

THE ANALYSES OF MODERNITY, POWER, AND RESISTANCE IN THE
DYSTOPIAS OF MARGARET ATWOOD

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY
AYÇA BERNA GÖRMEZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION

MARCH 2021

Approval of the thesis:

**THE ANALYSES OF MODERNITY, POWER, AND RESISTANCE IN THE
DYSTOPIAS OF MARGARET ATWOOD**

submitted by AYÇA BERNA GÖRMEZ in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science and Public
Administration, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East
Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Ayşe AYATA
Head of Department
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fahriye ÜSTÜNER
Supervisor
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Examining Committee Members:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kürşad ERTUĞRUL (Head of the Examining Committee)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fahriye ÜSTÜNER (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömür BİRLER
Middle East Technical University
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Prof. Dr. Hasan Bahadır TÜRK
Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ersan OCAK
TED University
Department of City and Regional Planning

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Ayça Berna GÖRMEZ

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE ANALYSES OF MODERNITY, POWER, AND RESISTANCE IN THE DYSTOPIAS OF MARGARET ATWOOD

GÖRMEZ, Ayça Berna

Ph.D., The Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fahriye ÜSTÜNER

March 2021, 371 pages

This study aims at analyzing modernity, power, and resistance in Margaret Atwood's dystopias. The examined books are *The Handmaid's Tale* and *MaddAddam* trilogy (*Oryx and Crake*, *The Year of the Flood*, and *MaddAddam*). It is argued that dystopian writings and social theories have much in common. These writings make us experience alternative worlds and they pose critique to the social organization, economic and political regimes. Through this critique, they have the power to trigger social transformation and change. This study seeks alternative ways of being and alternative social organizations. To do this, first, the general characteristics of the societies that are portrayed in *The Handmaid's Tale* and *MaddAddam* trilogy are given. This is done with the help of the theories of modernity. Then, it is argued that critique is necessary for the transformation of society. For this critique, it is necessary to reveal the power structures that constitute and shape the organization of society as well as our current ways of being. It is argued that the modern form of power is biopower and neoliberal rationality constitutes the general framework of biopower. Biopower is both power over life

and power of life. And in this study, it is argued, to fight against the power over life, it is crucial to mobilize the power of life. And the power of life can be mobilized by promoting different rationalities than neoliberal rationality as well as producing different subjectivities than neoliberal entrepreneur subjectivity.

Keywords: Dystopia, Margaret Atwood, Modernity, Biopower, Resistance

ÖZ

MARGARET ATWOOD DİSTOPYALARINDA MODERNİTE, İKTİDAR VE DİRENİŞ ANALİZLERİ

GÖRMEZ, Ayça Berna

Doktora, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fahriye ÜSTÜNER

Mart 2021, 371 sayfa

Bu çalışma Margaret Atwood'un distopyalarında modernite, iktidar ve direniş analizi yapmayı amaçlamıştır. Çalışmaya konu olan kitaplar *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü* ve *DelliAdem* üçlemesidir (*Antilop ve Flurya*, *Tufan Zamanı*, *DelliAdem*). Bu çalışmada distopya yazılarıyla toplumsal teorilerin analiz birimlerinin benzer olduğu ileri sürülmüştür. Distopyalar alternatif dünyaları deneyimlememize yardımcı olur ve toplumsal örgütlenme biçimlerine, iktisadi ve siyasi koşullara eleştiriler getirirler. Bu çalışmada bu alternatif örgütlenmeler ve alternatif yaşam biçimleri araştırılmaktadır. Bunun için ilk olarak bu distopyalarda tasvir edilen toplumun genel özellikleri verilmiştir. Ve bu modernite teorilerine başvurarak yapılmıştır. Daha sonra, toplumların dönüşümü için eleştirel bir bakışa ihtiyaç olduğu öne sürülmüştür. Bu eleştirel bakış için iktidar analizi yapılmıştır. Modern iktidarın biyoiktidar olduğu öne sürülmüştür ve neoliberalizmin biyoiktidarın genel çerçevesini oluşturduğu ileri sürülmüştür. Biyoiktidar hem yaşam üzerindeki iktidar hem de yaşamın gücü olduğu öne sürülmüştür. Yaşam üzerindeki iktidarla mücadelede yaşamın gücünün harekete geçirilmesi gereği savunulmuştur. Ve bu

seferberliğin neoliberal akılsallıktan başka akılsallakların teşvik edilmesine ve neoliberal girişimci özneden farklı öznellikler üretilmesine dayandığı iddia edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Distopya, Margaret Atwood, Modernite, Biyoiktidar, Direniş.

To my family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation has been written in the shadow of a world-wide plague, Covid-19. The year 2020 makes us experience a genuine dystopic scenario and I am very grateful to those who bring me light in such dark times. I would like to thank my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fahriye Üstüner, for being my mentor and for her encouragement during my doctorate studies. She has always believed in me, even in the times that I've lost my confidence in my works. She has brought me light and clarity in times that I've needed the most. Without her mentorship and her support, this study would not have been possible. I would also like to thank the members of my dissertation defense committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kürşad Ertuğrul, Prof. Dr. H. Bahadır Türk, Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömür Biler, Assist. Prof. Dr. Ersan Ocak. They have provided me with crucial feedbacks for strengthening my arguments, and they have generated new visions and new ideas for my future studies. I am very grateful to them for being in my committee.

My family has always been there for me my whole life. My special thanks go to my best friend, my sister, and my colleague Assist. Prof. Dr. F. Esra Soylu. There are no words for my gratitude to her. I feel very lucky to have her in my life and share our experiences of this journey. I am also grateful to my father, Prof. Dr. Kemal Görmez, for his encouragement and for making my life easy. I owe special thanks to my mother, Günay Kiracı. Our kitchen chats were and still are the best, she has thought me to be analytical and critical. Starting from my education in bachelor degree, we have discussed all my philosophical and existential concerns. She has helped me to develop a perspective and standing in life.

My friends have always been there for me and supported me. I feel very fortunate to have such wonderful friends. Müge, Elif Ceren, Burcu have always been there for emotional support. And also, I am very grateful to Aykut Örküp and Dr. Pelin Kılınçarslan, for believing in me and for encouragement since the beginning of our education in bachelor degree. Dr. Aybüke Garipcan is the one who introduces

me to the other worlds, to utopian and dystopian genres and she is the one who makes me think beyond the reality we are living in and imagine alternative worlds. I am very grateful to her. I would like to thank my dearest friend, my colleague Dr. Coşku Çelik. Her success has always inspired me and triggers my enthusiasm. And her friendship makes my life colorful and bearable even in times that I've given up.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. UTOPIA -DYSTOPIA: A CONCEPTUAL INTRODUCTION	17
2.1. Utopia; Traditions, Definitions, and Features	17
2.2. The Sources of Modern Utopia	22
2.2.1. The Idea of Perfectibility and Infinite Progress.....	23
2.2.2. Enlightenment.....	25
2.2.3. Process of Secularization	26
2.3. Dystopia; Definitions and Themes	28
2.4. Utopia and Dystopia within Social and Political Theory	32
2.5. Margaret Atwood	42
2.6. <i>The Handmaid's Tale</i> and <i>MaddAddam</i> Trilogy in Context.....	49
3. REPRESENTATIONS OF MODERNITY IN MARGARET ATWOOD'S DYSTOPIAS	54
3.1. Modernity and Its Consequences in <i>The Handmaid's Tale</i>	61
3.1.1. Capitalism, Liberalism and Totalitarianism.....	65
3.1.2. "Context is All:" Objectivity and Rationality in <i>The Handmaid's Tale</i>	73
3.1.3. "We Lived, as usual, by Ignoring:" Mass Society in <i>The Handmaid's Tale</i>	79

3.2. The Dissolution of Modernity as We Know it; <i>MaddAddam</i> Trilogy	86
3.2.1. Capitalism, Neoliberalism, and the State	89
3.2.1.1. Crisis of the 1970s.....	90
3.2.1.2. Neoliberalism	94
3.2.2. New Perspectives on Modernity	98
3.2.2.1. Postmodernity	98
3.2.2.2. Liquid Modernity	102
3.2.2.3. Reflexive Modernity	107
3.2.3. Reflections of the Theories of Modernity in <i>MaddAddam</i> Trilogy.....	118
3.2.3.1. Global World is “Vast Uncontrolled Experiment”	119
3.2.3.1.1. The Loss of Nation-State, Privatization, and Corporatization in <i>MaddAddam Trilogy</i>	120
3.2.3.1.2. "It's Game Over Forever:" Risk Society in <i>MaddAddam Trilogy</i>	127
3.2.3.1.3. "There Was Nothing of Interest...Apart from Buying and Selling:" Commodification and Consumer Culture.....	137
3.2.3.2. “The Art of The Possible”: Individualization in <i>MaddAddam Trilogy</i>	143
3.3. Concluding Remarks	152
4. POWER STRUCTURES IN ATWOOD’S DYSTOPIAS	157
4.1. The Perspectives of Biopower	163
4.1.1. Foucauldian Approach to Power and Biopower	166
4.1.2. The Political Theology Approach to Biopower	170
4.1.3. New Materialism and Biopower	176
4.2. Governmentality	183
4.3. Power in The Handmaid’s Tale	193
4.3.1. Power and Truth in <i>The Handmaid’s Tale</i>	194
4.3.2. Power Structure Before Gileadean Regime	202
4.3.3. The Power Regime in Gilead	208
4.4. The Power Mechanisms in <i>MaddAddam</i> Trilogy.....	219
4.4.1. “The Knowledge of Vital Processes” in <i>MaddAddam Trilogy</i>	220

4.4.2. Power Structure in <i>MaddAddam</i> Trilogy	235
4.5. Concluding Remarks	249
5. RESISTANCE IN <i>THE HANDMAID'S TALE AND MADDADDAM</i> TRILOGY	
5.1. Modes of Subjectivation in Neoliberal Rationality	255
5.2. Foucauldian Concept of Resistance	262
5.3. Resistance and Counter-Conduct in <i>The Handmaid's Tale</i>	267
5.4. Resistance in <i>MaddAddam</i> Trilogy	285
6. CONCLUSION	309
REFERENCES.....	328
APPENDICES	
A. CURRICULUM VITAE	352
B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET	354
C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU	371

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There are numerous ways to be involved in the present, to experience it as well as to comprehend it. One's presence in the world is apriori in experiencing the present though presence in the world does not open all the windows, remove all the curtains, and give us the complete meaning of the being in the world. Once we enter into somebody else's world, we experience a different version of reality or of the present. Literature is one of the strongest ways to enter into someone else's world, to experience it with someone else's perspective. Its variety, its accessibility as well as its diffuseness make it the most favorable candidate for such an experience. Fiction or non-fiction, literature provides the reader with different ways of thinking and plurality ways of being. It presents the reader various possibilities in the world as well as possibilities of the worlds, the possibilities that one cannot fully acknowledge in her sole subjective being in the world. In this sense, literature provides us with the experience, which does not belong to the writer alone but available to the others as well. This experience is transmitted to the reader and has transformative effects on individuals who come across with it.

As a crucial sub-genre of literature, dystopias, too, provide us with the experience of different worlds, the worlds that are worse than ours, and worse than our present. They do so by distancing ourselves from our present, through an estrangement. This estrangement, in turn, provides us with an experience that transgresses our experience in the world. Estrangement has the utmost importance in dystopias since the road to critical thinking is opened through estrangement. Dystopias are based on critique. In the alternative worlds of dystopia, historical and cultural limits of modernity, power, development, technology or subjectivity are given. They are given in such a way that the reader recognizes the historical and

cultural specificity of the courses of events and as a result, the reader acknowledges that nothing is natural or universal in that fiction; thus, things can be altered as well as prevented. Such installation provides the reader with an experience of the transgression of both the lived world and the fictitious world. Different modes of being and thinking in the fictitious world open up new directions in our being and thinking in the lived world and give readers the knowledge of our limits as well as the knowledge of different possibilities. Therefore, it can be stated, in this study, these dystopian novels are studied as "experience books," rather than truth books. This distinction is made by Foucault and can be clarified by positing that a truth book is based on a historical truth, takes the truth as the starting point whereas an experience book

do not limit themselves to stating a historical truth but take truth as a starting point for an analysis that pursues a specific objective: the problematization of the way we think about and judge certain objects in order to distance ourselves from their naturalness or self-evidence and to work toward new experiences.¹

Dystopias provide fertile ground to distance the readers from the apparent naturalness of the events. Dystopias conjure up the contingency and the historicity, and fiction in a world does not yet exist but shares the characteristics of the existing world.

Science is another way to describe and comprehend the world. It is the "will to knowledge" that triggers the development of modern sciences. Human science and life sciences depend on specific knowledge on their unique domains and requires differentiation in areas of knowledges, which becomes possible with modernity. Modernity is about differentiation and is marked by proliferation of sources of knowledge as well as sources of actions. These knowledges are systematized under the fabric of different rationalities in such a way that every sphere develops its "self-legislating"² rules. In each domain of life, objective criteria emerge as a result of specific knowledge. All these knowledges are meant to provide us with freedom by emancipating ourselves from the dogma. Both science and literature provide us a truth. In literature the truth is posed in its singularity and in its contingency whereas in science, there is a claim over the truth, and the truth is

¹ Thomas Lemke, "Critique and Experience in Foucault," *Theory, Culture & Society* 28.4, (2011): 32.

² Scott Lash, *Sociology of Postmodernism* (Routledge, 2014), 8.

dictated. Science's claim over truth is a consequence of the triumph of reason and rational thinking starting from the Enlightenment era. Thus, the emergence of dystopia as proposing a different version of the truth in modernity is not a coincidence but a result of historical and social conditions. Each and every dystopia portrays the fear of the era that is written.

The modernity is tied up with several transformations such as capitalism, emergence of nation-state, and industrialization. The consequences and critiques of these transformations are depicted in early dystopias. Modernity is also marked by Enlightenment thinking. Enlightenment is an age in which "men may freely deal with things and that the obstacles to general enlightenment or the release from self-imposed tutelage are gradually being reduced."³ This is achieved through taking critical standing towards the dogma. However, this critique has been practiced to find out universal values as well as formal structures and has led to the objectification and rationalization of all spheres of life and has led to the search for the universal truth. But in essence, Enlightenment sense of critique can be practiced differently. Enlightenment sense of critique necessitates "an awareness of the limitations"⁴ of the certain situations, of historical constructions. And for such awareness, Enlightenment sense of critique can be practiced, as Foucault posits,

as a historical investigation into the events that have led us to constitute ourselves and to recognize ourselves as subjects of what we are doing, thinking, saying. In that sense, this criticism is not transcendental, and its goal is not that of making a metaphysics possible.⁵

In this study, it is claimed that dystopian genre provides such a critique, a historical investigation of us as well as our present. In contemporary societies, there is a tendency of pessimism towards the present and the future. One can observe the rise of dystopic movies, dystopian literature as well as dystopic political theories, the theories of which cannot suffice to provide with better solutions to the current problems of economics, of ecology, of democracy. Some of us have fears about the

³ Kant, "What is Enlightenment"

⁴ Tom Moylan, *Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination*. Vol. 14. (Peter Lang 2014), 10.

⁵ "What is Enlightenment?," *The Politics of Truth*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer & Lysa Hochroth (Semiotext, 1997), 125.

future because we have lost the connection with the historicity of our present. Such historical investigation is necessary to perceive the limits of our present, the limits of how we constitute ourselves in order to move beyond them and constitute our present and ourselves differently. In this sense, dystopian genre provides us with the distance and critique that we need to transgress the limits of ourselves. They have transformative effects.

Dystopias reflect the historical, political and social conditions, in relation to this, they pose critique to these conditions. Critiques of rational thinking, of capitalism, of socialism are illustrated in the early dystopias. But the common point in early dystopias as well as many contemporary ones is the critique of instrumental reason, which reduces and transforms human beings into numbers and labor powers, nature into resources of exploitation and relationship into mere exchange, rivalry, and objectification. In *We*, Zamyatin literally reduce human beings into mere numbers, in *Brave New World*, Huxley depicts a society divided into five castes of human beings who ranked in accordance with their physical and mental qualities. Each member in these societies is behaved or functioned in compliance with their ranks. Therefore, it can be stated that beginning with modernity, the triumph of instrumental rationality over all other rationalities can be observed. Instrumental rationality becomes the essence of the all other rationalities and all other rationalities are subjected to the instrumental calculations, measurements and valuation. The triumph of instrumental rationality is closely related to the capitalist development as well as spread of the liberalism.

Capitalism requires constant growth and accumulation of capital. For further expansion, capitalism depends on freedom, freedom of mobility as well as freedom to own property. In that sense, capitalism requires liberalism. Liberal logic is equated with economic rationality and the principle of exchange becomes dominant in social, political as well as personal relationships. But capitalism also requires labor power as a productive force; it requires the integration of human beings into the production process. In this study it is argued that integration of human beings into production process is achieved through biopower. Biopower is the power mechanism that operates in modern and contemporary sphere of lives, composed of the technologies of power that operates in the social body. It also depends on the technologies of power that operates in the individual body. Two poles of biopolitics,

"the anatomo-politics of the human body" and "the regulation of the population"⁶ pave the way for successful capitalist accumulation. In short, for successful capitalist accumulation, the knowledge of the human body as well as the knowledge of the social body is required. Biopower, in its narrowest definition, is marked by the entrance of life into political calculations. It refers to a new type of knowledge, knowledge of living beings; a new type of power mechanism that makes and maximizes life and its capacities; and a new subject, the social body or the population. It is the "political economy of life,"⁷ which enables and further enhances capitalism. Thus, it is crucial to comprehend the mechanisms that make capitalism work in order to fight against it. Biopower or biopolitics makes this analysis possible by relating capitalism with the biological through a focus on specific rationalities, liberal and neoliberal rationality. And in this study, it will be claimed that liberalism and neoliberalism refer more than an economic policy or an ideology; it is a rationality that shapes and manipulates every aspect of life.

