategies that have to do with both physical and psychological survival in different groups. I will attempt to show that Findley has decided to make his characters survive through each others' help and not as individuals and that there is a huge difference between characters who give and receive psychological or social help and characters who only accept physical help, especially in terms of happiness and warmth. Then I will consider how this connects to the different "ages" in the novel: before the flood, on the ark and after the revolution and what has survived and what has not. I will compare the different worlds the characters have inhabited and the world they find themselves in at the end of the novel and consider what that means for their future. Lastly, I will analyse Findley's novel from the point of view of Canadian literature and postcolonialism.

5.1 Solidarity and diversity

The characters of *Not Wanted on the Voyage* are divided into two different groups, which is even more apparent on the ark. One of these groups is that of Yaweh and Noah who are joined by the angels, Shem, Japeth and Hannah. The other group consists of all the other characters, Mrs Noyes, Lucy, Ham, Emma, Mottyl, Crowe and other animals. Carinne Demousselle calls these two groups death-oriented and life-oriented, with Noah and Yaweh as the obvious agents of death, while Mrs Noyes tries to save the lives of many characters, sometimes succeeding. I have already discussed the structured nature of the first group, as it consists of the binary oppositions of chapter three, with Yaweh on top, followed by Noah and then the others beneath him. However, this is not at all the case for the second group. In fact, it is based on relationships, creating a network of information and solidarity. This network is introduced to us in the Forest.

When Mottyl goes to the Forest, she finds out about a birth on the meadow (40). This information she stores away, in order to possibly change it later to some information useful for herself. Also, she gossips and changes information with the lemurs guarding the Forest (44-47). Information about gossip, food and escape stories between species with common enemies, are exchanged between animals, creating an atmosphere of communion and negotiation (Pennee 1993, 42). Where for Noah, power is found in knowledge, to be decided on his own and guarded from everyone else, for the animals, power is found in information, to be shared and multiplied with others. As Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin conclude, “[r]eality thus becomes that which can be negotiated between a multiplicity of groups and possibilities” (1989, 101).

Another difference is in the nature of that power. For Noah, power means dominating others, making them follow his orders, but for the animals, the power they have is the power over their own destiny. The more stories of escape you know, the easier it is to escape the threat of an enemy and the more you know about the Forest, the less likely it is to encounter these enemies. It is a question of survival (Pennee 1993, 42).

With this network of information, we also see acts of solidarity and empathy. For the animals, giving means receiving, instead of Noah’s one-sided demands, and this reciprocity allows them to enhance their means of survival. The confined existence inside the ark intensifies this interdependence between all species (Jefferess 2000). As Carinne Demousselle points out, we see acts of solidarity happening between animals, between animals and humans, between humans, between divine beings and humans (1995). This also happens on the ark, with Big Tusk helping Mottyl up from the Well of Darkness and with Mrs Noyes comforting the bears at night. Big Tusk also remarks: “‘We are all in this together – and we must do what we can do’” (229),

revealing the practice of cooperation inside the ark (Bailey 1998, 136). The existence or lack of solidarity and empathy is, indeed, the key difference between the two groups.

The most powerful aspect of this solidarity is the atmosphere it creates. Noah's group above deck is lonely, insecure and miserable, with Noah calling out to the absent Yaweh, Shem drowning in gluttony and Japeth only thinking of sex (Bailey 1998, 137). Hannah refuses solidarity from Mrs Noyes even though she would need it, holding on to her pride, having chosen Noah's side, the side of power (266-67). However, for the characters inside the ark, there are moments of warmth and encouragement, created by characters being and acting together. Anne Geddes Bailey (1998) even compares the ark to "a kind of womb". The animals are all different, but they support each other's strengths and weaknesses, as in the case of Mottyl and Big Tusk.