Before moving on the organization and overview of the chapters, it should be clarified that this study provides with both descriptive and critical analysis. It is a descriptive study since it aims at understanding the era we are living in currently. And it also provides with critical analysis since it does not settle or confine itself to understanding and describing present conditions; it also questions how our present is constituted. So it is also an attempt to reveal out the mechanisms through which our current lives are constructed and shaped. The main motivation to study this topic is to find out alternative subjectivities to our current subjectivation and subjugation. It will be argued throughout the chapters that who we are and what we have become is strictly historical.

The first thing to do in this thesis will be to give an analysis of contemporary societies through the theories of modernity. These theories focus on the different dynamics and transformation in the organization of societies such as the transition from industrial to post-industrial society, from production based economy to consumption based economy, and loosening of the traditional social ties as well as

⁶ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. I.* trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage 95 1990), 139.

⁷ Thomas Lemke, "'A Zone of Indistinction'—A Critique of Giorgio Agamben's Concept of Biopolitics." *Outlines. Critical Practice Studies* 7.1 (2005): 10.

the traditional functions of the state. Theories of modernity will be valuable sources to evaluate the dynamics and give general characteristics of modern and contemporary societies. However, it will be argued that the theories of modernity lack an important analysis, the analysis of the power mechanisms that shape our lives and constitute us. It will be argued that modernity is marked by the entrance of life and biological process to the political and economic calculations. These calculations are made possible by biopower. It is through biopower, its mechanisms, and techniques that our modernity, society as well as ourselves are constructed. Biopower refers to a new type of sovereignty that operates over the social and individual body and it is what makes capitalism so effective and prevalent economic regime. Liberal and neoliberal rationalities are the ultimate source and foundation of the biopower. It generates certain objectives such as effectiveness, optimization or maximization of capacities by introducing the competition as a new behavioral norm. It also limits our capacities towards such objectives. For a better future or for the prevention of worse scenarios that are discussed in dystopian fictions, it will be argued, what needs to be done is to promote different and alternative rationalities and subjectivities. These alternatives can be found through an evaluation of the neoliberal subjectivation as well as through the ways to refuse this subjectivation. This will be done with reference to one of the most fertile sources of alternatives and possibilities, the dystopian genre. In this study dystopian fiction will be recognized as experience books and it will be acknowledged that these experiences have transformative effects; they do not only express different experiences but also transforms our experience.

In this study, Atwood's four dystopian novels will be evaluated. Atwood is chosen because of her strong contribution to the genre, her activism in fighting against the violation of human rights in general as well as her activism in politics especially in green politics. She fights for life that is worth living as well as for a sustainable one. Moreover, her writings follow two different dystopian traditions; Orwellian and Huxleyan traditions. A totalitarian, oppressive regime and state control on the part of Orwell and seemingly free, capitalist, and hedonist culture on the part of Huxley. Among the chosen books, *The Handmaid's Tale*⁸ follows the

⁸ Throughout the study, the abbreviation *HT* will sometimes be used for *The Handmaid's Tale*.

path of Orwell and *MaddAddam* trilogy follows the path of Huxley. In a sense, throughout the study, two different dystopian traditions will be analyzed. Furthermore, she has been writing dystopia for thirty-five years and one of the crucial traits of dystopia is that it involves in the present while depicting possible worse scenarios for the future. Atwood's dystopias are not different. They reflect the wrongdoings of human beings, the possible consequences of the developments and the possible ecological catastrophes. Her contribution valuable since she has witnessed many transformations and changes in the society and also changes in the political and social theory and has reflected these transformations in her fictions. In her books, the contemporary concerns such as climate change, ecological catastrophes, the fear of the unexpected and unintended consequences of scientific and technological developments and as well as the fears that never gets old such as the fear of repressive conditions, loss of freedom and the fear of totalitarian regimes can be observed. These will be studied through analyzing certain transformations such as the changing perceptions about modernity, about power, and the ways to resist this power.

The studied novels are *The Handmaid's Tale*⁹ (1985) and the *MaddAddam* trilogy consists of *Oryx and Crake*¹⁰ (2003), *The Year of the Flood*¹¹ (2009), and *MaddAddam*¹² (2013). These books portray the potential threats to lives of the humans. These books make the reader question what life is or whether life is worth living without the practice of freedom. Also, they make the reader think about the distinction between bare life and a life proper not only for human beings but also for other living species. These books not only disrupt the categorization and boundaries about life related issues and concerns but also emphasize togetherness on earth. In short, her dystopias, by bringing life into center of her writing, provide us with a fertile ground for an analysis of biopower. All dystopias reflect a fear or

⁹ (Vintage, 2017).

¹⁰ (Virago, 2004).

¹¹ (Virago, 2013),

¹² (Virago, 2014).

multiple fears and imply a warning. In the first novel, the fear of totalitarian regime, the loss of rights and freedoms, the degradation of and dehumanization of human beings, especially women, the fear of ecological catastrophes are illustrated. In the trilogy, scientific and technological developments and their consequences, the exploitation of nature and its resources, the loss of "ontological" categories and boundaries such as natural/artificial and human/nonhuman-inhuman, the risks, uncertainties and insecurities that individuals are compelled to live alone constitute the main subjects. These are actual fears and contain elements and characteristics of our lives. What is crucial about dystopias and make them relevant and fruitful for political and social theories is their critique. The fears reflected in these novels are discussed with a critical attitude. This critical attitude is both a historical and experimental one. Dystopias are historically situated; reflect the fears and concerns of the era in which they are written. They highlight the historicity of the events, the peculiarities and the contingencies. Thus they break the limits of what is perceived as universal and natural. By proposing the historicity, they offer a new ground to test for the reality and this makes dystopias experimental.

My decreasing faith and belief in better futures lead me to read dystopias, watch dystopian movies and TV series. However, the more I involved in this genre, the more I become optimistic about the future. The more I read the more I believe in better futures. I've found optimism in the depiction of worse worlds. The main motivation to study dystopia as experience book is to be able to adopt a critical attitude towards the present as I do so while reading these novels. The idea of the inevitability of the present conditions becomes superfluous through such critique. All the books that are studied in this thesis are about life; in *The Handmaid's Tale* one can observe the power over life, the subjugation of life and its capacities whereas in *MaddAddam* trilogy both the power of life as well as power over life can be observed. The power of life and the power over life is the subject of biopolitics. Biopolitics or biopower is the power, which on the one hand, maximizes life and its capacities and on the other, subjugates these capacities to a certain objective, to make life governable in a certain way by neoliberal rationality. The ultimate objective of this study is to reveal the possible forms of resistance. And throughout the study it will be argued that the resistance relies on and is motivated and triggered by the power of life, through the practise of freedom. Resistance, in this study, is

considered as practices towards to be governed differently as well as to construct oneself differently. To do so, first an examination of the society through theories of modernity and in relation with Atwood's dystopia will be made. Then, the power mechanisms that organize society as it is will be analyzed in relation to these dystopias. Then, the concept of resistance will be evaluated through an analysis of different forms of conduct portrayed in these dystopias.

The second chapter will be a descriptive one that offers a conceptual introduction to utopian and dystopian genres. First definitions, traditions and futures of utopia will be given. Then the sources of utopia, such as the idea of perfectibility and infinite progress, Enlightenment and secularism will be briefly discussed. Then dystopia will be defined and its general characteristics of it will be given. Afterwards, their position with regard to the social and political theory will be discussed. Finally, Margaret Atwood will be introduced and the contexts of the studied books will be presented. Some crucial points should be emphasized for clarification. Utopia and dystopia, in this study, will be regarded as the two sides of the same coin. In comparison to utopia, dystopias are novel forms of writings and products of modernity. Dystopias imply a warning; they are cautionary writings. Rather than predicting the future, they display the wrongdoings of the present, the troubles in it in order to prevent them realizing in the future. When considered as experience books, the significance of dystopian literature reveals immediately. They provide the reader with possible worse scenarios for the political regimes, ideologies, scientific and technological developments, and ecological catastrophes. Thus, they make us think, what if these would happen to us, and sometimes provide answers what could be done to prevent possible worse futures. Although it is not a general characteristic of dystopia, some of them are also sources of hope. Atwood's dystopias can be categorized among these dystopias; she adds elements of hope and embedded utopia in her dystopias.

The third chapter will be organized under the concept of modernity. This chapter is crucial for chasing the changing dynamics and perception of modernities in different dystopias as well as in social and political theories. The first section will focus on *The Handmaid's Tale* and the second section will focus on the *MaddAddam* trilogy. For the *Handmaid's Tale* section, it will be argued, totalitarianism is inherent in the organization and structure of modernity. Capitalism, together with liberalism,

paves the way for the totalitarian take-over in this dystopia. So a detailed discussion will be made for the relation between capitalism, liberalism, advanced industrial societies and totalitarianism since the society portrayed before the totalitarian take-over is an advanced industrial society. After this discussion, two different lines of argumentation and critique will be analyzed; first, theoretical conception of modernity and second, societal organization of modernity. By theoretical conception of modernity, I mean the characteristics that are later announced as the characteristics of "first modernity" or "solid modernity." These characteristics could be summed up as follows; grand narratives, claiming universalities, objective truth, scientific rationality, and instrumental rationality. In *The Handmaid's Tale*, Atwood disrupts the domination of grand narratives, the category of objective truth and scientific rationality. As responses to these narratives, what she proposes has the characteristics of postmodernity. Context dependency, uncertainty, contingency, and subjectivity are discussed through experiences of the narrator, Offred. In *the Handmaid's Tale*, the clash between modern and postmodern ideas will be observed and this will be the subject of the first line of argumentation.

In the second line of argumentation, societal organization will be discussed in relation to the concept of mass society and advanced industrial society and their consequences for individuals and social order. It will be claimed that atomization, isolation, conformity, lack of spontaneous action, and individualization are the consequences of industrialization and pave the way for totalitarian take-over. As one of the great dystopian writers states "since the invention of the steam engine...the world has been permanently in an abnormal state; the wars and revolutions are just visible expressions of this state."¹³ These abnormal states are further accelerated and deepened in advanced industrial societies. Atwood perfectly depicts these consequences in *the Handmaid's Tale*. Not taking responsibility, ignoring social and individual's wrongdoings, taking things for granted and passively accepting them are the reasons that make totalitarian take-over and its maintenance is possible. With these perspectives, Atwood presents a critique to the society she has lived in the 1980s. She takes something from her life, extrapolates, and creates something that does not exist. She may do so to warn her readers, to transform the reality that she

¹³ Arthur Koestler, *Darkness at Noon: A Novel* (Simon and Schuster, 2019), 138.

has lived in. By writing dystopia, she both exposes and challenges the dominant structure and worldview. Thus, her fictions may "inspire and even direct initiatives and actions in the real world when it comes to, e.g. social movements, ecology, mobility, crime and virtual reality."¹⁴

In *MaddAddam* section, the paradigm shift in the theories of modernity emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s will be the focal point. First, a discussion will be made with reference to the transition to neoliberalism and its social and political effects. It will be argued throughout the chapter that transition to neoliberal policies and the spread of neoliberalism in every aspect of life generate a corporation-controlled society, in which individuals enjoy little freedom and live in insecure, uncertain and contingent conditions. This has also altered the conception of modernity into a more fluid and liquid one. To make this point explicit, the economic crises of the 1970s and transition to neoliberal policies will be given first. Then the process and effects of neoliberalism will be given briefly. In here neoliberalism is only interpreted as an economic theory due to the fact that the modernity theories acknowledge it as such. Then new perspectives of modernity, such as postmodernity, liquid modernity and reflexive modernity, will be discussed. Although postmodernity is discussed previously for *the Handmaid's Tale*, in this section, it will be discussed as an introduction to the other theories of modernity. Then liquid modernity that Bauman proposes and reflexive modernity that Beck, Giddens and Lash propose will be analyzed in detail. Although there are differences in all these approaches, common points can be detected as well. These are the loss of strict categorization, emphasis on contingency, uncertainty, insecurity, and risk, increase in consumption or more accurately transition from production-based economy to consumption-based economy, increased privatization, loss of the function of the state's institutions and increased individualization. The portrayal of these modernities and their consequences will be analyzed through two levels of inquiries; on the macro level, the focus will be on Atwood's illustrations of the global changes and their consequences and on the micro level the focus will be on the individuals who live in these societies.

¹⁴ Michael Hviid Jacobsen, and Keith Tester, "Introduction: Utopia as a Topic for Social Theory," in *Utopia: Social Theory and the Future* (Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2012), 4.

On the macro level, *MaddAddam* trilogy reflects many concerns that are shared with the theories of modernity. The loss of the power of the nation-states in problem solving and decision-making regarding global problems, global environmental problems and ecological catastrophes, the loss of the state's welfare services and the burden put on individuals' shoulder consequently will be the first discussed issues. On the micro level, the effects of global and local changes on individuals will be evaluated. This will be done with reference to the individualization that all these theories declare and define. All these subjects are discussed in the trilogy, thus it can be stated that Atwood's projection of modernity is in parallel with the theories of modernity.

Although with the postmodern paradigm, it seems grand-narratives are diminishing in explaining and analyzing the societies, for the theories of modernity such narratives have still validity. When the unit of analysis is society, it might be valid to speak through grand-narratives. However, it is also important to ask how this society is organized? Under which circumstances or under which conditions consumers replace producers? How the relationships are liquefied? Why discourse of risks, dangers and hazards become so crucial in the 1990s whilst ontological uncertainty, sense of insecurity can be dated back to the beginning of modernity.¹⁵ To answer these questions, an analysis of power mechanisms is crucial and in the fourth chapter, the aim will be to provide this analysis.

All dystopias are about power but conceptualization of power is diverse. State-centric approach to power is dissolved since the 1960s and political theorists acknowledge plurality of power relations as well as power mechanisms. These have been also reflected in dystopias and Atwood's dystopias exemplify this point. The main argument in the fourth chapter will be that modern and contemporary form of power is biopower. Biopower offers a relationship between life and politics, and through biopower the way we think, the way we do, the way we live is shaped. There are diverse interpretations of biopower. In this study, the scope will be narrowed on the basis of the content of the books. Three approaches to biopower will be analyzed in relation to the dystopias. These are, Foucauldian approach, political theology approach, and new materialist approach. All these approaches have arguments on

¹⁵ Michel Foucault, *Society must be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*, ed. Arrnod I. Davidson. trans. David Macey (Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 256.

the relationship between life and politics, death and politics. What constitutes life, how to define valuable life and who defines it, the scope of the living beings as well as the relationship between the matter and agency are also being questioned by these approaches. These approaches have different, sometimes contradictory explanations about the sovereign and all the differences as well as similarities will be evaluated in the first section. Then, strategies and techniques of biopower, which is termed as governmentality, will be briefly introduced. The aim to this introduction is the idea that the government of individuals, living species, and their milieu require systematic knowledge about the vital processes and this knowledge is mobilized, generated and disseminated by the techniques of governmentality. By introducing governmentality, another reading of liberalism and neoliberalism becomes possible. In this reading, liberalism or neoliberalism is not just an ideology or economic theory, it is a rationality according to which our lives are shaped and organized.

It should be emphasized that throughout this chapter, it will be argued that power mechanisms require knowledge and truth to operate and govern. Each modality of power requires different knowledges and in *The Handmaid's Tale* and in the *MaddAddam* trilogy, these different knowledges make the government of the living beings possible. For the power relations in *the Handmaid's Tale*, Foucauldian approach to power and biopower as well as political theology approach will constitute the background of the analysis. It will be argued in this section, in *the Handmaid's Tale*, two different analysis of power is necessary; one before Gilead is established and the other is the power mechanism that operates within the Gilead. However as little information is given for the pre-Gilead society as an advanced industrial society, the focus is more on to the Gileadean regime. Nevertheless, it will be claimed that the neoliberal rationality paves the way for the totalitarian regime. As the fear of totalitarianism never diminishes, *The Handmaid's Tale* is considered as a valuable source for this study. For Gileadean regime, it is possible to observe three modalities of power Foucault proposes; sovereign, disciplinary and biopower exist simultaneously. As the regime is totalitarian, political theology approach will be valuable in explaining the power of the sovereign in determination of the life worth living, the valuable lives as well as expandable lives. Disciplinary power, on the other hand, is useful in producing individual subjects necessary for the regime. Biopower operates as the basis of the regime; maintenance of the population

provides the legitimacy of the regime, and for the maintenance, one can observe a systemic intervention to the lives of the individuals.

In the trilogy, the dystopia is constructed upon an advanced industrial society. Thus neoliberal rationality is more explicitly given than the *Handmaid's Tale*. In the first section on the *MaddAddam* trilogy, the developments in science and technology and their leading position in our lives will be discussed with reference to the biopower. Biopower, together with neoliberal rationality, aims at the maximization of the life capacities' of individuals, and in the trilogy, one can observe this maximization with the increase in knowledge about the vital processes of living beings with the developments in technology. All the vital processes are open to alter due to the molecularization of science and technology. Moreover with the increased knowledge, vitality is begun to be attributed not only to human beings but also matter, and recognition of this vitality will be a massive step to overcome the anthropocentrism. These will be discussed in detail. In the second section of the trilogy, the power structure will be evaluated through the concept of governmentality as a technique of biopower. Governmentality makes the knowledges operable and turns individuals into governable subjects. In this section, rather than an analysis of macro power that is put forward by the theories of modernity, an analysis of micro power will be chosen. With such an analysis, the loss of functions of the nation-state, privatization, individualization as well as consumption can be read with reference to neoliberal rationality. This rationality constructs, shapes and guides our way of being and way of thinking. It also organizes the society by the principal of competition. Reading societal transformations through neoliberal rationality opens up the ways to challenge it. And the last section will be on this challenge, on resistance.

In the fifth chapter, the concept of resistance will be analyzed and its reflection in the dystopias will be evaluated. In this study, resistance refers to micro resistance and it refers to resistance at the personal level. For the concept of resistance, first the modes of subjectivation in neoliberal rationality will be given since resistance will be analyzed in terms of "counter-conduct." It will be argued that, the individualization that the theories of modernity emphasize is the subjectification of the neoliberal rationality. In order to find ways to resist this rationality and its subjugation, two different but interrelated concept of resistance

will be given; these are, taken from Foucault, to be conducted differently and to conduct oneself differently. This resistance is both political and ethical; the political means to resist the individuality that is promoted by neoliberal rationality and the ethical refers to the relation with oneself and others. Both require freedom.

Then resistance and counter-conduct in *the Handmaid's Tale* and *MaddAddam* trilogy will be given. As *the Handmaid's Tale* is set in totalitarian future, the resistance will be the power mechanisms that make totalitarianism possible. It should be stressed that the totalitarian regime is made possible due to the neoliberal rationality. To resist this rationality would have been prevented the take-over. But there is limited information about the pre-totalitarian era, thus the focus will be more on to the totalitarian regime than the free advanced industrial past. It will be claimed that, in totalitarian regimes, sovereign and disciplinary power is more visible than in contemporary societies so that resistance will also emerge in these modalities. As sovereign power is the power to let live and make die, the resistance will come from these areas, in the acts of killing and the acts of suicide. Disciplinary power, on the other hand, is about making disciplined subjects. Thus resistance will come from not being disciplined and being otherwise than the subjugation of the regime. As stated above, in *The Handmaid's Tale*, the regime is legitimized on the basis of the maintenance of the healthy population, on the procreation of healthy babies. It is based on the biopower. And resistance to biopower comes from the life itself. It will be claimed that biopolitics is power of life as well as power over life and in such conditions, death is the limit of the power. The act of suicide and killings can also be considered as resistance to biopower. The object as well as the subject of biopower, the life, is erased from the relation.

Refusing the passivity and embracing active involvement in the present conditions, and not ignoring the wrongdoings, which surround us are the common themes of *the Handmaid's Tale* and *MaddAddam* trilogy. But these are contextualized differently in these novels. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, dystopia is set in advanced liberal society so that the resistance will emerge as a resistance to neoliberal rationality. Rivalry and competition are the two principles that neoliberal rationality promotes and through these principles, individuals are integrated into the market. To oppose these principles is to oppose the rationality. So in this section, promotion of alternative subjectivities to the subjection of neoliberal rationality will

be observed in the trilogy. These alternative subjectivities challenge the anthropocentrism, consumerism, objectification and relations of competition. These alternative subjectivities are constructed through a critical attitude towards "who we are." Alternative subjectivities can be promoted through the transgression of "the limits that are imposed on us."¹⁶ Transgression and moving beyond these limits will be analyzed in terms of mutual-dependence, collective actions, ethical self-formation, giving actancy to the things and the living beings. These will be conceptualized as resistance to the neoliberal rationality.

When studied as experience books, dystopias are fertile ground for social and political theories. They do not have claim over the truth or they do not seek for the fundamental truth. They produce something new; something that does not exist yet but something that has common elements with the present. Literature reveals the limits of who we are and provides us with the experience of going beyond. It allows "the people of that time to see what they are doing from a different angle."¹⁷ In this sense, "fiction consists not in showing the invisible, but in showing the extent to which the visibility of the visible is invisible."¹⁸ And in these dystopias, an attempt will be made to reveal the invisibility of the visible to make things otherwise.

¹⁶ Foucault, "What is Enlightenment?," 132.

¹⁷ Neil Gaiman, "Introduction," *Fahrenheit 451*, İthaki, 2018, 12.

¹⁸ Michel Foucault, "The Thought of the Outside," in *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, ed. James D. Faubion. trans. Robert Hurley et al. (New York: New, 1998), 153.

CHAPTER 2

UTOPIA -DYSTOPIA: A CONCEPTUAL INTRODUCTION

2.1. Utopia; Traditions, Definitions, and Features

Almost every descriptive written study on the subjects of utopia and dystopia begins with the etymological definitions of the words. The word utopia, which was first used by Thomas More in 1516, is composed of two different but seemingly interrelated meanings. The components of the term utopia are the prefix “u” and the word “topia.” The word “topia” is derived from Greek word “topos,” meaning “place,” and the prefix “u” can be read as a combination of two different prefixes that give the word two different meanings. These are the prefixes “eu,” meaning good, and “ou,” signifying non-existing. So, the word utopia refers to both a good place and a non-existing place to a non-existing good place. The word utopia takes its meaning from More’s book, *Utopia*, but its content and form change in time. Utopia is seemingly an ideal place to live, but the ideal place, from this definition of the word, is impossible to realize.

Utopia refers to a non-existing good place in which people want to live. The word contains a dreaming, a longing, and a hope that is seemingly impossible to satisfy. There are different types and phases of utopia. Gregory Claeys states, “the three phases of development of utopian thought might loosely be considered as the mythical, the religious, and the positive or institutional.”¹ Mythical and religious writings also posit utopian thought, but what is essential for social and political theory is the last phase of utopia; the positive or institutional utopia. “The last phase of utopia, the more institutional or constitutional, is less concerned with imagining

¹ Gregory Claeys, *Searching for Utopia: The History of an Idea* (Thames and Hudson, 2011), 8.

the ideal than with creating it, and reaches its apogee in modernity.”² More’s *Utopia* is positive in the sense that there is a detailed analysis of the ideal state and its structuration of every single part of it, including the people living in it. But he is not the first one who writes institutional utopia. Plato is the best known among the early writers with his book *Republic* but what makes More is different than the other names before him might be the era of the book; It is the beginning of a new era, of transformations, of discoveries as well as inventions. The modernity of More’s *Utopia* is, first of all, what makes it distinctive. After More, utopia is not just an ideal; it is an ideal to be pursued and achieved through taking necessary steps.

Claeys and Sargent identify two different utopian traditions. These are “utopias of sensual gratification and utopias of human contrivance.”³ Utopian tradition, as it is said above, does not begin with More. There are different sources of utopian tradition, such as the myth of the Golden Age, Earthly Paradises, Cockaigne, Millennialism, and these can be considered as examples of the first tradition.⁴ With More, however, tradition has evolved. Thomas More is the first modern interpreter of the second tradition; tradition of human contrivance. For the tradition of human contrivance, Claeys and Sargent claim that the most important thing is “to imagine that every aspect of social order can be susceptible to human control.”⁵ Plato is the best known of this tradition, and More is the modern inventor of the genre; beginning with him, the genre is identified with modernity and written and evaluated through the concepts and patterns of modernity. It means that after More, the ideal society becomes a society that is based on justice and equality and can be realized by human effort, and less attached to religion in achieving the ideal society;⁶ this means the secularization of utopias after More. The idea of

² Claeys, *Searching for Utopia*, p.10.

³ Gregory Claeys, and Lyman Tower Sargent, eds. *The Utopia Reader*. (NYU Press, 1999), 2.

⁴ These are not within the scope of the analysis, for more information see Krishan Kumar, *Ütopyacılık* (İmge Kitabevi, İstanbul, 2005) and Lyman Tower Sargent, and Gregory Claeys, eds. *The Utopia Reader* (New York University Press, 1999).

⁵ Sargent and Claeys, *The Utopian Reader*, 3.

perfectibility of society by human effort is the trend in utopian writing after More. Still, this perfectibility is also what makes utopia threatening for some scholars such as Karl Popper and Frederic Hayek. The idea of perfectibility of society and individual is closely related to the notion of infinite progress, but as it will be discussed later on, most of the utopists do not favor the perfection; utopia, most of the time, refers to a process rather than an end in itself.

There are many different definitions of utopia, and the aim is not to give them all. There are rather few definitions that are accepted by the scholars of utopianism, and Sargent's descriptions are among them. Sargent defines utopia as "a non-existent society described in considerable detail and normally located in time and space."⁷ When he defines positive utopia, he adds "that the author intended a contemporaneous reader to view as considerably better than the society in which that reader lived."⁸ The intention of the author is what makes utopia in the first instance, but there is also a perspective of the reader as well since the view of a better society may vary. Another definition that is accepted among the scholars is Darko Suvin's definition. He defines utopia as

The verbal construction of a particular quasi-human community where socio-political institutions, norms and individual relationships are organized according to a more perfect principle than in the author's community, this construction being based on estrangement arising out of an alternative historical hypothesis.⁹

Utopia defines the basic institutions of a certain society; it gives an image of how people live in it; also, the norms and the rules that govern the society are clearly given. The institutions, social relationships as well as norms and rules, are relatively better than the lived society.

There are common features that can be detected in most of the utopias and giving some of them will contribute to how utopia is defined and perceived in this

⁶ Gregory Claeys, "News from Somewhere: Enhanced Sociability and the Composite Definition of Utopia and Dystopia," *History* 98.330, (2013): 154.

⁷ Sargent, "Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited," *Utopian studies* 5.1 (1994): 9.

⁸ Sargent, "Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited," 9.

⁹ *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre* (Yale University Press, 1979), 49.

study. The most important feature of utopia is that it provides a positive image of society. The author intends to project a better society than the society lived in. It “is the expression of the desire for a better way of being or of living.”¹⁰ As there might be more than one projection of better society, what is characterized as utopia is strongly depended on the perspective of the author and as well as the reader. Gregory Claeys argues, “whether a given text can be described as a dystopia or utopia will depend on one’s perspective of the narrative outcome.”¹¹ So the positive image of the utopia is disputable and relative concerning the perspective of the author and the reader. From this point, it can be said that “just as one person’s terrorist is another’s freedom fighter, so is one person’s utopia another’s dystopia.”¹² Another important feature of utopia is its intentionality. French philosopher Paul Ricoeur argues, utopia “is seen to represent a kind of social dream without concern for the real first steps necessary for movement in the direction of a new society.”¹³ Both the author and the reader are aware of the dream that is projected; the author advocates this dream. “The utopia knows itself as a utopia and claims to be a utopia.”¹⁴ A much-debated feature of utopia is its dynamic character. The enemies of utopia and utopian thought strongly posit that utopia is a static concept and proposes a closed system. However, the variety of utopias and their changing characters in time proves the opposite. So, in this study utopia is perceived as dynamic. The meanings and components of utopia alter in accordance with the current socio-political conditions. Utopia is intrinsic to the lived society; it has a dynamic relationship with present time and present world. Every stage of history produces its own utopia because every period has its own deficiencies as well as its own objectives and hopes. Utopias are not meant to offer a static point to be achieved. As Wells claims, “the modern utopia

¹⁰ Ruth Levitas, *Utopia as Method: The Imaginary Reconstruction of Society* (Springer, 2011), xii.

¹¹ Gregory Claeys, "The Origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell", eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* (The Cambridge University Press, 2010), 108.

¹² Gregory Claeys, "The origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell," 108.

¹³ Paul Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia* (New York NY: Columbia, 1986), 2.

¹⁴ Paul Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, 15.

must not be static but kinetic, must shape not as a permanent state but a hopeful stage, leading to a long ascent of stages.”¹⁵ The reference to the static state of utopia brings forth another misconception about utopia; utopias, it is argued, have a political agenda; they are meant to achieve a certain, static mode of being. Opposite to this claim, utopias should be considered as a process. They project a process of being; being different and being better. Recognizing utopia as a process is closely related to its dynamic character. Utopia projects alternatives. These alternatives would, of course, change in the course of history because other options are historically relative. Utopias are, as many philosophers, sociologists, and scholars of utopianism and utopian thought (such as H. G. Wells, Ernst Bloch, Paul Ricoeur, Frederick Polak, Lyman Tower Sargent, Darko Suvin, Ruth Levitas, Gregory Claeys) agree with, visions open to change. Utopia is “always concerned with humanity’s journey towards a horizon, rather than its arrival at a place determined by a utopian agenda.”¹⁶ Utopia is a journey towards a better society, and it is a journey that has no end or a final point, it is not a journey towards a perfectly organized and a static society. As Wells claims in modern utopias, there would be no perfection; there is always friction and conflicts, but these “will be enormously less than in our world.”¹⁷ The point that is reached in utopias might seem static; it might be characterized as a perfect state to be achieved and thus questioned and labeled as hazardous. In response to this claim, Sargent argues he considers utopia as a photograph. Photographs capture only one moment, and the photograph or the scene captured in the picture has its past, and as well its future, but what is photographed is only one moment, thus only illustrates one part of the present. The captured photograph, according to Sargent, does not display an unchanging and static present.¹⁸

¹⁵ Herbert George Wells, *A Modern Utopia* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska Press, 1967), 5.

¹⁶ Tom Moylan, “To Stand with Dreamers: On the use value of Utopia,” *The Irish Review* 34 (2006):5.

¹⁷ Wells, *A Modern Utopia*, 262.

¹⁸ Lyman Tower Sargent, “In Defence of Utopia,” *Diogenes* 53.1 (2006): 13.

The features of utopia at issue (positivity, intentionality, dynamicity, and comprehension of it as a process) will be expanded and analyzed in detail in proceeding chapters, and it should be emphasized that the features of utopia and dystopia can be altered according to one's perception on what constitutes utopia/dystopia. In this study, utopias and dystopias are treated as dynamic projections of better (for utopias) or worse (for dystopia) societies; they neither aim at perfection nor project imperfection. They are explorations of the possible (better or worse) worlds and discovery of alternatives beings; they represent a journey towards these worlds. These journeys make critical thinking possible by constructing alternatives as well as by deconstructing the present.

2.2. The Sources of Modern Utopia

The well-being of society is the primary motivation of utopian writings, and the well-being of society refers to various things at different epochs. With modernity, utopian literature starts to be fed from the ideas of Enlightenment, rational and critical thinking, the idea of infinite progress, perfectibility of individual and his/her society through human action. The ever-growing development, together with men's mastery over his fate and his environment, contribute to the flourishing of utopianism and utopian writings. Utopia necessitates analytical and more crucially critical thinking; it requires understanding the present days and their deficiencies, and also thinking about alternatives and foreseeing a possible and a better future. As Mannheim puts it very clearly, "the conception of utopia...strives to take account of the dynamic character of reality, inasmuch as it assumes not a reality as such, as its point of departure, but rather a concrete historically and socially determined reality which is in a constant process of change."¹⁹ The dynamic relation between utopia and reality is the reason why the concept of utopia is changing. Utopias are historically situated; one epoch's utopia can be the reality or the enemy of another epoch. Therefore, the contents and features of utopia, along with its sources are situated historically. However, in early utopias, an emphasis on mythical existence, religion, and religious motives occur, whereas in modern utopias this

¹⁹ Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia* (Routledge, 2013), 178-179.

emphasis is on higher power ceases and it is replaced with human contrivances. The sources of modern utopias can be summed up under three headings: the idea of perfectibility and infinite progress, the Enlightenment, and the process of Secularization.

2.2.1. The Idea of Perfectibility and Infinite Progress

Although perfection cannot be considered as the defining feature of utopia,²⁰ the idea of perfectibility and infinite progress have affected utopian thinking in several ways. The most famous representatives of the notion of infinite progress and the idea of perfectibility are Condorcet and Godwin. Condorcet argues that nature has given us everything, and there is no limit for progress that is set by nature, progress has begun through the triumph of reason and rationality, and there is no turning back from this point. Human beings would never be immortal, but their health quality and lifespan would be higher; social order will improve and will be perfected in time.²¹ This idea shapes utopian thinking and writing afterward. Future harbors longings, longings of better ways of lives, and better ways of doing things; in a sense, all hopes and dreams will come true in the future. Utopias, once set in the islands that are not discovered, started to be set in future times. From then on, not the discovery of an isolated island but the future holds the possibility of a better life. So after the triumph of the idea of progress, “utopia came to be increasingly displaced in time rather than in place...not on some distant island, not in a remote mountain valley, but in the future, by the necessary development of human society...”²² Godwin, on the other hand, argues that “all vices and misery that are

²⁰ Lucy Sargisson, “The Curious Relationship between Politics and Utopia,” in *Utopian Method Vision: The Use Value of Social Dreaming*, ed. Lucy Sargisson, Tom Moylan and Raffaella Baccolini, (Peter Lang, 2007), 30.

²¹ Condorcet, “Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind: Tenth Epoch,” trans. Keith Michael Baker, *Daedalus*, vol. 133, no. 3, (2004): 65–82.

²² Krishan Kumar, “Aspects of the Western Utopian Tradition,” *History of the Human Sciences* 16.1, (2003): 67.

seen in civil society to human institutions.”²³ It is the institutions that humans made generate evil for the society; political regulation and administration of property, for Godwin, create disturbance and disrupt equality. There is nothing wrong or evil in the nature and natural organization of things. So evil is human-made, and thus they can be corrected by human efforts.

Thomas Malthus, in his “Essay on the Principle of Population,” responded to the ideas of Concordet and Godwin regarding infinite progress, perfectibility of man, its society, and social institutions and rejected their arguments. He has claimed, there is an inequality between the powers of the population and the powers of the production; production would never grow as the population does; it is not possible to produce as much as the population growth. Regarding Concordet’s argument on no limits has been set by nature, Malthus argues that the inequality between the powers of the population and the production is a natural inequality, and it is the great law of nature. This is the first barrier to hope for infinite progress. Malthus maintains, regarding the issue of improvement, although partial improvement has been achieved, the limits and the scope of this improvement cannot be ascertained. He says, “it would be highly absurd to say that this progress has no limits...it may be doubted whether since the world began, any organic improvement, whatever in the human frame can be clearly ascertained.”²⁴ Malthus wrote this book at the end of the eighteenth century, and this is the time when dystopian or counter utopian and anti-utopian writings started to flourish. It is not by coincidence that almost every utopia and dystopia written in this period and also afterward has concrete projects and sometimes restrictions on the numbers of the population, marriage, and childbirth.

Perfectibility of society has a double meaning; first, it means perfectibility of its living conditions through its institutions, its laws and norms, its environment, and its sources. It also requires perfectibility of the population. Since Plato, the rulers of the population ought to be the wisest among the population. Society, for

²³ Thomas Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population: An Essay on the Principle of Population, as it Affects the Future Improvement of Society with Remarks on the Speculations of Mr. Godwin, Mr. Concordet, and Other Writers* (1798). Electronic Scholarly Publishing Project (1998), 56.

²⁴ Malthus, *Essay on the Principle of Population*, 52.