Diversity and its oppression are, indeed, an important theme in the novel. In addition to all the real animals presented in it, we also meet demons, dragons, the Faeries and the Unicorn. These beings die either because they are not allowed in the ark, as in the case of the Faeries and dragons, or are killed during the voyage by Japeth or Noah, like the demons and the Unicorn, turning the world into the kind that we live in now. With them, we lose some of the beauty of the world, a message that calls out to acceptance of difference and variety, so that such tragedies would not keep repeating themselves. The Forest is a beautiful place with mostly happy beings living in it, but when most of them are destroyed, the world that is left becomes dark and gloomy. Still, there is some diversity left and so there is still more warmth and solidarity inside the ark than in Noah's group. The example of Hannah's bad cooking is a symbol of how equally incompetent the characters above the deck are in terms of survival and reveals to us that diversity is essential for survival.

By raising himself above the others, Noah is denying the importance of diversity, which thrives in a network of appreciation and empathy. Thus, he turns into a lonely man, having rejected the other characters and been abandoned by Yaweh (242). In his world of binary oppositions, men are learned, strict and unencumbered by emotion, which necessarily distances him from the other group characterised by caring. (Nielsen 1998) As Mrs Noyes realizes, cruelty is born out of fear and fear is born out of the lack of imagination, that is, not being able to imagine what would happen (252). The reason for Noah's cruelty, then, is his fear for anything that does not fit his binary structure of the world. A good example of this is his disgust of Lotte-children, since they are hybrid between animals and humans (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 102) Mrs Noyes, on the other hand, conquers her fear, and acts with great empathy instead of cruelty towards everyone.

Lucy is another character who does not fit Noah's binary structures at any time during the novel. She is characterised by hybridity: she is male, but marries a man and dresses up as a woman; she is an angel, but lives with humans; she uses humor or violence depending on the situation. She is on a constant quest to find a world where she could decide who she wants to be and be accepted as that person. She jumps from heaven to escape its constant light, hoping to find her dream world on Earth, only to find herself in darkness inside the ark. She is ready to fight for diversity, for the right of hybridity, since "there must be somewhere where darkness and light are reconciled" (284). She starts a rumour of this place and plans the first revolt with the help of demons. However, their first attempt goes horribly wrong. Demousselle argues that this is because they try to use the weapons of Noah's world: violence and animals as objects. The reason they are successful on their second try is because they use solidarity, with Crowe giving her life in the process and Emma fighting to open the door for the revolutionaries. With

cooperation and solidarity, Lucy's group is able to release themselves from imprisonment and see light again.

What we do not find out, is whether these two groups will ever form one group and destroy the division between us and them. It is clear that Noah has not changed his ways and even Japeth is released again (351). In that sense, the revolution may be considered a failure. Yet, as we will see in the next chapter, the fight for diversity may also be a process and this revolution only a step towards a more diverse world.

As I have shown, the most important means of survival for animals and humans include a network of information, solidarity, empathy and cooperation. While physical survival is possible on one's own, we may ask how well Noah has survived when he ends up lonely, high above the others, and in fact, becomes God, or consider how Japeth or Shem are now defined by one characteristic only: Japeth by violence and Shem by gluttony. On the other hand, Mottyl survives time and time again, because other characters help and care for her. The text seems to be arguing for the importance of social interaction and respect for diversity and hybridity. They feed the imagination and create beauty and happiness, making the world a better place.

5.2 The past, the present and the future

In this chapter, I will discuss the different worlds we learn about during the story and the different conceptions of time and place the novel presents to us. Which of these worlds survive and which do not? Like the story of Genesis, Findley's novel has many endings and beginnings in it, but at the same time the Faeries make the sign of infinity, which also appears throughout the text as a marker for a new section. This contradictory combination conceals the central message of the novel. I will then consider the novel from a postcolonial point of view, since, as I will argue, there are parallels to the concerns of postcolonialism in the story. I will end the

chapter with a discussion on what makes the novel Canadian, what exactly is the price of survival and, most importantly, what happens after it.

Many critics, Diana Brydon (1998) especially, have pointed out the endings and beginnings in the text, comparing it to Genesis. The flood is the end of the world to allow a fresh start for Noah and the proper social structures that have been forgotten by most, much to Yaweh's disappointment (Brydon 1998, 76). At the same time, it is holocaust for all of them and there have indeed been comparisons of the story to Nazis, concentration camps and fascism (Bailey 1998; Demousselle 1995; Guihan 2009). Wendy Pearson (1998/1999) even argues that there is "an allegorical conflation of all holocausts, past, present and future, real or imagined" present in *Not Wanted on the Voyage*. Indeed, Lucy refers to a holocaust in heaven, survival being the reason she joined humans (110). This holocaust is another ending, and beginning, meant to wipe out dissenting voices, to have only light, harmony and obedience for Yaweh in heaven.

There are many other glimpses and connections to the past in the novel in addition to Lucy remembering heaven. Noah remembers the old times "when Yaweh [was] the object of man's worship" (47) and Mottyl and Mrs Noyes remember the world that was before the flood at the end of the novel (332-33; 342-43). Brydon argues that Findley encourages us to remember and build on the old instead of destroying, which, according to her, is a view that aligns itself with Canadian Tories' ideas of conservatism and reluctance to change (1998, 76). Pearson's argument is in essence the same, since she draws our attention to the paradox of creating a world filled with diversity and beauty, yet with many problems, and then destroying it to make it better, yet losing all the magical elements like the Faeries and singing voices of the sheep and keeping the problems (1998/1999).

The opposite of this idea is the sign the Faeries make: the sign of infinity that Findley also uses in the beginning of each book and each section of the text (Brydon 1998, 78). To Brydon, the sign represents “the endless fertility of the creative imagination and the inexhaustible diversity of forms of life beyond the human” (ibid.). I would also add to this a sense of continuation, a belief in and a fight for that diversity and its acceptance. As Mrs Noyes says to Lucy, when she starts the rumour of a world tolerant of light and darkness: “‘Even if it takes a thousand years – we want to come with you’ [...] ‘Wherever you may be going’” (284). To this Lucy answers: “‘Now [...] you have begun to understand the meaning of your sign’”(284). Creating a perfect world is impossible, destroying an imperfect world is cruel, but striving to make the present world better is a goal worth reaching. This process begins with survival, and the sign of the Faeries refers to this process: it may be never-ending, but, at the same time, it creates infinite possibilities for life and diversity.

I cannot agree entirely with the idea of Findley’s conservatism simply because of the many problems created by Yaweh and Noah’s binary system of power. W.J. Keith draws our attention to this paradox: the antediluvian world is both magical and beautiful, but at the same time, polluted and violent (1987). Already the Faeries make the sign of infinity, telling us that the aspiration towards a world of diversity and solidarity will never cease. Lucy survived heaven and Mrs Noyes and the others survived the flood, with new determination to find the world in Lucy’s rumour and not to submit to Noah’s oppression. This world has not yet been in existence as such, nor will it ever be, and Findley is aware of that which is why the characters do not reach it in the novel either. Lucy’s rumour is a dream, the purpose for living and resisting and a reason to survive.

However, as Findley does not tell us but a rumour of this world, we are left to wonder whether such a world may come to existence or whether the same us-and-them mentality will continue in one form or another. While Mrs Noyes is capable of acting with kindness (Bailey 1998, 149), Lucy is ready to use even violence to hold on to her dream. We do not really see the two groups coming together, as Noah is too set in his structure of the world. In fact, it seems to me that while Findley is arguing for nostalgia, remembering and building from what we already have, he is also against conservatism and fixed views, instead calling for change between the social relations of humans and animals. David Jefferess (2000) says that the story seeks to resist the idea of a better world somewhere else, but I would argue that Findley is presenting us with a mission. He is calling for “the continuity within change”, “a faith in human resilience against the dangerous rigidities of any excessively rationalistic system” (Keith 1987). Nielsen (1998) even argues that “once you disrupt binary thinking (even temporarily), patriarchy cannot sustain itself.” Indeed, the text is calling for imagination, openness and lack of fear which are the qualities that can prevent dichotomous thinking from ruling the world and separating it into us and them.