Plato, is naturally divided into parts, and the best part of the society, together with the necessary education, will become the philosopher-king. In the nineteenth century, this idea of the importance of the inherited characteristics is riveted due to the findings of Darwin and the theory of evolution. Natural selection is key to the survival of the species, and only those adopt the changing conditions can survive in nature. Herbert Spencer uses the term survival of the fittest and adopts Social Darwinism. Social Darwinism asserts that inherited characteristics play a different role for people. Survival of the fittest does not suggest that the fertility of the people will lead to the survival because if it does so, the poorest one will determine the human evolution; instead, it is the intelligence of the people required for the survival. Race and class combination maintain its existence, and the idea of race gain a new meaning that is attached to the skin color. A biological race discourse becomes pervasive, and race is attributed to a determinate factor in human evolution.²⁵ Social Darwinism also has an essential place for the utopian and dystopian writings; extensive discussions on eugenics have been made both in realpolitik and in utopian/dystopian literature. The control of the population and its inherited characteristics and their importance for the perfectibility of society have been fundamental subjects, especially for the dystopian literature because these issues necessitate too much control and they pave the way for restricting freedom; ultimately, it may lead to despotism and totalitarianism, which are the first fears that are demonstrated in the dystopian literature.

2.2.2. Enlightenment

The age of Enlightenment aims at emancipation through which individuals would have power over themselves and have the autonomy to guide their lives. Kant defines enlightenment as “man’s emergence from his self-imposed immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one’s understanding without guidance from another.”²⁶ This inability derives from the individual himself/herself, “indecision

²⁵ Gregory Claeys, "The Survival of the Fittest" and the Origins of Social Darwinism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 61.2 (2000): 236-238.

²⁶ Kant, "What is Enlightenment."

and lack of courage” lead to the lack of using one’s one reason. The most harmful immaturity is in the realm of religion according to Kant. Though Kant argues with secularism, a way out from immaturity in religious matters has appeared, the era can still not be defined as enlightened; it is still an ongoing process; it is an ‘age of Enlightenment.’ Freedom is prerequisite for enlightenment. He says, “if it is only given freedom, enlightenment is almost inevitable.” Through freedom, individuals would use their reason publicly and would guide their lives. Enlightenment, according to Kant, is the ‘sacred rights of man’; to use one’s reason is an obligation for him and it is the appreciation of man’s value. The relationship between utopia and enlightenment can be observed in the search for the improvement, for the better and making use of one’s reason. Enlightened mind requires critical thinking, critical evaluation of the present conditions and potentialities and one of the main characteristics of utopia is its critical attitude towards the past, the present and the future. Utopia puts great emphasis on the human action, capabilities, and the potentialities that we need to discover. It goes beyond what is seen and what is lived in actuality, it is an experiment of what we are capable of. Utopia cannot be formed unless present is critically analyzed and the deficiencies of the present and the ways for recovery of these deficiencies for the future are determined. It is not to posit that all utopian writers have enlightened mind; it is just to say that utopia requires the use of one’s reason, which is the precondition for an enlightened mind. Without using reason, one cannot be able to project a better future, a better way of living, and doing things.

2.2.3. Process of Secularization

Secularism means “the process by which sectors of society and culture are removed from the domination of religious institutions and symbols.”²⁷ The retreatment of religion and religious institutions from the public sphere resulted in the establishment not only of public institutions but also of cultural and social organizations that do not derive their sources from religion or do not comply with religion. Charles Taylor defines the shift to secularity as “a move from a society

²⁷ Peter Berger, *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* (Doubleday, 1967), 107.

where belief in God is unchallenged and indeed problematic, to one in which it is understood to be one option among others, and frequently not the easiest to embrace.”²⁸ So in the secular age, religion becomes one option among others. The legitimacy of religious rules and laws, the idea of good life promoted by religion, and the idea of the afterlife began to lose their influences on people’s lives. The belief in God and the belief in humankind are negatively correlated. In a society where faith in God is diminished, individuals recognize their power in their life; they realize that there can be alternative rules and laws, and the sources of the good life do not derive only from religion. These sources can be infinite and good life can be achieved here and now, without any reference to the afterlife. Loss of belief in God and its power on earthly phenomena open up spaces for individual autonomy on his/her actions and the social, cultural, and political regulations. Utopia, in a secular age, is a reflection of this autonomy. Utopia, as a project of a better society, is strongly affected by secularism. After the shift to secularity, the pre-modern sources of utopia, such as myths²⁹, “the nostalgia about the achievement of the ancients or primitives,”³⁰ and religions lose their influence on shaping utopias. Modern utopia is defined by “its secular character, its insistence on locating and promoting the good life in here and now, rather than discovering or creating it imaginarily elsewhere.”³¹ Modern utopias emphasize the human action without reference to any higher power; neither nature nor God is relied upon in these utopias³²; the human efforts and human potentials are considered as the source for a better society. To sum up, the societies of modern utopias portray are here, created by human effort, and they are better than the present societies.

²⁸ A Secular Age (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 3.

²⁹ Myths are classified as the first eutopia that is known. see Sargent and Claeys, *The Utopian Reader*, 2.

³⁰ Claeys, *The Search for Utopia*, 99.

³¹ Claeys, *The Search for Utopia*, 99.

³² Lyman Tower Sargent, *Utopianism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2010), 16.

Secularism, belief in reason, and rationality, the ever-growing progress together with men's mastery over his fate, contribute to the flourishing of utopianism and utopian writing. However, these developments have begun to be questioned, especially after the developments occurred in science and technology. Developments have a double meaning; on the one hand, they become the symbol of unlimited progress for human capacity, but on the other hand, these developments could damage the human society and its milieu. The nature of developments, their positive and negative consequences, the nature of human beings, and their perception towards these developments began to be questioned. From this questioning, a sub-genre is born, dystopia. After the 19th century, "the question is no longer whether a rational and abundant society is technically feasible, but whether men are capable of the rationality and the goodness to create and sustain it."³³ So dystopias are the interrogations of what could go wrong in this process of infinite progress.

2.3. Dystopia; Definitions and Themes

It is plausible to start with the history of the word of dystopia. The word derives from two Greek words, dus, and topos, "meaning a diseased, bad, faulty, or unfavorable place."³⁴ The term is much younger than the term utopia. Sargent defines dystopia as "a non-existent society described in considerable detail and normally located in time and space that the author intended a contemporaneous reader to view as considerably worse than the society in which that the reader lived."³⁵ Dystopia portrays a negative image of society. This negativity can be considered as a result of human actions in various ideas and areas of life. Dystopias demonstrate and project what could go wrong as results of human action or as consequences of the utopian ideal itself and how could progress turn into the enemy of the society. In the modern era, the emphasis is on human action, and the political

³³ Chad Walsh, *From Utopia to Nightmare* (London: Geoffrey Bles. 1962), 16,

³⁴ Gregory Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History* (Oxford University Press, 2016), 4.

³⁵ Sargent, "Three Faces of Utopianism," 9.

structures and social organizations are neither God-given nor natural; “most of what we associate with dystopia is thus a modern phenomenon, wedded to secular pessimism.”³⁶

There is a close relation between utopia and dystopia; they are interconnected; they cannot be considered as the opposite genre. Scholars of utopian studies argue that they are more like twins that look at the different scenarios. Fatima Vieria gives some of the well-known scholars’ ideas on the relationship between utopia and dystopia. “Every utopia contains dystopia (Ribeiro); rather than being the negation of utopia, dystopia may paradoxically be its essence (Sargent); dystopia can well be seen as the shadow of utopia” as it emerged in the wake of the latter (Kumar); or we can think of it as the alter ego of utopia, always pulling its dreamy companion back to earth.’ (Davis)”³⁷ From these perspectives, it can be said that dystopia and utopia cannot be thought separately. One looks from/to a positive side, the other looks from/to the negative side. Both the positive and negative sides of the coin crystallize after modernity, after the idea of infinite human progress, belief in the human mind, and humankind. “The targets of the dystopia have been...what others have called the ‘grand narratives,’ of modernity: reason and revolution, science and socialism, the idea of progress and the faith in the future.”³⁸ Both utopias and dystopias are “specific responses to modernity”³⁹ in a sense. Dystopia “is intimately interwoven with discourse about the crisis,” and what could go wrong.

Dystopia is a much younger concept than utopia; utopia has a tradition grounded before modernity, whereas dystopia is genuinely a product of modernity. It is generally argued that dystopias date back at the nineteenth century, but it has become a dominant genre in the twentieth century. This is called ‘dystopian turn.’ There are several reasons for this turn, according to scholars. These can be

³⁶ Gregory Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 4.

³⁷ Fátima Vieria, "Introduction," in ed. *Dystopia (n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), 1.

³⁸ Krishan Kumar, "Utopia's Shadow," in *Dystopia (n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage*, ed. Fátima Vieria (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), 19.

³⁹ Claeys, “News from Nowhere,” 172.

summarized as follows; the inadequacies of bourgeois capitalism and communism,⁴⁰ fascism and domination of science and technology,⁴¹ grand narratives of modernity, and its consequences.⁴² As the reasons for the domination of the dystopian writings will be discussed through analyses of the combination of history, writings, and theory in the following chapters, in order to maintain the coherence, it can be summed up dystopias became a dominant genre due to the terrors of the twentieth century.⁴³ As it is said above, both utopia and dystopia are responses to the phenomena of the present days. They are bound to the reality of the world we live in as a starting point. They are meant to say something different, something that most of the people cannot see or show the opposite of what most of the people take for granted and what makes these genres crucial are the words, worlds, and alternatives they create that are productive or destructive at the same time.

Dystopias, like utopias, are gone through changes by the time that they are written. Every century produces its dystopias; the written subjects are generally in parallel with the existing political and social discussions of the century. Claeys summarizes the diverse dystopian themes among centuries. He argues that in the nineteenth century revolutionism and terror that it implied, scientific and technological innovations, consequences of eugenics, and mechanization were the subjects of the dystopian literature. In the early twentieth century, he continues, fascism and communism, the domination of science and technology controlled the genre. However, the 1960s witnessed a shift both in the genre in parallel with the political conditions. The emergence of the new social movements, life politics, environmental concerns, and feminism become crucial for the genre. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, Claeys suggests, there is a shift from “a concentration on political collectivism” to the impact of technology, population, and

⁴⁰ M. Keith Booker, *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994), 20.

⁴¹ Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 271.

⁴² Kumar, *Ütopyacılık*, 19.

⁴³ Tom Moylan, *Scraps of the Unintended Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia* (Westview Press, 2000), xi.

environmental problems.⁴⁴ As it is not possible to speak of one utopia, it is not also possible to speak of a single dystopian theme. Each generation produces its utopias and dystopias alike. As Mannheim puts it

The relationship between utopia and the existing order turns out to be a dialectical one. By this is meant that every age allows to arise those ideas and values in which are contained in condensed form the unrealized and the unfulfilled tendencies which represent the needs of each age.⁴⁵

For clarification of dystopia's position within the genre, a distinction should be made. Dystopia and anti-utopia are sometimes used interchangeably. In this study, they will be assigned different meanings. Dystopias could be anti-utopian in the sense that they take the utopian ideal as their subject and refute this ideal.⁴⁶ These utopian ideals can be summarized as social harmony, equality, friendship, communitarianism, a constructed social project in every way. Anti-utopias take these subjects and believe that such a “society of this sort can only be maintained by the continual use of force.”⁴⁷ Anti-utopias criticize utopianism or utopias in general and some form of anti-utopias attack to a particular form of utopian ideal. However, there is another kind of dystopia that is not anti-utopian. These dystopias do not attack utopian ideals; these present social, economic, or political catastrophes that do not derive from the utopian ideal itself. These kinds of dystopia explain and analyze mistakes that humans made and do not close the door for better alternatives, whereas anti-utopias “forecloses all the transformative possibility.”⁴⁸ Dystopias that are not anti-utopian may maintain hope and may have a transformative capacity for social change. They can be considered as warnings as they portray societal wrongdoings. The unit of analysis of this study will be these kinds of dystopias, dystopias that are reserving hope for social transformation. These kinds of dystopias offer a productive critique. They may demonstrate several ways to resist the dystopic

⁴⁴ Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 271-274, 461-469, 488.

⁴⁵ Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*, 179.

⁴⁶ Claeys, “News from Nowhere,” 160.

⁴⁷ Sargent, “The Three Faces of Utopianism,” 24.

⁴⁸ Moylan, *Scraps of the Unintended Sky*, 147.

conditions, projects a resistance, resistance that can only be triggered through hope for better ways of living.

2.4. Utopia and Dystopia within Social and Political Theory

Ursula K Le Guin, during a speech at National Book Awards, stated, “resistance and change often begin in art. Very often in our art, the art of words.”⁴⁹ All arts have to do with the social and political conditions of the era, and literature may be the most powerful one. Writers are crucial in projecting social conditions; “we must take the writers seriously. What they are thinking and feeling and fearing today may be the way your children and the children of the man in the street will think, feel, and fear tomorrow.”⁵⁰ Within literature, the utopian genre is more influential in projecting social and political subjects. This genre is directly related to them, and the raison d'être of this genre is reflecting, analyzing, and, if possible, changing the social and political conditions. Utopia expresses a desire and hope. It examines what is missing in present social and political organizations, and this is “an important part of understanding society itself,”⁵¹ and thus, the relation between sociology and utopia appears. Sociology is inherent in utopian writings; they generate social and political analyses.

H.G. Wells, in *Modern Utopia*, argues for the necessity of utopia for an analysis of society, and he perceives utopia as sociology and sociology as utopia. He states utopia and sociology are forms of knowledge. He claims that present realities and future possibilities can be better if alternative scenarios are generated, and if the relationship between structures, systems, and processes are analyzed.⁵² Imagining the alternatives is a multi-level activity. It necessitates analyzing the

⁴⁹ “Ursula K Le Guin's Speech at National Book Awards: 'Books Aren't Just Commodities,'" *The Guardian* (Guardian News and Media, November 20, 2014), <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/nov/20/ursula-k-le-guin-national-book-awards-speech>.

⁵⁰ Walsh, *From Utopia to Nightmare*, 21.

⁵¹ Ruth Levitas, “For Utopia: The (Limits of the) Utopian Function in the Late Capitalist Society.” *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 3.2-3, (2000): 26.

⁵² Levitas, *Utopia as a Method*, 91.

present reality, with its positivity and negativity; it requires determination of what is missing and also what can be done to alter this reality. Change is not possible without analyzing the present and imagining the future. For a change in tomorrow, it is a prerequisite to imagine today differently, and utopia enables us to imagine differently. As Mannheim puts it, “because the concrete determination of what is utopian proceeds always from a certain stage of existence, it is possible that the utopias of today may become the realities of tomorrow.”⁵³ Utopia and dystopia try to transcend the present reality, but this transcendence is not immune from present reality. The basis of both is the reality itself. Utopia and dystopia, in this regard, “is central to modern intellectual history. It encapsulates our greatest fears, our most colossal failings, along with our deepest hopes and most noble aspirations.”⁵⁴

According to Wells, “the creation of Utopias and their exhaustive criticism is the proper and distinctive method of sociology.”⁵⁵ Although Wells always supports an understanding of sociology merged with utopian thought, the “impossible realization” of utopias sets certain boundaries for utopianism or utopian thought within social theory. When sociology becomes a separate and positivist social science, it detaches itself from the utopian thinking because social theory has started to focus on what is real rather than what can be imagined. In this thesis, one of the most significant attempts is to re-unite utopian/dystopian thinking with social theory. Thus it is argued here that utopian thought should be considered as a branch of social and political theory. Utopias produce social criticism through an image of the alternative society, and Barbara Goodwin and Keith Taylor argue, they “must be regarded as the stuff of political theory.”⁵⁶ They discuss the subject of utopias and political theory, and their problematization is similar; they both seek for the best polity. They differ in their attention as utopias “treat society as an integrated

⁵³ Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*, 183.

⁵⁴ Claeys, "News from Nowhere," 172.

⁵⁵ Levitas, *Utopia as a Method*, 11.

⁵⁶ Barbara Goodwin, and Keith Taylor, *The Politics of Utopia: A Study in Theory and Practice* (Peter Lang, 2009), 19.

totality,”⁵⁷ whereas the focus of the political theory is much narrow. Utopian thinking may cultivate political theory. Levitas shares this perception. She argues

To be utopian...is the stuff of sociology, and it first involves subjecting the society of the present to critique. Secondly, it involves imagining human communities that do not yet exist and, thirdly, it involves thinking and acting so as to prevent the foreclosure of social possibilities in the present and the future.⁵⁸

Utopia and utopian thought have a very crucial role in social and political theory; as they are situated elsewhere, Goodwin and Taylor argue, as they are not bound to “here” and to the “present,” “they open up a space for critical and constructive change and improvement.”⁵⁹ As portrayals of possible worlds, utopias have a “systematic role in political theory.”⁶⁰

Ruth Levitas argues that utopia should be considered not as a goal to be realized but as a method pursuing three possible functions; “compensation, critique, and change.”⁶¹ Utopia creates a dream, a hope in which dreamer’s world is better than the present reality. This produces compensation. The second and the third potential of utopia, which are critique and change directly related to one another. Utopia creates a critique of the present reality by offering better alternatives. Utopias destroy what is taken for granted, what seems fixed, and what seems natural. Utopia offers what is unthinkable. By providing an alternative to the present day, showing that the lived world is not the only option that we have, utopia triggers the need for change. This need for change is sometimes misinterpreted. It is generally suggested that utopias produce a blueprint for society and present social engineering. In this argument, utopia is considered as a goal, not as a method. In contrast to this argument, thinking of utopia as a method, as an approach to change, and as a possibility is crucial. Utopia should not be interpreted as plans for the future or as

⁵⁷ Goodwin and Taylor, *The Politics of Utopia*, 22.

⁵⁸ Levitas, *Utopia as a Method*, 102.

⁵⁹ Goodwin and Taylor, *The Politics of Utopia*, 22.

⁶⁰ Goodwin and Taylor, *The Politics of Utopia*, 133.