This is even more important, if we consider the basis of Noah’s power, that is, the control of knowledge. Without openness and equal status of diverse beings, the one in power has control over the language and can decide on knowledge, history and values, as in the case of antediluvian Noah. In such a world, only rumours can exist outside this structure, but anything that threatens it can be disposed of, as in the case of Lotte-children.

Now I will once again compare the story to the era of colonialism and its effects on the world today. Colonialism was the end of the world for many, yet there were enough “rumours of another world” for decolonisation to finally happen. Just like the Revolution on the ark, its result

was not clear or easy, but instead left most ex-colonies drifting, with no one to help or support them. Still, the present is better than it was before decolonisation, though the past of colonialism will inevitably affect the future of these countries forever. In fact, wiping out all of the ex-coloniser's culture would be, not only impossible, but also probably harming, since it easily leads to a simple reversal of power relations. There are still "us" and "them", only the one who was previously cast in the role of the other is now the oppressor. Therefore, it would be madness to ignore the history of colonialism, or any darker period of time, and not learn from it. Findley is very critical of the Western history of colonialism and oppression, and shows us its inevitable effects on the oppressed people (Ashcroft&al. 1989, 104), but at the same time, gives us hope, through the voice of Lucy, of a world where these effects would lose their meaning through reconciling with and learning from the colonial past.

As I explained in the theory section, Canadian literature is postcolonial literature and it has often been concerned with the nature of Canadian society and the question of what is Canadian. Findley's novel calls for the same acceptance of diversity that the Canadian society is based on, highlighting the allegiance between citizens more than the collective identity of a nation. Common identity will always create a group, a "we", which will need the Other to define itself. This happens in *Not Wanted on the Voyage*, when Noah calls the people from the lower deck to his cabin, cementing the two opposing groups on the ark and giving the members of each group a sense of "us" with common values and goals differing from the other (210-213). This strengthens the perception of the other group as "them", and this strengthening will finally lead to both more cruelty and, finally, revolution. If, instead of group identity, there would be unity based in allegiance, it would allow everyone to seek their own happiness and, at the same time, allow them to accept others doing the same. Animals with their different enemies, diets and needs are

different from each other, yet they help each other, cheer for each other and, most of all, accept each other in their own quests for survival.

As we have seen, *Not Wanted on the Voyage* is filled with survivors, victims and victimisers. However, what is the meaning of surviving? And of not surviving? What happens after survival? Apart from our biological need for survival, survival is also closely connected to the belief in future. We must survive in order to find the world of Lucy's rumour, to help create it also for our children and loved ones. When Mottyl is unable to do this, all of her babies and Crowe having died, she finally gives up her fight for survival (332), whereas Mrs Noyes, the mother figure for everyone inside the ark, does not. As for Noah, his means of survival is, just as in the rest of his actions, his system of binary oppositions. His sense tradition and obedience to Yaweh enable him to build the ark. Still, even he cannot survive alone, but depends on Japeth to be his soldier and Hannah to be his cook. Yaweh himself is dependent on his angels. Just like Mottyl, he decides to die when his creation has changed and is about to be destroyed, though, unlike Mottyl, he is the destroyer of his own creation, when it no longer fits his binary world view. As we can see, the text argues that survival is nearly impossible on one's own. Japeth is the only character who survives the Ruffian King and being marinated on his own, but the Japeth of childhood, trusting and sunny, is dead forever. All the others receive help from another character: the Faeries, bears and Lotte from Mrs Noyes, Mottyl from Big Tusk and Mrs Noyes, Lucy from the demons and so forth.