⁶¹ Levitas, *The Concept of Utopia: Utopianism and Communitarianism* (Syracuse University Press, 1990), 34.

goals to be achieved. The suggested order in a particular utopia should not be read as the only way toward better future; it should be regarded as one option, among others. In this sense, “utopia explores the space between the possible and the impossible...it is a pole-stat, a guide, a reference point on a common map of an eternal quest for the improvement of human condition.”⁶²

Frederick Polak explains the possible effects of utopias for the course of history. He argues that utopia can serve as “a buffer for the future, as a driving force toward the future, and as a trigger for social progress”⁶³ Utopia creates a buffer in the sense that as the image of the future may be realities of tomorrow; utopia prepares humans for the new ideas and events of the future.⁶⁴ It is a driving force for the future as it creates the image of the future through “crossing the frontiers of the unknown,” and it triggers social progress through contributing the social thought and social conscience. According to Polak, imagining the future adds to shaping it, and without utopia, the image of the future would be missing.

Imagination affects reality, and most essential characteristics of imagination are the activity of thinking and creativity. Polak argues that “If the Western man now stops thinking and dreaming the materials of new images of the future...his civilization will come to an end. He has no choice but to dream or to die.”⁶⁵ Polak puts thinking and dreaming at the center of human life. He argues that without these two activities, life at the micro-level and at the macro-level, namely the individual life and life of the society or civilization, will diminish. Dreaming the better alternatives and hoping them to come true have triggering effects for lives for a society without hope would hardly improve its well-being. Utopia both cultivates this hope and is the basis of this hope. Without this hope and utopia, there is no room for becoming, becoming otherwise, and becoming better. As Ricoeur argues, “we

⁶² Claeys, *Searching For Utopia*, 15.

⁶³ *The Image of the Future*, trans. Elise Boulding (Elsevier Sdentific Publishing Company, 1973), 179.

⁶⁴ *The Image of the Future*, 138.

⁶⁵ Polak, *The Image of the Future*, 53.

cannot imagine a society without hope, because this would be a society without goals.”⁶⁶

Earlier in this chapter, the idea that one should understand utopia as a method not as a goal to be achieved is given to emphasize the dynamic character of utopia. In Ricoeur’s statement, utopia seems to be equated with goal, but in this argument, the goal is not a direction or blueprint to be followed; rather, it is a process of exploration of the possibilities. Ricoeur argues, “the best function of utopia is the exploration of the possible,”⁶⁷ and possibilities always exist, and utopias demonstrate these possibilities. So the goal is, in a way, exploring the possibilities. As Polak states, “future not only must be perceived; it also must be shaped,” and one option to shape the future is through imagining utopias. Social scientists must take into account of the diverse images of the future as an object of analysis if they are willing to change the world; utopian writings should be studied through scientific observation.⁶⁸ Utopia portrays a dynamic relationship with reality and possibility, and the loss of utopia is the loss of dynamic relation, which results in “the static state of affairs.” In this state, man loses his ideals, his motives, and thus “lose his will to shape history and therewith his ability to understand it.”⁶⁹ In this century, the decreasing of the utopian writings indicates that the willingness to shape history, to follow the motives and ideals, become harder.

Ricoeur, in *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, states that utopia is “an attempt to replace power by something else.”⁷⁰ All utopias are about authority, the replacement of that authority, in most of the cases, this authority is the state. Each state, he argues, is similar to the other, “each power imitates power,” and utopia is an attempt to replace the power and authority. In this sense, “utopias (in the sense

⁶⁶ Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, 283.

⁶⁷ Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, 310.

⁶⁸ Polak, *The Image of the Future*, 22.

⁶⁹ Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*, 236.

⁷⁰ 288.

of visions of a better way of being) give politics a sense of where it wants to be. Thus, utopias lie at the heart of politics.”⁷¹ To the questions of ‘how to replace power and with what and through which ways,’ utopias give answers and demonstrate a social experiment. In this sense, utopia can be considered as practices as well as experiences; it “tests its theory by practice, by showing how the theory works in the imagined practices of the utopia.”⁷²

Even though many thinkers and scholars of utopia and utopianism highlight the importance of utopia for social improvement, this improvement can be attained through adopting different position as well; this position is the dystopian genre. Dystopia portrays a negative image of society, and it implies a warning, a warning that can happen soon unless human beings do something. The function of dystopias, like utopias, is the exploration of the possible, but this possibility is not wanted, it is a possibility or possibilities that should be avoided. Dystopias also transcend social reality by offering worse scenarios. Dystopian writers, most of the time, warn the reader about the possibility of actualization of dystopias; dystopian present or dystopian portrayal of the present would become true if warnings are not taken seriously. Dystopia tries to prevent the worse futures, As Ray Bradbury strongly says, “I was not predicting the future, I was trying to prevent it.”⁷³ And in this century, the social reality paves the way for the domination of dystopian writings. Utopian writings do not vanish altogether, but it can be said that dystopias become dominant because of social, political and economic conditions of this century and reasons for this can be summed up as follows;

A weakening of historicity or of the sense of the future; a conviction that fundamental change is no longer possible, however desirable...omnipresent consumerism, having become an end in itself, is transforming the daily life of the advanced countries in such a way to suggest that the utopianism of multiple desires and consumption is here already and needs no further supplement.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Lucy Sargisson, “The Curious Relationship Between Politics and Utopia,” 42.

⁷² Peter G. Stillman, “‘Nothing Is, but What Is Not’:Utopias as Practical Political Philosophy,” *Critical Review of International and Political Philosophy* 3.2-3 (2000), 14.

⁷³ *Fahrenheit 451*, 198.

⁷⁴ Fredric Jameson, "Utopia as Method, or the Uses of the Future," in *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*, ed. Michael D. Gordin et al. (Princeton University Press, 2010): 24.

The waning of utopias has much to do with the advanced industrial society and its ‘achievements.’ Advanced industrial countries provide with access to improved material conditions and the rising standard of living conditions. These conditions began to be perceived as the most desired things, the utopias in themselves. Thus utopia seems to be lived in this world with the help of these developments. However, there is dissatisfaction in the nature of utopia, dissatisfaction with the general order of things (political systems, political institutions, economic system, etc.), a longing to be different, to be governed differently, to have a different society. Critique lies at the very basis of utopia and dystopia, and "there cannot be any critique without an idea of what is conceived as intolerable and unacceptable."⁷⁵ From this perspective, utopia makes intolerance and unacceptance explicit, and if utopia is perceived to be lived in here and now, there would be no future images of the better worlds. Marcuse points out, “under the conditions of a rising standard of living, non-conformity with the system itself appears to be socially useless.”⁷⁶ Marcuse maintains that these are false needs, “superimposed upon the individual by particular social interests in his repression...such needs have a societal content and function which are determined by external powers over which the individual has no control.”⁷⁷ So the achievement of science and technology justifies the status quo and thus “closes itself against alternative.”⁷⁸ The satisfaction of the false needs, in this sense, prevents utopia from flourishing again and in the absence of strong utopian impulse, dystopias can assume the role of utopia for imagining alternatives. By presenting the consequences of our “false needs,” of our actions, and the unexpected and contingent consequences of the practical use of science and technology, by pointing out our real needs as against to our satisfied false needs, dystopia opens up a space for critical thinking, and thus critical rationality. In this century, dystopias are dominant not only because past utopias were realized, such as socialist utopias,

⁷⁵ Thomas Lemke, "Critique and Experience in Foucault," 40.

⁷⁶ Herbert Marcuse, *One-dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, (Routledge, 2007), 5.

⁷⁷ Marcuse, *One-dimensional Man*, 7.

⁷⁸ Marcuse, *One-dimensional Man*, 19.

and “lose their creative powers,”⁷⁹ as Levitas suggests and but also because of the seemingly inevitability of capitalism. The so-called inevitability of capitalism produces dystopias rather than utopia. In such conditions, the role of utopia as the exploration of the possible, imagining a better way of doing things can be assigned to dystopia. Today dystopias serve as a fundamental instrument in re-establishing utopian thinking; with the words of Baccolini, it can be said, “our times need utopia more than ever, but they seem to be able to recover utopia mostly through dystopia.”⁸⁰

Dystopias do not usually offer better alternatives. They present worse scenarios. However, these worse scenarios, in some dystopias, can be prevented or can be altered, and these dystopias will be the focus of the study. These dystopias are not anti-utopian; they maintain hope, and as long as there is hope, change is possible. All dystopias are inherently critical, but what they criticize changes with regard to the type of dystopias; it might criticize the impulse for change, the utopian ideal itself, or it might be critical about the mistakes that human beings have made, make or would make. The most critical function of dystopia is that “dystopian fiction frequently functions as a form of social and political criticism that resonates with the work of a number of modern cultural critics and theorists.”⁸¹ This is the most important reason to study dystopia in relation to political and social theory. By giving the darker scenarios, dystopia criticizes the course of events that seems harmless from within. Critique is not neutral in the sense that it is done to change the way we do things. Dystopias do not generally offer a specific method for change or specific arrangements of society; they only show what is wrong with the current going. They may suggest a way out; they present options before us, but they do not necessarily propose a better way of doing things. Levitas argues, “critical dystopia...may point to the exist, but it does not suggest what we might find, or make when we leave.”⁸²

⁷⁹ Levitas, *The Concept of Utopia*, 168.

⁸⁰ Rafealla Baccolini, "Dystopian Matters: on the Use of Dystopia and Utopia," *Spaces of Utopia* 3, (2006): 3.

⁸¹ Keith Booker, *The Dystopian Impulse*, 174.

Dystopias are mainly warnings, most of the scholars agree, and Sargent claims, “warning implies that choice, and therefore hope, are still possible.”⁸³ This is why it is generally argued that every dystopia contains utopia or as Kumar argues, “dystopia is not so much the opposite of utopia as its shadow.”⁸⁴ Considering dystopia as a warning opens up a possibility to prevent the projected darker scenarios, or as Baccolini states, “to escape such a dark future.”⁸⁵ This dark future is portrayed as the result of human behavior, and this is what makes the future changeable. In modern utopias and dystopias, the course of events depends on human action, the choices that humans make. In this genre, human beings decide their future because in utopian thought, there is an assumption that “there

are no fundamental barriers or obstacles to human earthly perfection: scarcity can be overcome, conflict eliminated and moral dilemmas and psychological frustrations resolved.”⁸⁶ What we are looking for is not perfection but better alternatives, and this can be explored through utopias and dystopias and achieved through human efforts. The belief in human action is a product of modernity. Human action necessitates freedom, and what is observed in utopias is freedom. In contrast, in dystopias unfreedom is the subject, and there is also “exposure to the constantly capricious rule of a supremely powerful force.”⁸⁷ However, this unfreedom is not a static characteristic of dystopias; in some dystopias, there is resistance to this powerful force, there emerges a counter-power. Utopias and dystopias portray a world that human choices determine the lived world, and human choice means exercising freedom. Sargent argues, “freedom is not

⁸² *Utopia as Method*, 111.

⁸³ "The Three Faces of Utopianism", 26.

⁸⁴ "Utopia's Shadow," 19.

⁸⁵ Raffaella Baccolini, "The Persistence of Hope in Dystopian Science Fiction," *PMLA* 119.3 (2004): 520.

⁸⁶ Laurence Davis, "History, Politics, and Utopia: Toward a Synthesis of Social Theory and Practice." in *Existential utopia: New Perspectives on Utopian Thought*, ed. Michael Marder, and Patricia Vieira (2012): 129.

⁸⁷ Claeys, "News from Nowhere," 170.

possible without utopias.”⁸⁸ Freedom requires possibilities and alternatives and utopias, and dystopias propose these alternatives. There is a close relation between freedom and utopia, as Sargent suggests, and although dystopias are based on the fear and sometimes unfreedom, they generally propose a way out from that close system; they also point out to the freedom that can be exercised and achieved through resistance. So it can be argued that most of the utopias and dystopias alike are about the altering the power relations, authority and order and this is the reason why studying utopia and dystopia can be considered as a part of the social sciences.

Dystopias are valuable form of critique; they are both critiques of utopias in general and critique of the present; in this study, dystopias that function, as a critique of the present will be taken as subject. Dystopias are about the social and political structures they analyze power relations. Utopia seeks to ‘replace power with something else’ whereas in dystopias what is observed is the power that is abused in diverse ways. Utopias are meant to “deinstitutionalize relationships”, the relationship of power, of authority and of order whereas in dystopias over-institutionalization is at stake. De-institutionalize is a term used by Ricoeur; by this, he means the destruction of what is taken for granted, what seems natural and ordered. In dystopias, the power relations seem so structured that no one, no institution, or no person can escape from it in the first place. But then, the protagonist finds a way towards freedom. To observe this practice of freedom through over-institutionalization and then the de-institutionalization of relationships, utopia and dystopia can be considered as necessary parts of social theory. Dystopias are crucial for portraying “the impact of an unseen and unexamined social system on the everyday lives of everyday people.”⁸⁹ Phenomenon such as the destructive consequences of immense scientific and technological developments and relative passivity of human beings to such events, global terror, heavy consumption, inequality over the distribution of rights and resources make harder to adopt a utopian position but as Baccolini states, “Utopia is maintained in dystopia.”⁹⁰

⁸⁸ Lyman Tower Sargent, "Authority & Utopia: Utopianism in Political Thought," *Polity* 14.4 (1982): 575.

⁸⁹ Moylan, *Scraps of the Untamed Sky*, xiii.

⁹⁰ Baccolini, "Persistence of Hope in Dystopian Science Fiction," 520.

Utopias and dystopias are fictive, but their fictions are not far away from reality. In their bases, the present reality is situated with all its social, economic, and political conditions and impacts. They display alternatives to the present by using the present conditions, their improved version, or their devastating consequences. As is said earlier, there are at least two different traditions in dystopias; the first one is the dystopia that criticizes the utopian tradition that is called anti-utopian. And the other one maintains hope, a utopian hope. This kind of dystopia is crucial for contemporary politics because it transcends the inevitability of terrors of the century; it criticizes the passivity of human beings and creates a space for resistance to such dark events. As Malthus strongly points out, “evil exists in the world not to create despair but activity, we are not patiently to submit to it, but to exert ourselves to avoid it.”⁹¹ It is the capacity to identify the evil that can help to transcend it, to avoid it,⁹² and dystopia points to the unexpected, unseen, evil consequences of our actions. Dystopias, from this perspective, can trigger activity for the avoidance of evil and create a space for change.

2.5. Margaret Atwood

Atwood is a Canadian, activist and a female writer; these characteristics of her identity affect her position in the world and her writings. Although these characteristics are not separable; they are “whole, entire, indivisible,”⁹³ each one has made a specific contribution to her writings. One of the most important components of her identity, through which she became world-famous, is her becoming of a writer. From the beginning of her childhood, she was dedicated to be a writer. She was/is an excellent reader, but besides that, she has always wanted to become a writer. She has written poems at a very early age and then stopped writing but at the age of 16, she has begun to write poems again. Although in many interviews, she

⁹¹ Malthus, *Essay on the Principle of Population*, 124.

⁹² Goodwin, and Taylor, *The politics of Utopia*, 280.

⁹³ Margaret Atwood, *Second Words: Selected Critical Prose 1960-1982* (House of Anansi, 2011), 195.

avoids answering the questions regarding the reasons why she writes, there is one constant answer she gives in her writings; “because someone has to bear witness.”⁹⁴

For her, the writer is bearing witness to the social and political surroundings, to life itself; “writers are an “eye-witness, I-witness.”⁹⁵ Writing is a private activity most of the time, however, privacy of the physical activity does not mean its isolation. Writing takes life at the center in its imaginary form or real form. For Atwood, there is no clear-cut distinction between the imaginary and the real as she states that “what we consider real is also imagined: every life is also an inner life, a life created.”⁹⁶ The genres of the literature or other writings do not exclude life in all forms from the writing itself. The basis of the writing is the language through which the writer communicates with the reader, and for Atwood, language is not neutral, it cannot be separated from the feelings; language is normative; it has a moral dimension.⁹⁷ Writing has a moral dimension as well, and the writer, as an eye-witness, is not exempt from the moral and ethical responsibilities. Eye-witness is who has seen something, has something more to say, who experiences the world and shares these experiences with others, who holds the truth in a sense, and Atwood defines writing at some point as a “truth-telling.”⁹⁸

Truth-telling has a crucial moral dimension. It is the duty or responsibility of the eye-witness, who witnesses the truth, to tell her/his story, to “make explicit what has been implicit”⁹⁹ for those who cannot speak for themselves. Although everyone possesses the language, not all the people have the power to speak it; not everyone possesses the voice. Speech is considered as a political activity since Aristotle, and for Atwood, it is the writers’ responsibilities to reveal the truth and to

⁹⁴ Margaret Atwood, *Moving Targets: Writing with Intent 1982-2004* (House of Anansi, 2004), 134.

⁹⁵ Atwood, *Second Words*, 203.

⁹⁶ Margaret Atwood. *Negotiating with the Dead: A Writer on Writing* (Virago Press, 2003), 7.

⁹⁷ Margaret Atwood. *Negotiating with the Dead*, 96-97.

⁹⁸ Atwood, *Second Words*, 348.

⁹⁹ Atwood, *Negotiating with Dead*, 160.

speak the truth on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves; writing is an “art...it is bringing the dead of life and giving voices to those who lack them so that they may speak for themselves.”¹⁰⁰ Writing reveals the unspoken truth, brings light into the darkness,¹⁰¹ and this what makes writing dangerous; it is a “risky trip to the Underworld, and to bring something or someone back from the dead.”¹⁰² To speak the unspoken, to give voice to those who do not have, to make the truth explicit are the moral and ethical responsibilities of the writer. To write, for Atwood, is an act of faith and act of hope.¹⁰³ It is an act of faith because the writer assumes someone will read what it is written, and it is an act of hope because the writer writes to make a change, to make things better through his/her words, through telling the truth.

Atwood states that writing is different from the other arts in terms of its democratic character, its availability to everyone as an instrument for expression.¹⁰⁴ However, this availability is maintained under “normal conditions,” in times of crisis such as state of emergency or under political repression, democratic character of writing disappears. The voice has power, and under oppressive conjunctures, the voice is being silenced, and only those who are in power can speak the words and have the voice. Writers, even under such conditions, have the responsibility to bear witness and speak the truth, “speak the forbidden.”¹⁰⁵ Speaking the truth is not an attribute belongs to the writers only; it belongs to humanity, but some people and institutions possess the necessary means to spread the truth more than the others, and this leads us to another crucial component that constitutes Atwood’s writings. It is her activism towards human rights and environmental issues.

¹⁰⁰ Atwood, *Second Words*, 347.

¹⁰¹ Atwood. *Negotiating with the Dead*, xxii.

¹⁰² Atwood, *Negotiating with the Dead*, 149.

¹⁰³ Atwood, *Second Words*, 249.

¹⁰⁴ Atwood, *Negotiating with the Dead*, 22.

¹⁰⁵ Atwood, *Second Words*, 350.

Margaret Atwood is an active member of Amnesty International, which is a non-governmental organization that fights for human rights across the world. Amnesty International reveals the human rights violations, injustices, and creates public awareness and challenges the injustices globally. It has more than 7 million members and supporters all around the world. It is not only human rights that Atwood actively supports, but it is also the voice of the writers, which she gives utmost importance, she is defending. Atwood has helped to the foundation of PEN Canada in the 1980s, which is a Canadian representative of an international organization PEN, which is originally established to promote coordination among poets, essayists, and novelists and now stands for “Poets, Playwrights, Editors, Essayists, and Novelists.” PEN defends freedom of speech and expression of the writers of all kinds, and Atwood has been the president of PEN. The organization tries to bring justice to the imprisoned writers, writers who lost their voices due to political oppression. It is through the writers and journalists that people know the truth about “what power-holders are doing” and for Atwood, knowing what power-holders are doing “is the only way the citizens of any society can begin to hold those power-holders to account.”¹⁰⁶ Independent press is necessary for a free society, and Atwood thinks war is waged against “truth-telling kind” journalism. Freedom of speech is the basis of democracy, and she argues, “If we lose the free speech, we cease to be a democracy.” So her active involvement in such organizations is proof for her commitment to the betterment of living conditions for humanity as a whole.

Betterment of living conditions necessitates rights and freedoms, but these rights and freedoms mean nothing if we lose our environment and our habitat. Margaret Atwood actively supports green organizations; she participates in the conferences on environmental concerns and makes public speeches to warn us against climate change. She does not say climate change; rather, she says, “this isn’t climate change; it is everything change.”¹⁰⁷ The environment is not external to

¹⁰⁶ Margaret Atwood December 20, “Margaret Atwood: If We Lose the Free Press, We Cease to Be a Democracy,” Literary Hub, April 30, 2019, <https://lithub.com/margaret-atwood-if-we-lose-the-free-press-we-cease-to-be-a-democracy/>.

¹⁰⁷ “Margaret Atwood: Women Will Bear Brunt of Dystopian Climate Future,” *The Guardian* (Guardian News and Media, May 31, 2018), <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/may/31/margaret-atwood-women-will-bear-brunt-of-dystopian-climate-future>.

human beings, it is where we belong, and it affects every species living in this world. We are all connected, and we are connected through our environment. As living species, we are all dependent on our ecosystem, and it is the duty of human beings to protect its environment. According to Atwood the opinions such as “this won’t happen to us” have negative consequences as these opinions prevent immediate action; she warns us to step up and take responsibility of the truth, the truth that we are going to lose our habitat and we will be lost if we do not act.

As a woman writer, inequalities, injustices, and violations of rights and freedoms that women suffer from also have an important place in Atwood’s writings. She defines herself as “pre-feminist,”¹⁰⁸ as the feminist movement has begun to accelerate after she has started to write. In *Negotiating with the Dead*, she asks whether being a woman writer makes the writer necessarily feminist and what feminism means.¹⁰⁹ She is not involved in the feminist movement. In many interviews, she explains and reveals the difficulties that woman writers have to face, such as, their “potentially dangerous position” when they are successful, the critics that women writers’ receive that are based not on their works but their personality, how they have to choose between having “female sensibility” and being “sexless.”¹¹⁰ Women’s cultural and political positions have a crucial place in Atwood’s writings. Still, she does not involve in feminist movement compared to her active involvement in defending human rights and environmental issues. The reason for this might be violations of human rights, and the loss of nature would affect everyone without exception; they are threats to universal existence in a sense. Atwood is concerned about human dignity. Though Atwood states that the danger we are facing today would affect mostly those who lack the opportunity and resources, and these are the women and the children. Her concerns about the future of humanity and the position of women cannot be separated from one another. As she does not categorize her concerns, she does not separate her identity into parts as

¹⁰⁸ Beatrice Mendez-Egle, "Witness is What You Must Bear", in Margaret Atwood: *Conversations*, ed. Margaret Atwood and Earl Ingersoll (Firefly Books, 1990), 162

¹⁰⁹ Atwood, *Negotiating with the Dead*, 95

¹¹⁰ Atwood, *Second Words*, 198.

well; being a woman and being a writer is not separable for her as she states, “in any individual woman writer, they are inseparable.”¹¹¹ Although Atwood’s books have been studied and are still being studied through feminist theories and discourses, it is hard to find a strict commitment to feminist ideology and ideologies in general. She is not “a propagandist.”¹¹² Atwood considers good writers cannot be “the transmitter of someone else’s ideology.”¹¹³ Her multi-dimensional perception influences her views towards ideologies; life and life-related issues cannot be perceived and experienced one-dimensionally. As is said above, she considers life at the center of the writings, and her writings are related to the relationship between human beings and their relationship with their environment; in this equation, if they behave in anti-human ways, she maintains, “their ideology will not redeem them.”¹¹⁴ Ideology is one way to experience, interpret and analyze the world; there is more than one ideology as there are more than one ways to interpret the social and political life around us, and Atwood rather than proposing a single ideology and its worldview, provides with multi-dimensional perceptions for her readers. “Nobody can claim to have the absolute, whole, objective, total, complete truth. The truth is composite, and that’s a cheering thought.”¹¹⁵

The last component that influences Atwood’s writing is her Canadian identity. For some critics, she is a Canadian nationalist.¹¹⁶ Most of her childhood was spent reading English literature, American comic books, but she argues, she does not become aware of the national identity of the writers; what matters for her is the availability of the books. She begins to develop her national identity and

¹¹¹ Atwood, *Second Words*, 195.

¹¹² Margaret Kaminski, "Preserving Mythologies," in Margaret Atwood: *Conversations*, 27.

¹¹³ Atwood, *Second Words*, 203.

¹¹⁴ Linda Sandler, "A Question of Metamorphosis," in *Waltzing Again: New and Selected Conversations with Margaret Atwood*, ed. Earl Ingersoll (WW Norton & Co., 2006), 36.

¹¹⁵ Jan Garden Castro, "An Interview with Margaret Atwood," in *Margaret Atwood: Vision and Forms*, ed. Jan Garden Castro, and Kathryn VanSpanckeren (Southern Illinois University Press, 1988), 232.

¹¹⁶ Nathalie Cooke, *Margaret Atwood: A Critical Companion*. (Greenwood Publishing Group, 2006), 19.

awareness about Canada after going to the United States for graduate school.¹¹⁷ Unlike old generations that went to States to study, her generation has returned to Canada, she emphasizes. Instead of trying to publish in metropolitans like London or New York, they have tried to publish in Canada, and for this reason, they have founded their own companies and publish their writings.¹¹⁸ Atwood has become the chair of Writer's Union in Canada and helped to the foundation of PEN Canada and actively participate in these organizations. She emphasizes that Canadian nationalism or nationalism, in general, is about "human dignity,"¹¹⁹ and human dignity, for Atwood, is inseparable from her concerns about human rights.¹²⁰ Her Canadian identity is deeply reflected in her writings; it is more than her physical being in Canada. In 1972, she wrote a book for guidance to Canadian literature, *Survival*. In this book, Atwood analyses Canadian literature, its recurrent themes, and the bases of the themes. She argues, "authors are also transmitters of culture,"¹²¹ and thus, she analyzes the impacts of Canadian culture for Canadian literature. The recurrent themes in Canadian literature, Atwood suggests, survival, in relation to this, victimization, the relationship between nature and men/women, and endless explorations. These themes are also constantly occurring in Atwood's novels.

Although Canadian culture may structure her writings, it should be stressed that what she writes cannot be limited to the national borders. The concerns that Atwood gives utterance to in her books are far away from being local or national. Nation-states lose their power in the face of global politics; international organizations and international corporations become more active in world politics, and problems become global and require joint action. In such a state, Atwood argues,

¹¹⁷ Atwood, *Second Words*, 86.

¹¹⁸ Atwood, *Second Words*, 384.

¹¹⁹ Karla Hammond, "Defying Distinctions," in *Margaret Atwood: Conversations*, 10.

¹²⁰ Gregory Fitz Gerald and Kathryn Crabbe, "Evading the Pigeonholders," in *Margaret Atwood: Conversations*, 139.

¹²¹ Margaret Atwood, *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature* (House of Anansi, 1972), 12.

We are all in this together, not just as citizens of our respective nation states but more importantly as inhabitants of this quickly shrinking and increasingly threatened earth. There are boundaries and borders, spiritual as well as physical, and good fences make good neighbours. But there are values beyond national ones. Nobody owns the air; we all breathe it.¹²²

These “values beyond national ones” require each human being to take responsibility and it is not only the writers who have responsibility to bear witness; through such writings (fiction or non-fiction), readers also witness the truth and share the responsibility with the writers in a sense.

Each of the components of her identity, a writer, activist, woman, and Canadian, find echoes in her writings. Her protagonists are usually women, Canada is occurring almost in all her books, her protagonists are generally in a dilemma of being active participants in their milieu or being passive observer, but between participation and observation, there are no precise boundaries. In Atwood’s novel, the recurrent themes can be summarized as follows; a critique of American imperial culture, an exploration of the self, of humans, and nature, freedom and unfreedom, involvement, and isolation. So her multi-dimensional identity offers multiple ways of readings and interpretations for her books.

2.6. *The Handmaid’s Tale* and *MaddAddam* Trilogy in Context

The Handmaid’s Tale is Atwood’s first novel in the dystopian genre. After this book, Atwood’s writings are classified under this genre, and she still writes dystopian novels. *The Handmaid’s Tale* was written in 1985. 1970s and 1980s had very dynamic political and economic conditions. There were many coups all around the world in the 1970s as well as economic upheavals; the right-wing, conservative political parties were in power in the 1980s. Multi-national corporations started to shape the economic system, but nationalism has increased increase as well. At the same time, many technological as well as scientific developments have occurred such as computers and cell phones, genetic engineering, genetically modified crops, vitro fertilization as well as surrogate pregnancy. *The Handmaid’s Tale* is written in times of uncertainty; on the one hand, there have been immerse scientific and technological developments that would affect everything that would trigger progress

¹²² Atwood, *Second Words*, 392.

and development, and on the other hand, there were coups and wars, which end up mostly with oppressive regimes. These two poles, the scientific and technological developments, and oppressive political regimes, have always been two recurrent themes for the dystopian genre. Thus, it can be said that 1970s and 1980s generated fertile ground for the dystopian genre. Atwood chooses to use the second pole, the oppressive political regimes, for her first dystopian novel. The book is about a religiously oriented totalitarian regime. Iranian Revolution took place in 1979, so totalitarian take-over, even if it was a religious one, was still a possibility. Her motivation to write within the genre derives from this possibility; she claims, “we’ve done it, or we’re doing it, or we could start doing tomorrow.”¹²³ She began to write her book in West Berlin and visited East Berlin and many Eastern European countries. She emphasizes these trips have contributed to “the atmosphere of the book: totalitarian dictatorship.”¹²⁴

The *MaddAddam* trilogy consists of *Oryx and Crake* (2003), *The Year of the Flood* (2009), *MaddAddam* (2013). This trilogy has a different orientation as it was written in a new era. As it is discussed earlier, dystopian literature is not detached from reality; it takes historical, political, and social reality and plays with them on a different level. 2000s reality was composed of decreasing power of the nation-states in international politics, the strengthening of the multi-national corporations in determining economic as well as political relations, rising consumerism. It is also an era of Green movement; the concerns about the environment began to be most discussed political subjects; climate change and global warming have set the new rules for both national political parties and international actors. There have been tremendous scientific and technological breakthroughs such as the Human Genome Project, artificial organ implant, the use of robots in medical treatments. So *MaddAddam* trilogy is written in an era of constant discoveries and inventions in the scientific sphere. Compared to the *Handmaid’s Tale*, *MaddAddam* trilogy focuses less on the political regime and more on the effects of scientific and technological developments. However, it should be emphasized that the books have more in

¹²³ Margaret Atwood, *Curious Pursuits: Occasional Writing* (Hachette UK, 2009), 85.

¹²⁴ Atwood, Margaret. *Moving Targets*, 10.

common than their differences. What is mostly criticized and revealed in the chosen books are capitalist culture and the drawbacks of this culture. In *the Handmaids' Tale*, the isolated individuals, their indifferences to their milieu, to politics and lack of responsibility and ignorance are the building blocks of the totalitarian take-over. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, consumer culture, environmental problems, loss of the boundaries between the real and the artificial as well as isolated individuals and their indifferences to the ongoing crisis pave the way for the annihilation of the most of the human race. Atwood, in these books, warns the reader about the damaging consequences of capitalist culture, loss of human dignity, responsibility, and sense of belonging and community. The demonstrations vary in parallel to the timing of the book, and the possibilities of the era. In all the books, the question is not about the scientific and technological inventions; it is about "what we might be done with them."¹²⁵ Atwood, as emphasized before, is not a "propagandist," she does not favor one way of being to another or one experiences to another, and this is deeply reflected in her writings. She does not explicitly attack any ideology, but she does not support any of it either. In parallel to this vision, for the dystopic presents and future that has been set, she does not propose a concrete solution. Rather she demonstrates different types of beings and leaves the reader with these alternatives.

One last thing should be clarified concerning the classification of her novels. Atwood does not favor clear-cut boundaries and strict categorization, but she defines the genre of the selected books as "speculative fiction." Speculative fiction is based on things that could really happen.¹²⁶ These books are written based on human experiences. She argues there is nothing in these books that happened already or is happening right now or would happen in the future. According to Atwood, there is an important difference between novels and speculative fiction. Speculative fiction

can explore the consequences of new and proposed technologies in graphic ways by showing them as fully operative...they can explore the nature and limits of what it means to be human in very explicit ways, by pushing the envelope as far as it will go in the direction of the not-quite-human...SF narratives can also interrogate social organization by showing what things might be like if we rearranged them.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Atwood, Margaret. *Curious Pursuits*, 323.

¹²⁶ Atwood. *In other worlds: SF and the Human Imagination* (Virago, 2011), 6.

¹²⁷ Atwood, *In Other Worlds*, 62.

So speculative fiction, for Atwood, is like a trailer for what would be life and humans in the near future, it is a simulation. She invents a new word to characterize her novels; "ustopia." It is a combination of utopia and dystopia.¹²⁸ She argues, in parallel to the premise made at the beginning of this chapter, each utopia contains a dystopia and vice versa. This creates a yin and yang pattern; "within each utopia, a concealed dystopia; within each dystopia, a hidden utopia, if only in the form of the world as it existed before the bad guy took over."¹²⁹ So her dystopias are not anti-utopian in the sense that they do not reject utopian ideals. However, in *the Handmaid's Tale*, she explicitly criticizes one of the premises that some feminists make; the emphasis on the creation of women society. Nevertheless, her dystopias are not anti-utopian. Some critics have positioned her dystopias, especially *MaddAddam* trilogy as critical dystopia.¹³⁰ Critical dystopias, critics argue, provides the readers with "utopian aspirations,"¹³¹ a horizon of hope. However, in this study, a distinction between critical and traditional dystopia is not made; it is argued here, every dystopia is critical whether or not it generates a component of hope. Component of hope is not the distinguishing element of dystopia. In Atwood's fictions, there are no ultimate answers to the questions raised throughout the books; there is no single end; rather, there are diverse endings; characters and scenes are fluid. To sum up, most of the subjects open to multiple interpretations. Various categorizations of her writings, the double-sidedness, and open-endings make her writings so powerful and open to be interpreted through different theories and discourses. Speculative fiction, as its basis itself on the things that could really happen, can also be considered as testing the alternatives. Speculative fiction or dystopias, in general, can be regarded as the practices through which social and

¹²⁸ Atwood, *In Other Worlds*, 66.

¹²⁹ Atwood, *In Other Worlds*, 85.

¹³⁰ Peter G. Stillman, "Twenty-first Century Critical Dystopias," in *More After More: Essays Commemorating the Five Hundredth Anniversary of Thomas More's Utopia*, ed. Ksenia Olkusz et. al. (Facta Ficta Research Center, 2017).

¹³¹ Raffaella Baccolini, "Gender and Genre in Feminist Critical Dystopias," in *Future Females, The Next Generation*, ed. Marleen S. Barr (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 18.

political theories can be verified. These practices will be analyzed in the following chapters, in terms of representations of modernity, power structure, and resistance.

CHAPTER 3

REPRESENTATIONS OF MODERNITY IN MARGARET ATWOOD'S DYSTOPIAS

As it is stated in the previous chapter, dystopias are products of modernity. They reflect the flaws of modernity; question the achievements and their possible consequences. Dystopias are critical by nature; they either criticize utopian aspirations or the status quo or possible course of events for the future. Dystopia represents losses in several ways; loss of control,¹ loss of individual identity,² loss of individual subjectivity,³ loss of freedom, and last but not least, loss of politics and/or political. These concepts are either the indicators of modernity, or they are assigned different, more inclusive, and extensive meanings with modernity. From this perspective, it can be said that most of the dystopias contain the critique of modernity, its ideals and principles, its achievements, and its consequences. Before moving on to analyze dystopias of Atwood, it is highly crucial to determine what is meant by modernity, what are the constituent features of modernity, and why and how these are subjected to dystopian writings.

The word “modern” was used in the late fifth century in its Latin form “modernus” to “distinguish present, which had become officially Christian, from the Roman and pagan past.”⁴ Until the Enlightenment, the word had appeared

¹ Claeys, “News From Somewhere,” 170.