With Faeries, demons, dragons and the Unicorn, the world loses much of its magic and its power of imagination, which is another reason, and especially the means, to survive. Diversity, imagination and empathy are closely connected and without them, the world will be subject to tyranny and violence. Findley's novel puts the survival of this kind of imagination above the

survival of individual characters and Crowe's death during the Revolution of the Lower orders is heroic, for the best of causes. All the beings drowned by the flood, on the other hand, are a huge loss of diversity and imagination that robs the world of its beauty and wonder. This makes all of the world a collective victim, as Atwood portrays Canada in *Survival*.

Sometimes the price of survival is great, as in the case of Mottyl or the Revolution itself. Mottyl loses her babies and her health, the Revolt causes the demons to die and the Revolution causes the death of Crowe. Still, as is typical of Canadian literature, the characters endure and persist as long as is needed. Crowe's death is needed for the survival of the rest of the animals and beings inside the ark. Similarly, there is much gloominess and suffering inside the ark even with the little warmth and solidarity they share. Inside the ark, the animals truly have nothing else but their lives, and many mistake the ark for death. Still, with all this hardship, the animals also find ways to survive mentally, using the same network of solidarity they used in the Forest. However, the price of the revolution is the highest for this network: the sheep lose their ability to sing and communicate, as do probably the other animals. Still, they survive to the deck, to see daylight again. So, the story definitely does not promise the end of all suffering through solidarity and communal behaviour, but it does seem to argue that they make bare survival possible. This is in sharp contrast to Hannah, who births a baby without help and without any kind of support.

Findley's novel may not take place in Canada, but it surely contains themes typical of Canadian literature. Brydon even compares it to Northrop Frye's idea of the garrison, the first fortresses in Canada that both protected and imprisoned the people who lived there (1998, 86). It is also markedly postcolonial in its approach to oppression and the binary structures of power, tying it to the tradition of Canadian literature as postcolonial literature. The story of Noah's ark

is by nature a story of survival, but Findley's story also shows us the ones who did not survive, or survived but struggled against the end of the world. In fact, Brydon argues that Mrs Noyes's prayer for rain at the very end of the novel is the ultimate way of saying no to Noah, who wishes to find land, to have a stable starting point for the new world based on Yaweh's rules and wishes (1998, 77). She prays for continuation, for eternity, with no clear beginning and end, no clear binary oppositions or dictatorial power over others (*ibid.*). After all the ends and the beginnings, she wishes to continue with the world they have, making the best of it, instead of having it destroyed once again. In a way, Yaweh's flood has created the possibility for this, because the ark is not on stable ground but is instead left floating infinitely. Mrs Noyes wants to reach the world of the rumour on its terms: no new beginnings that imply dreadful endings for what exists before that, but instead the infinity of imagination and freedom. She knows that she is a victim, but by endeavouring to find this infinity, she is endeavouring to find the position of the creative non-victim, able to choose her own fate. She aspires to reach a world that is unified in trying to find happiness through imagination, solidarity and diversity, because, according to Findley, it is ultimately the only way to survive.

6. Conclusion

In this thesis, I have examined the theme of survival in Timothy Findley's novel, *Not Wanted on the Voyage*. As I have shown, survival is a typical theme in Canadian literature. By comparing Margaret Atwood's victim positions, which she defined in *Survival*, with the postcolonial term the Other and its implications, I was able to discuss a wide range of issues concerning victimhood and survival in the novel. I have also attempted to show that *Not Wanted on the Voyage* can be read as a metaphor of the processes of colonialism and postcolonialism, allowing Findley's message to reach beyond the novel.

I also tried to present to the reader the richness of Findley's novel and the many possible interpretations of it. There is still an endless amount of critique to be done for future critics. In fact, this very multitude of different interpretations supports the novel's basic tenet of diversity and imagination, especially when many agree on the surface level of the novel, for example, in the case of the binary opposition of Noah's world, but come up with entirely different interpretations of it. I deliberately decided to discuss survival and victims from a postcolonial, Canadian perspective, but there is more even on these subjects in the novel than would ever fit into a thesis. Therefore, I have tried, above all, to concentrate on finding the essential themes and messages of the novel through some well picked-out examples instead of listing several scenes supporting one idea. There is always the question of how to narrow your subject enough but, at the same time not too much, and this time I decided to analyse the novel on a broader scale, especially since there has been comparably little criticism focusing on *Not Wanted on the Voyage* exclusively.

I started my analysis by analysing the victimisers of the story, Yaweh and Noah. I concluded that their power is based on a hierarchical structure of binary oppositions, creating

unequal, dichotomous pairs like God and man, man and woman, human and animal. As Yaweh and Noah are at the top of this structure, they have control over language and thus, over knowledge. By withholding knowledge from everyone else, it is possible to control them as well. However, if this control is not rigorously upheld, the structure's lower levels, the Others, may start to rebel. In Yaweh's case, he decides to end the world because of this and in order to have his traditional power structure continue with Noah on its top.

In the next chapter, I discussed different kinds of victims in the story. What they all have in common is that they are cast in the role of the Other. The difference is how they face their victimhood. I used Japeth as an example of a victim in denial. Japeth is unable to face his victimhood, so he turns to what he perceives as the markers of manhood and strength: violence and cruelty. Mottyl, on the other hand, is an example of a helpless victim, one who knows she is a victim but is ultimately unable to do anything about it. She is also a true Canadian victim by Atwood's definition, since she suffers excessively and is also an animal victim, whose sufferings we experience through her viewpoint. Mrs Noyes, the character who develops the most during the novel, is a victim vacillating between different victim positions, moving from a rather helpless victim to a resisting victim to even a creative non-victim. Her transformation is propelled forward by Noah's cruelty towards her loved-ones and she becomes the agent of survival for herself and for many other characters. Lastly, I talked about Lucy, the androgynous angel and Ham's wife, who constantly refuses to be victimised. She leaves heaven because she is too curious to be obedient and unquestioning of Yaweh's power. She does not fit with Noah's view of the world either with her ambiguous sex, sexuality and even nationality. Later, she affects the revolution on the ark and through her, Findley tells us a "rumour of another world" (282), which contains the central message of the story.

Different characters have different reasons to survive. For Noah, the reason is to uphold Yaweh's order and tradition in order to not lose his position on top of this order. Japeth's survival is left to chance, which creates a strong need in him to stay in control of his own life. Mottyl and Mrs Noyes, on the other hand, survive for their loved-ones. Mottyl suffers through almost everything to protect and give birth to her babies, whereas Mrs Noyes finds courage to help others survive and through them, finds reason to survive herself as well. Lucy needs to survive to another world to be able to decide on her own identity and to be accepted as she is.

After analysing individual victims, I moved on to discuss survival on the level of groups, society and the world itself. I concluded that a group and solidarity inside that group are essential for survival. On the other hand, this group should rather include all of the world instead of having several groups that oppose each other. This means accepting diversity as the principle of all life, giving everyone the right to choose their own identity. Inside the ark, and already in the Forest, the animals' society was based on this idea of diversity and solidarity between individuals. In this case, the power that one has is the power over one's own destiny and the more information the more power you have. This information and other acts of kindness flow between the animals, especially inside the ark, where survival is only possible together. As we saw with the case of the revolution, however, reaching this kind of world, instead of an individual group, is very difficult after oppression and cruelty between two different groups. However, the text seems to be suggesting this world more as a dream, something to aspire to and a hope for the future. Change should be based on remembrance and continuance instead of ends and beginnings, though we should not accept oppression or cruelty but aspire to be rid of them.