² Walsh, *From Utopia to Nightmare*, 143.

³ Claeys, “News From Somewhere,” 172.

⁴ Jurgen Habermas , “Modernity versus Postmodernity,” trans. Seyla BenhabibNew German Critique, (1981): 3.

several times “when the consciousness of a new epoch formed itself through a renewed relationship to the ancients.”⁵ With the Enlightenment, the word denotes a different meaning; modern is counted as ‘the new’ and “the relation between ‘modern’ and ‘classical’ has definitely lost a fixed historical reference.”⁶ Enlightenment aims at men’s mastery over his fate and over his environment; it aims at emancipation from myth and from dogma through knowledge. It aims at producing “development of the objectivating science, of the universalistic foundations of morality and law, and of autonomous art, all in accord with their own immanent logic.”⁷ However, the Enlightenment as a project is criticized for not accomplishing what it promises. Social theories propose a fundamental critique of the Enlightenment project, but they are not the only ones. Art and literature have always had a critical function and put forward strong criticism of societal organizations and transformations. The dystopian genre can be considered as a crucial and serious attempt through which drawbacks of the project of modernity are revealed and criticized. So, this chapter aims at examining representations of modernity in Atwood’s dystopia by resorting to critical social theories that analyze modernity. But first, what constitutes modernity or modernism will be briefly discussed.⁸

In the previous chapter, the sources of modern utopias are briefly discussed. These sources are the Enlightenment, secularism, and the idea of perfectibility and infinite progress. These can also be regarded as the principles of modernity in general. On the one hand, modernity can be considered as the growth of reason, of scientific consciousness, of secularism, as well as instrumental rationality. On the other hand, it is tied up with several transformations such as capitalism, break with

⁵ Habermas, “Modernity versus Postmodernity,” 3-4.

⁶ Habermas, “Modernity versus Postmodernity,” 4.

⁷ Jürgen Habermas, "Modernity: An Unfinished Project," in *Critical Essays on the Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, ed. Maurizio Passerin d'Entrèves, and Seyla Benhabib (MIT Press, 1997), 45.

⁸ Scott Lash makes a discussion on the difference between modernity and modernism, and claims not only modernity and modernism refer different things, but also modernism marks a break with modernity. However, in this study, modernity and modernism are used interchangeably. See Scott Lash, *Sociology of Postmodernism* (Routledge, 2014), 123-149.

tradition, increased mobility, and industrialization.⁹ Although the era of modernity can be dated back to the Renaissance and the Reformation period, what is interpreted as modernity in this study dates back to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Habermas argues this era marked by a “radicalized consciousness of modernity,”¹⁰ and can be classified as the beginning of aesthetic modernity. In this era, what is observed is differentiation; “differentiation of value spheres of science and knowledge, of morality and or art.”¹¹ In this era, each sphere has institutionalized and become autonomous from one another; in short, each sphere “becomes self-legislating.”¹² Self-legislating, autonomous sphere means “each under its own specific aspect of validity,”¹³ and these self-legislating spheres constitute the principle of subjectivity.¹⁴ So, modernity is marked by both an objectification and a principle of subjectivity, which “freed from imperatives of objectification in dealing with individualized needs, desires, and feelings.”¹⁵

Objectification derives from the search for the universal truth, which could only be achieved through positivist knowledge and modern science. Objectification necessitates specific knowledge and experts equipped with this knowledge. Weber reflects this as the rationalization of all aspects of life. As life is rationalized, its traditional substance is devalued. But cultural rationalizations do not necessarily or automatically lead to the rationalization of everyday practices.¹⁶ As a result, a gap

⁹ Charles Taylor, "Two Theories of Modernity," *Hastings Center Report* 25.2 (1995): 24.

¹⁰ "Modernity: An Unfinished Project," 39.

¹¹ Habermas, "Modernity: An Unfinished Project," 45.

¹² Scott Lash, *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 6.

¹³ Jürgen Habermas, "Modernity's Consciousness of Time and Its Need for Self-Reassurance," in *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures* (Polity Press, 1998), 19.

¹⁴ Habermas, "Modernity's Consciousness of Time and Its Need for Self-Reassurance," 18.

¹⁵ Jurgen Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. 1.* (Beacon Press Boston, 1984), 216.

¹⁶ Habermas, "Modernity: An Unfinished Project," 45.

opens up between everyday practices and cultural rationalization. As Weber puts it, “the more complicated and specialized modern culture becomes, the more its external supporting apparatus demands the personally detached and strictly ‘objective expert.’”¹⁷ So rationalization leads to the rise of expertise. Rationalization has made mastering the world possible; generated and supported a belief that one could govern the world through calculations and measurements, which can be obtained by scientific knowledge. Weber argues this new era is marked by rationalization and intellectualization.¹⁸ The world is rationalized in a purposive manner, and the metaphysical becomes embedded in the realm of irrational.¹⁹ In other words, in the process of rationalization, science has detached from the metaphysical and formed a worldly asceticism. This detachment means an individual’s freedom from the religious and metaphysical explanations, but against this freedom, another barrier emerged; “hard and cold” institutions of the modern world.”²⁰ The very forces that liberate individuals are used to dominate and manipulate the freedom of individuals. That is why modernity can be perceived as “Janus-faced, as blocking and facilitating at the same time,”²¹ and it is first Weber who examines the double-sidedness of modernity.

Freedom of individuals is achieved through subjectivity, and the principle of subjectivity is founded upon “the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and the French Revolution.”²² Hegel defines the world history as a “progress in the consciousness of freedom - progress that we must come to know in its necessity.”²³ Although

¹⁷ "Technical Advantages of Bureaucratic Organization," in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. and trans. Hans Heinrich Gerth, and C. Wright Mills (Oxford University Press, 1946), 216 .

¹⁸ "Science as Vocation," *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, 155.

¹⁹ Weber, "The Social Psychology of The World Religions," *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, 281.

²⁰ Jeffrey C. Alexander, *The Dark Side of Modernity* (John Wiley & Sons, 2013), 38.

²¹ Jeffrey C. Alexander, *The Dark Side of Modernity*, 2.

²² Habermas, "Modernity's Consciousness of Time and Its Need for Self-Reassurance," 17.

²³ *Introduction to The Philosophy of History* (Hackett Publishing Company, 1998), 22.

freedom refers to self-consciousness and the consciousness of freedom, it also refers to the actualization of freedom. For Hegel, the final goal of the world can be conceived as the Spirit's consciousness of freedom, and the state is the place where freedom is actualized. The state is “the reality wherein the individual has and enjoys his freedom - but only insofar as he knows, he believes, and wills the universal.”²⁴ However, the state is a bureaucratic apparatus, and bureaucracy has a double side; it means autonomy on the one hand and discipline on the other. For Weber, bureaucracy depends on dehumanization. It eliminates from “official business love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements which escape calculation.”²⁵ Bureaucracy also depends on the “capacity to make a “tool” out of oneself,” which eventually leads to “depersonalize and objectify others.”²⁶ According to Weber, rationalization is actualized and maintained through discipline and self-control. Rationalization brings autonomy as well as subjection through discipline and mastery over humans. Not only nature but also human beings are mastered through rationalization. For Weber, there is “no remedy for rationalization.”²⁷ It is the instrumental rationality or rationalization that Weber considers no remedy.

Weber is among the first social theorists to analyze modernity in its full scope, especially instrumental rationality, with its bringings as well as its drawbacks. After Weber, Critical theorists of the Frankfurt School severely criticized instrumental rationality. Weber is pessimistic about the consequences of rationalization, and thus modernity in a sense, whereas Critical theorists of the Frankfurt School aim at sustaining the goal of the Enlightenment thinkers; “man’s emancipation from slavery.”²⁸ With the Enlightenment, they argue, knowledge

²⁴ Hegel, *Introduction to The Philosophy of History*, 41.

²⁵ "Technical Advantages of Bureaucratic Organization," 216.

²⁶ Alexander, *The Dark Side of Modernity*, 39.

²⁷ Alexander, *The Dark Side of Modernity*, 4.

²⁸ Max Horkheimer, *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell and Others (Continuum, 2002), 246.

becomes power, knowledge produces method, technology is its essence, and nature is for domination.²⁹ Adorno and Horkheimer argue that enlightened thinking generates the ‘structure of unitary science,’ through which “the multiplicity of forms is reduced to position and arrangement, history to the fact, things to matter.”³⁰ For Enlightened thinking, they maintain, the world is calculable, and only calculable things must be taken into account. Although Enlightenment aims at reducing the impact of myths and dogma in humans’ lives and bringing reason and rationality as a driving force for humans’ actions, for Adorno and Horkheimer, Enlightenment itself becomes a myth. Critical theorists theorize the problems of modernity, its principles, and its ideals, whereas dystopian writers may help to instantiate these theorizations.³¹ What is common for critical theorists and the dystopian genre is their critique of the modern philosophical, political, social, and economic structure; Horkheimer defines criticism as

Intellectual and eventually practical effort which is not satisfied to accept the prevailing ideas, actions, and social conditions unthinkingly and from mere habit; effort which aims to coordinate the individual sides of social life with each other and with general ideas and aims of the epoch, to deduce them genetically, to distinguish the appearance from the essence, to examine the foundations of things, in short, really to know them.³²

Criticism necessitates transcendence from the prevalent conditions; it seeks the reality under the surface of appearances; it does not settle with the appearances; rather, it examines the essence of things. What makes dystopia crucial for social and political theory derives from its critical character; without critique, analysis of society is not possible, and without analysis, one has to bear his/her fate without a chance to change it. Dystopia, as it is stated before, projects the flaws of modernity and wrongdoings of humans, and modernity, as we understand it in social and political terms, is structured by the principles and ideas of the Enlightenment.

²⁹ Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Stanford University Press, 2002), 2.

³⁰ *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, p. 4.

³¹ Instantiation of the principles is taken from Peter G. Stillman “Nothing is, but what is Not” He uses this for utopias, it seems accurate to use this also for dystopia.

³² Horkheimer, *Critical Theory*, 270.

Although modernity is treated, for a long time, as a single, unified, and fixed phenomenon, now it is hard to argue in favor of this position. In social and political theory, modernity is now understood as a process, which is changing, and different interpretations of modernity are possible (solid modernity, postmodernity, liquid modernity, second modernity, the radicalization of modernity). These interpretations are subjects of this chapter and will be discussed later on concerning Atwood's dystopias. Critical thinking has been added to new dimensions due to the changing socio-political and socio-economic conditions. All these dimensions are portrayed in dystopian writings as well and will be discussed in this chapter. These ideas and principles can be summed up as follows; reason and rationality, the foundation of modern science, industrial and scientific development, rational organization of society, the individual, the self, and the subjectivity. There is a strong linkage between social and political theories and dystopias, and this chapter aims to present these linkages.

Before moving on to the analyses of the books, it is also essential to highlight some of the features of the dystopias written after the 1960s to determine the positions of *HT* and *MaddAddam* trilogy within the genre. Starting from the 1960s dystopian genre has several shifts. The global warming scenarios began to be conquered the genre together with ecological collapses. There has also been a shift towards feminism due to the rise of Second Wave Feminism in the 1960s. Political collectivism is replaced with the "impact of technology, population growth, and environmental degradation."³³ In the 1990s, apocalyptic scenarios start to be dominant within the genre.³⁴ There has also been a shift regarding the transgression of strict categorization made possible by modernity. Beginning with the 1960s, dystopias "involve transgressions of subject/object, male/female, human/animal and human/alien or human/non-human, master/slave, nature/nurture, nature/culture, mind/body, sanity/madness, self/other, literacy/orality, codes/stereotypes, the relation between myth/history with regard to the (im)possibility of a representation

³³ Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 488.

³⁴ Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 489.

of reality and truth(s)."³⁵ These shifts within the dystopian genre reflect the transformations that occurred in the social and political theories. So, it is crucial, once again, to stress that dystopian writings are highly dependent on the social and political conditions of the era; the changes and transformations in a certain period directly affect the dystopian writings. These changes and their representations in Atwood's dystopia constitute the very background of this chapter.

3.1. Modernity and Its Consequences in *The Handmaid's Tale*

The Handmaid's Tale is one of Atwood's most studied novels by various disciplines. It's her first novel in the dystopian genre, but the subjects that are cultivated throughout the book are familiar for both the readers of Atwood and the readers of the dystopian genre. It's not to claim that there is nothing new in the book; rather, the familiarity of the subjects makes the novel crucial and makes the reader think, and this is generally considered as the intention of the writer, what if this would happen to us. Atwood argues that every fiction starts with a "what if"³⁶ question, and *HT* represents another what-if question; what if a religiously oriented group takes over the power and rules the United States through total domination and totalitarian means. For dystopian fiction, "what if" question is not only asked to portray a possible scenario for the question; it also aims an analysis of the present, its flaws, and its wrongdoings. It is a sociological and political task in a sense. Writing itself can be considered as a political act, but dystopias are specifically interested in politics, economics, and power relations. For Atwood, all writings can be political or, more accurately, writing is itself a political act as "the writer is always a reporter of truth, even when her subject is fiction."³⁷ It is the responsibility of the writer to tell the truth. In most of her novels, her narrators are in a position of exploration of themselves, of their environment, of their responsibility as human

³⁵ Dunja M. Mohr, "Transgressive Utopian Dystopias: the Postmodern Reappearance of Utopia in the Disguise of Dystopia," *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 55.1 (2007): 12.

³⁶ Atwood, *Curious Pursuits*, 91.

³⁷ Barbara Hill Rigney, *Margaret Atwood* (Macmillan International Higher Education, 1987), 111.

beings. In a sense, they are transforming into political beings, transforming from passive recipients into active participants, actively involved in their social and political environment since “political confrontation is not merely a choice but a human responsibility.”³⁸ In *HT*, the readers are given these transformations from a dystopian perspective.

Before moving on the analysis of *HT*, it is crucial to emphasize the novel is different from most of the dystopias in three important aspects and these differences shape the whole book. The first important difference is the gender of the narrator. In most of the dystopian fiction, the narrator is male, but in *HT*, the narrator is a female. The novel is written from a female perspective. In most of the dystopian fiction, female characters are secondary for the novel; “they have been either sexless automatons or rebels who’ve defied the sex rules of the regime. They’ve acted as the temptresses of the male protagonists.”³⁹ In contrast to this tradition, in *HT*, women are active; they are aware of the gender and their genders; more specifically, their bodies determine their positions in society. Most of the women who appeared in the novel have no attachment to male characters. Only the narrator has such an attachment, and in her case, the male character becomes “the temptation” for the narrator. That is why *HT* is mostly categorized as a feminist dystopia.

The second important deviation from the dystopian tradition is the role of religion in *HT*. Utopias and especially dystopias are the products of modernity; they are secular writings in this sense. In dystopias, religion is strictly prohibited; rational authority replaces divine authority. However, as Ricoeur points out, a transformation occurs in these writings; “they often begin with a radical anticlerical and even anti-religious stand and end up by claiming to recreate religion.”⁴⁰ Although divine rule and the religious authorities are erased from the social life and the minds of the individuals, the leader is generally attributed to the role of God. In *We*, Zamyatin gives the role of God to the Benefactor, who is the leader of the

³⁸ Rigney, *Margaret Atwood*, 118.

³⁹ Atwood, *Curious Pursuits*, 338.

⁴⁰ *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, 288.

OneState; he is attributed as a “superhuman power.”⁴¹ In *1984*, Big Brother is given the role of God, through the means of control and surveillance; he is the one who sees and knows everything. He claims the authority of being the protector, the judge, and he is above the general rules and the norms of the society. As opposed to this tradition, *HT* is set up in a near future in which a religiously oriented group takes over the power. Old Testament is the source of the laws and rules in Gilead; the authorities (Commanders and Aunts in Red Centre) use Biblical reference for their conduct such as punishments, re-education of the Handmaids, determination of the males and females' social roles, and even the rules of sexual intercourse. Therefore religion, in *HT*, is given the fundamental source of authority as opposed to the dystopian fictions in general.

Atwood is criticized because of her choice for setting *HT* in a theocratic future. Beauchamp argues neo-theocracy is not a serious threat compared to the techno-totalitarian threats. Thus he considers *HT* as “absolute historical improbability,”⁴² and by being so lacks the dystopian qualities. However, *HT* is written in times when religious groups have taken power in several countries, and Atwood has a universal vision in the sense that she is not only concerned about what could happen in the USA or in Canada but what could happen to humanity in general. She argues, “the novel is a social vehicle. It reflects society... The less you pay attention to it, the more it’s going to be there for somebody else.”⁴³ The so-called improbability of neo-theocracy in the USA does not guarantee its improbability in somewhere else. Taken things for granted is one of the most important themes in *HT*, and Beauchamp, in a sense, takes the present regime for granted, and such guarantees should be avoided as they prevent people from seeing the things behind the surfaces.

The third difference is also related to the religious orientation of the book. It is generally acknowledged, “most dystopias are scientific and technological in

⁴¹ Yevgeny Zamyatin, *We* (Avon Books, 1987), 48.

⁴² Gorman Beauchamp, "The Politics of the Handmaid's Tale," *Midwest Quarterly* (2009): 22.

⁴³ Alan Twigg, "Just Looking at Things That Are There," in *Margaret Atwood: Conversations*, 126.

orientation.”⁴⁴ In a sense, science and technology become the bases of the social configuration, and the possible consequences of this configuration, such as the mechanization, dehumanization, social engineering through genetics, social conditioning, control and sometimes the elimination of emotions, are the subjects of the most of the dystopias. *HT* departs from this orientation; it represents a return to the traditional society regarding the use of science and technology as well as norms and values. In *HT*, science and technology are still important; nonetheless, they have a secondary position; they have played a crucial role in the regime’s takeover, but after a religiously oriented totalitarian regime is established, the use of technology is rather limited to the means of control.