This challenge is also the challenge of postcolonialism. How to unite countries with two, or more, different groups that have histories of oppression and othering behind them? In chapter

3.2, I outlined how Findley's story could be used as an allegory of colonialism. We can now also consider it from the point of view of decolonisation and postcolonialism and once again reveal the parallels in the story. As we concluded, Yaweh corresponds to the Empire or the colonisers' culture which creates the colonised as the Other, as their counter-image. However, when the colonised become dissatisfied, the Empire decides to be rid of them and their culture. The coloniser, Noah, that is, is still left in the colony, or the ark, stranded and alone, yet unable to reach out, because he has positioned himself above the colonised people he now has under his control. This situation of oppression finally leads to decolonisation, or the Revolution of the Lower Orders. But, just like in the real world, the process of decolonisation and the period of postcolonialism is not smooth or clear-cut. In fact, it is still just as uncertain as the ark floating infinitely on the sea. The text seems to leave this rumour of another world to the entire world, which is still struggling with the cruelties of the period of colonialism, calling for diversity, solidarity and remembrance.

Canadian literature is postcolonial literature and the call for diversity in *Not Wanted on the Voyage* makes it a postcolonial Canadian novel in the truest sense of the term. The principle of diversity and creating one's own destiny is the basis of Canadian society, with more emphasis on allegiance than unified culture. What Findley's text adds to this, however, is the idea of solidarity and of community. Communication and respect between humans and animals would allow us to move beyond survival to living our diverse lives together, choosing our own identities and giving and receiving solidarity from others. This world may only exist in a rumour for now, but it is the best of goals to aspire to and the best reason to survive.

Bibliography:

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Atwood, Margaret. *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*. Toronto: Anansi, 1972.

Bailey, Anne Geddes. "Revolution and Counter-Revolution: Language and Authority in *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *Timothy Findley and the Aesthetics of Fascism*. Vancouver, B.C.: Talon, 1998. 131-52.

Brydon, Diana. *Timothy Findley*. New York: Twayne, 1998.

Buchanan, Ian. "Binary Opposition." *A Dictionary of Critical Theory*. Oxford University Press, 2012. Web. 24 Feb. 2013.

Bumsted, Jack. "Visions of Canada: A Brief History of Writing on the Canadian Character and the Canadian Identity." *A Passion for Identity: Canadian Studies for the 21st Century*. Ed. David Taras and Beverly Jean Rasporich. Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson Thomson Learning, 2001. 17-35.

"Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." *Justice Laws Website*. Government of Canada, 1 Mar. 2013. Web. 15 Mar. 2013. <<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/Const/page-15.html>>.

Demousselle, Carinne. "Antifascism and Characterization in Timothy Findley's *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *The Guises of Canadian Diversity: New European Perspectives = Les Masques De La Diversité Canadienne*. Ed. Serge Jaumain and Marc Maufort. Amsterdam [u.a.: Rodopi, 1995. 47-54.

Dickinson, Peter. "'Running Wilde': National Ambivalence and Sexual Dissidence in *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *Essays on Canadian Writing*. 64 (Summer 1998): 125-47.

"Divina Commedia." *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Ed. Dinah Birch. Oxford University Press, 2009. Web. 2 May 2013.

Duffy, Dennis, and Kate Johnson. "Timothy Findley." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historical-Dominion, 2012. Web. 30 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/timothy-findley>>.

Farca, Paula Anka. *Postcolonial Studies, Volume 12 : Identity in Place : Contemporary Indigenous Fiction by Women Writers in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand*. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.

Findley, Timothy. *Not Wanted on the Voyage*. Markham, Ont.: Penguin, 1984.

Foley, Michael. "Noah's Wife's Rebellion: Timothy Findley's Use of the Mystery Plays of Noah in *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *Essays on Canadian Writing*. 44 (Fall 1991): 175-83.

Frye, Northrop. *The Bush Garden; Essays on the Canadian Imagination*. [Toronto]: Anansi, 1971.

- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia UP, 1998.
- Guihan, Vincent J. "'Only an Animal. Nothing Human': Menagerie as Counter-Hegemony in Timothy Findley's *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *Of Mice and Men: Animals in Human Culture*. Ed. Nandita Batra and Vartan P. Messier. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009. 246-66.
- Hepburn, Allan, and Michael Hurley. "Southern Ontario Gothic." *Oxford Reference*. Ed. William Toye and Eugene Benson. Oxford University Press, 2012. Web. 30 Apr. 2013.
- Jefferess, David. "A Pacific (Re)Reading of Timothy Findley's *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *Essays on Canadian Writing*. 72 (Winter 2000): 138-58.
- Keith, W. J. "Apocalyptic Imaginations: Notes on Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* and Findley's *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *Essays on Canadian Writing*. 35 (Winter 1987): 123-34.
- Lamont-Stewart, Linda. "Androgyny as Resistance to Authoritarianism in Two Postmodern Canadian Novels." *Mosaic : A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature*. 30.3 (1997): 115-31.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- "Lucifer." *The Oxford Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*. Ed. Elizabeth Knowles. Oxford University Press, 2012. Web. 2 May 2013.
- Marteli, Cecilia. "Unpacking the Baggage: "Camp" Humour in Timothy Findley's *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *Canadian Literature* 148 (1998): 96-111.
- Miller, Arthur G. *The Social Psychology of Good and Evil*. New York: Guilford, 2004.
- Mongia, Padmini. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. London: Arnold, 1996.
- Morton, W. L. *The Canadian Identity*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1961.
- Naqvi, Fatima. *The Literary and Cultural Rhetoric of Victimhood: Western Europe, 1970-2005*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Nielsen, Dorothy. "Timothy Findley's *Not Wanted on the Voyage*: An Exemplary Ecofeminist Text." *Canadian Poetry: Studies, Documents, Reviews*. 42 (Spring-Summer 1998): 100-22.
- O'Malley, Martin, and Randy Potash. "Timothy Findley: 'The World of Tiffiness'." *CBCnews*. CBC/Radio Canada, n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.cbc.ca/news/obit/findley/>>.
- Pearson, Wendy. "Vanishing Acts II: Queer Reading(s) of Timothy Findley's *Headhunter* and *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 33.4 (Winter 1998/1999): 114-32.
- Pennee, Donna Palmateer. *Praying for Rain: Timothy Findley's Not Wanted on the Voyage*. Toronto: ECW, 1993.
- Ram, R. V. "A 'Postcolonial' Response to Timothy Findley's *Not Wanted on the Voyage*." *Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages Bulletin* 2nd ser. 16 (Dec. 2006): 7-17.

Reid, Jennifer. *Louis Riel and the Creation of Modern Canada: Mythic Discourse and the Postcolonial State*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 2008.

Resnick, Philip. *The European Roots of Canadian Identity*. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview, 2005.

Richter, Miriam Verena. *Creating the National Mosaic : Multiculturalism in Canadian Children's Literature from 1950 To 1994*. Editions Rodopi, 2011.

Ronning, Anne Holden and Lene Johannessen. *Cross/Cultures – Readings in the Post/Colonial Literatures in English, Volume 89 : Readings of the Particular : The Postcolonial in the Postnational*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2007.

Said, Edward. "From *Orientalism*." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. London: Arnold, 1996. 20-36.

Sethi, Rumina. *Politics of Postcolonialism: Empire, Nation and Resistance*. London: Pluto Press, 2011.

Staines, David. *The Canadian Imagination: Dimensions of a Literary Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1977.

"victim, n.". OED Online. December 2012. Oxford University Press. 21 January 2013 <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/223196?rskey=RfyCr8&result=1&isAdvanced=false>>.

York, Lorraine. "'A White Hand Hovering over the Page': Timothy Findley and the Racialized/Ethnicized Other." *Essays on Canadian Writing*. 64 (Summer 1998): 201-21.

Zach Wells. "Out of the Garrison and Into the Garret". *Northern Poetry Review*. 2011.