Atwood’s dystopias offer critiques for both utopian aspirations of some ideologies such as feminism and the status quo. *HT* is crucial because it is not a dead-end dystopia; it shows the alternative ways of being; it projects perfectly why things happen in that way and why they might keep happening. It also gives the reader an end to the dystopic future through “Historical Notes.” As it will be discussed later in this study, this end is not quite the future that we might want; but it may be the future we can prevent and change through our actions. *HT* is a value-oriented dystopia; it is not about the direct consequences of scientific and technological development for humans’ lives. Rather, it is about values that are originated from the culture that industrial society produces. As it portrays religiously oriented totalitarian rule, it projects a reversal in a sense; the loss of secularism, a retreat from one of the greatest outcomes of the modernity paradoxically, derives from the modernity itself. The values of modernity, which are generated by economy and politics, spread the whole society and reproduced by it and become the means of destruction of the achievements of modernity. In a sense they become their own enemy. That can be considered as the contradiction of modernity, co-existence of the productive and destructive forces. So, it is important to analyze how Atwood portrays modernity, which eventually leads to its destruction and paves the way for a theocratic totalitarian regime. The reasons that catalyze such a takeover can be found mostly in the rationality and subjectivities that carriers of modernity produce and reproduce.

⁴⁴ Claeys, "News from Nowhere," 169.

Modernity, in intellectual terms, refers to the emancipation from immaturity. So how then, modern individual, who is autonomous and able to use her own understanding, who is freed from immaturity, drag herself into a position of a total loss of control. Dystopias project the loss of control in general,⁴⁵ and in *HT*, the control is lost mostly because of human irresponsibility, ignoring the facts, and taking rights and freedoms for granted. This loss of control will be analyzed in relation to the consequences of modernity. Although the readers are not given the details of how the economy works before or after the totalitarian rule, it is explicit in the book that the Pre-Gileadean regime is an advanced industrial society. In this study, it is claimed that there is an inherent relation between totalitarianism and advanced capitalist societies, and this will be analyzed in the following section. Cultural features that advanced industrial societies produce are directly portrayed in the book, and these features, it is claimed, lead to the totalitarianism, which is generally regarded as intrinsic to modernity.

3.1.1. Capitalism, Liberalism and Totalitarianism

As the fear that is reflected in *HT* is the takeover of a religiously oriented group and their rule through totalitarian means, it is crucial to discuss totalitarianism in relation to social and political theories. Totalitarianism is a product of modernity. Arendt defines totalitarian movements as “mass organizations of atomized isolated individuals...Their most conspicuous external characteristic is their demand for total, unrestricted, unconditional, and unalterable loyalty of individual member.”⁴⁶ Totalitarian movements depend “on the specific conditions of an atomized and individualized mass.”⁴⁷ The advanced capitalist economy, mass society, and atomized/isolated individuals in it are the very basis of totalitarian rule. So, it is vital to begin with the mechanisms through which capitalism, liberalism, and totalitarianism merge with one another.

⁴⁵ Claeys, "News from Nowhere," 170.

⁴⁶ Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1973), 323.

⁴⁷ Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 318.

Marcuse states that there is a transformation from liberal to totalitarian theory, and this transformation is made possible through “the transformation...from mercantile and industrial capitalism, based on the free competition of the independent individual entrepreneurs, to monopoly capitalism, in which the changed relations of production require a strong state mobilizing all means of power.”⁴⁸ Capitalism necessitates the maximization of capital, and the two conditions that make the maximization possible are the private property and freedom, which are the basic values of liberalism. The inherent logic of the capitalist economy is constant economic growth and expansion of the capital. When industrial capitalism successfully achieved its economic growth within national borders, and an expansion is still on the agenda of the bourgeois class, search for export markets has emerged. This marks the entrance of the bourgeoisie into the political sphere;

The bourgeois turned to politics out of economic necessity; for it did not want to give up the capitalist system whose inherent law is constant economic growth, it had to impose this law upon its home governments and to proclaim expansion to be ultimate political goal of foreign policy.⁴⁹

It is the beginning of “the political rule of bourgeoisie,”⁵⁰ as well as the beginning of the monopoly capitalism or imperialism. This era is also marked by the transformation of bourgeois, economic rationality into common rationality, the transformation of the individual into the economic subject, the era of the domination of economic rationality over all other spheres of lives. In this era, “*economic relations*...transformed into *political relations*, economic expansion and domination must not only be supplemented but superseded by political expansion and domination.”⁵¹

The entrance of the bourgeoisie into the political realm marks several shifts. The first shift, which also triggers the other shifts within cultural and political

⁴⁸ Herbert Marcuse, *Negations: Essays in Critical Theory*, trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro (MayFlyBooks, 2009), 12.

⁴⁹ Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 126.

⁵⁰ Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 138.

⁵¹ Herbert Marcuse, *Technology, War, Fascism: Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse*, ed. by Douglas Kellner (Routledge, 1998), 72.

structures, is the rise and spread of the bourgeois culture. The bourgeois era is marked by the “emancipation of the individual” which is the result of the “the emancipation of the economic subject, a process the results of which were contained in the liberal utilitarianism of Hume and Adam Smith.”⁵² The bourgeoisie adapted the logic of natural law from liberalism. There is a natural law that provides equality and harmony, and liberals believe that if this natural law is not distributed and adapted, “strife between the general interest and private interests, as well as social inequality, are ultimately overcome.”⁵³ What emerges through this adaptation, however, is the equation of individual interest with the general interest, and this is the logic of universalism. The idea is that if man follows his reason and realizes himself through using his reason, his particular interest would be satisfied, and this specific interest would also follow universal interests. “Operating among men who at first follow their particular interests, the laws of reason eventually succeed in bringing about community.”⁵⁴ Transformation of the individual into economic subjects, however, means that the particular interest of economic subject would be related to the maximization of his own interest; the only value is the exchange value, and his success or his failure in pursuing his interest would depend only on his reason and his action.

As the market expanded and all goods are produced to sell in the market, and as the use value is dominated by exchange value,⁵⁵ the division of labor emerged to increase productivity and efficiency. Division of labor is an effective instrument for the expansion of the market; it creates specialization, the participation of a higher number of individuals in the production process and increases efficiency as well as productivity. The growing population, together with the growing productivity of labor and the concentration of economic enterprise,⁵⁶ altered the production process

⁵² Marcuse, *Technology, War, Fascism*, 117-118.

⁵³ Marcuse, *Negations*, 7.

⁵⁴ Marcuse, *Negations*, 119.

⁵⁵ Theodor W. Adorno, *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. J.M. Bernstein (Routledge, 1991), 5.

into mass production. As the rules of the market become the site of veridiction, and the bourgeoisie has acquired a political interest to expand their market in foreign lands, even in the governmental practices, market rules have started to be applied. From then on, the actions of government begin to be assessed in terms of their utility and efficiency, in parallel with liberal rationality.

Originally and etymologically, the economy means the management of the household. According to Arendt, in the ancient era, the economy belongs to the household; as it is characterized within the realm of necessity, it belongs to the private realm.⁵⁷ However, in the modern era, the economy becomes an end itself as well as a means for the management of the nation, or more accurately, people living in a nation. Arendt claims there is a close correlation between the decline of the family and the rise of the social, “the absorption of the family unit into corresponding social groups.”⁵⁸ The population as the new unit is considered as a whole and as a mass. This mass forms a society, not a society in the traditional sense; it forms a mass society. Arendt explains the difference between society and mass society;

Perhaps the chief difference between society and mass society is that society wanted culture, evaluated and devalued cultural things into social commodities, used and abused them for its own selfish purposes, but did not “consume” them...Mass society, on the contrary, wants not culture but entertainment, and the wares offered by the entertainment industry are indeed consumed by society just as are any other consumer goods.⁵⁹

The rise of the social, society’s transformation into a mass society, and change in the production, as well as consumption, are the characteristics of industrial society. The rise of the social eliminates the distinction between the public and private realm, according to Arendt. What is considered as the private realm, the realm of necessities, has begun to be posited at the center of politics, whereas the public realm disappears with the rise of the social and because of the lack of collective action.

⁵⁶ Herbert Marcuse, *Towards a Critical Theory of Society*, ed. Douglas Kellner (Routledge, 2001), 46.

⁵⁷ Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (The University of Chicago Press, 1958), 27.

⁵⁸ Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 40.

⁵⁹ Hannah Arendt, "Society and Culture," *Daedalus* 89.2 (1960): 281.

For Arendt, the blurring distinction between public and private paves the way for totalitarian rule. The social emerges as a result of the blurring the distinction between the public and the private, and it has a total nature; it is accompanied with mass society and mass society “expects from each of its members a certain kind of behavior, imposing innumerable and various rules, all of which tend to “normalize” its members, to make them behave, to exclude spontaneous action or outstanding achievement.”⁶⁰ Elimination of spontaneity and action mean loss of politics. In a society without spontaneity, where only certain kind of behavior is approved or is normalized, conformism becomes a way towards integration into society and conformism “which allows for only one interest and one opinion, is ultimately rooted in the one-ness of mankind,”⁶¹ and this is the main argument for totalitarian rule.

It is the population as mass constitutes mass society. This society requires mass production and mass consumption; thus, the needs, the social needs “must become individual needs...these needs must be standardized, coordinated, generalized.”⁶² With the domination of bourgeois interests overall aspect of life, individual needs and social needs are equated through a highly centralized society. This society is “managed from above,” and

the masses, which certainly exist, are the product and object of this management and of this administration; as the product and object of administration, they in turn become active and vociferous, and determine the policies which their managers and administrators want them to determine.⁶³

Needs and wants are originally managed from above, and there exists a seeming unity called society. This unity damages individual autonomy and is resulted in isolation and atomization. Besides loosening of the traditional social ties, there is a social division of labor in which everyone has a function in the production process and a function “is devoid of meaning, and the meaning which will be eventually

⁶⁰ Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 40.

⁶¹ Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 46.

⁶² Marcuse, *Negations*, 191.

⁶³ Marcuse, *Towards a Critical Theory of Society*, 83-84.

bestowed on it is in no way pre-empted by the actions of its perpetrators.”⁶⁴ Actions are devoid of meaning, or if a certain meaning is attached, this is determined by the above. The individual is left on his/her own in this competition with his/her chance to success or failure to adapt the system; “everyone be given according to his free performance...the pursuit of self-interest should be the guiding motive in all performances...”⁶⁵ What matters is the individual’s own survival. Individuality “is reduced to self-preservation by standardization.”⁶⁶ Standardization affects freedom; it is the loss of freedom in a sense. The concept of freedom is also rendered meaningless through the lack of spontaneous action, and freedom becomes the freedom to choose among existing alternatives. Existing conditions are the only means through which individuals connect with the world, and “the representation of living reality becomes a technique for suspending its development and thus comes to occupy that static realm which revealed the very essence of variety.”⁶⁷ Marcuse defines advanced industrial societies as “closed universe” in the sense that “arming itself against the specter of its own potentialities which would spell its end, mobilizing its resources for the containment of its own power.”⁶⁸ It is a system of total administration, blocking its potentialities to achieve progress rather than change, uses its power for social and political controls. In advanced industrial societies, population growth and mechanized labor provide little space for individual autonomy and privacy, and they are maintained through selling “the comforts and conveniences which help to keep the people in line, to repress the real alternatives.”⁶⁹ The higher standards of living make protest senseless, and “the individual who would insist on his freedom of action would become a crank. There

⁶⁴ Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Polity Press, 2008), 100.

⁶⁵ Marcuse, *Technology, War, Fascism*, 79.

⁶⁶ Marcuse, *Technology, War, Fascism*, 53.

⁶⁷ Adorno, *The Culture Industry*, 71.

⁶⁸ Marcuse, *Towards a Critical Theory of Society*, 43.

⁶⁹ Marcuse, *Towards a Critical Theory of Society*, 49.

is no personal escape from the apparatus which has mechanized and standardized the world.”⁷⁰

Advanced industrial society creates a total universe in which economic interests spread and established, on the whole, a premise shared with liberalism.⁷¹ In this total universe, individuals seem to possess freedom, but this freedom is only in appearance. This is also a feature of liberalism. One of the basic principles of liberalism is freedom, and freedom is required for the development of a capitalist economy. However, liberalism sets certain boundaries in providing these freedoms; “under liberalism, the citizen could within limits develop his potentialities; his destiny was within limits determined by his own activity.”⁷² These limits can be regarded as the liberalism’s own contradiction.

Another output of advanced industrial society is the formation of an individualist society, which is, at the same time, a mass society. In this society, man is a mass man, and his “chief characteristics is his isolation and lack of normal relationship.”⁷³ His isolation and atomization “provides the safe ground on which individual’s forces and faculties can issue into the service of the regime.”⁷⁴ His isolation and atomization derive from the social division of labor, which is a consequence of the dominance of the economic rationalization. In a society where exchange value is the only value and where efficiency and functionality prevail, individuals cannot establish a normal relationship and thus become isolated. In a world of efficiency, “the world had been rationalized to such an extent, and this rationality had become such a social power that the individual could do no better than adjust himself without reservation.”⁷⁵ She is alone in the ruthless competition

⁷⁰ Marcuse, *Technology, War, Fascism*, 46.

⁷¹ Marcuse, *Negations*, 8.

⁷² Horkheimer, *Critical Theory*, vii.

⁷³ Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 317.

⁷⁴ Marcuse, *Technology, War, Fascism*, 81.

⁷⁵ Marcuse, *Technology, War, Fascism*, 45.

of self-preservation and bare survival, so she adjusts and conforms to the rules of the regime; otherwise, she cannot survive. To sum up, the road towards totalitarianism is intrinsic to the established structure of advanced industrial society.

In *HT*, Atwood criticizes modernity both for its consequences at the structural level and individual level. At the structural level, the critiques are directed to the grand narratives of modernity, objectivity, scientism, either/or conceptualization, objective truth, and also culture itself. At the level of the individual, what is observed is the lack of responsibility, not paying attention, ignoring facts, and isolation, which are the fundamental problems of the consumer culture. These two levels are not separate; they transform each other; they feed each other; they reproduce each other. Although grand narratives of modernity do not directly result in the consumer culture, as it is emphasized previously in this chapter, without modernity and its instrumental rationality, the consumer culture cannot be established. In *HT*, the totalitarian regime did not emerge instantly from anywhere. It has its roots in the organization of society, in the economy, as well as in politics and individual behaviors. Capitalism, consumerism, the dominance of economic rationality over other aspects of life, ecological destruction⁷⁶ together with taking rights and freedoms for granted and choosing passivity due to the illusion of stability and security can be resulted with losing the rights and freedoms, and in worse scenarios such as *HT*, with totalitarianism. As Atwood emphasizes, “established orders could vanish overnight,”⁷⁷ as well as “nothing changes instantaneously: in a gradually heating bathtub you’d be boiled to death before you knew it.”⁷⁸ So in this part, what paves the way for this change that has destroyed established order will be analyzed; first, the critique of the structure will be given, and then the result of this structure, the representation of mass society and individuals in it, will be discussed.

⁷⁶ Sławomir Kuźnicki, *Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Fiction: Fire is Being Eaten* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017), 22.

⁷⁷ Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale*, ix.

⁷⁸ Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale*, 66.

3.1.2. "Context is All:" Objectivity and Rationality in *The Handmaid's Tale*

The Handmaid's Tale is often categorized, besides being a feminist dystopia, as a postmodern literary text. The book concerns the “nature of reality, history, and identity,”⁷⁹ and there is an urge “to challenge and to disturb overly rigid categories of classification.”⁸⁰ These rigid categories are derived from the modernity. Postmodernism, on the other hand, is an era that marks the “disappearance of a sense of history, the way in which our entire contemporary social system...has begun to live in a perpetual present and in a perpetual change.”⁸¹ *The Handmaid's Tale* presents both the rigid categories of modernity and their dissolution; one can find both the strict principles of modernity such as either/or principle, the principle of objectivity and their refusal with the introduction of both/and principle and the promotion of the principle of subjectivity. However, a brief commentary is necessary before moving on the challenges *The Handmaid's Tale* poses.

It is crucial to emphasize that Atwood, in most of her writings, argues for the exploration; exploration is a never-ending process, “you can't find anything or get anywhere permanent.”⁸² But exploration is necessary for her, and speculative fiction stories (this is what she calls her dystopian novels) “can explore the outer reaches of the imagination by taking us boldly where no man has gone before.”⁸³ Crossing the boundaries of reality as well as of imagination and exploration of the alternatives are the main themes of Atwood’s writings. However, these themes do not end up with a better alternative; exploration is on going; it does not have an end. The relation between imagination and reality is a slippery slope; she states, “my eventual

⁷⁹ Gina Wisker, *Margaret Atwood: An Introduction to Critical Views of her Fiction*(Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 5.

⁸⁰ Nathalie Cooke, *Margaret Atwood: A Critical Companion*, 27.

⁸¹ Fredric Jameson, “Postmodernism and Consumer Society,” in *The Anti-Aesthetic: The Essays Postmodern Culture*, ed. Hal Foster (Bay Press, 1987), 125.

⁸² Atwood, *Survival*,116.

⁸³ Atwood, *In Other Words*, 63.

writing life- the inability to distinguish between the real and the imagined, or rather the attitude that what we consider real is also imagined.”⁸⁴ *The Handmaid’s Tale* sets an excellent example for exploration, for crossing the boundaries between the real and the imagined as well as between objectivity and subjectivity. The book consists of fifteen sections and a “Historical Note” part, and these sections are divided into seven-night and seven-day times and one nap. Day times are based on Offred’s daily activities, whereas in the night times Offred is alone with herself; during these times, she constructs herself, her identity, her reality, and imagination. “The Historical Notes,” on the other hand, is an academic discussion on Gilead.

Night times give Offred independence from the regime because she is alone at night time with “self-affirmation...her memories, her mind.”⁸⁵ In the nighttime, she challenges the concepts of objective truth and objective reality.

The things I believe can’t all be true, though one of them must be.

The contradictory way of believing seems to me, right now, the only way I can believe anything. Whatever the truth is, I will be ready for it.

This also is a belief of mine. This also may be untrue.⁸⁶

During the night times, she reconstructs the things she has lived, she has experienced, and she records the tapes to tell her “story.” She never says she tells the truth or the reality of Gilead. She chooses to tell her story or to believe that she tells her story so that she can have control over her account.

If it’s a story I’m telling, then I have control over the endings. Then there will be an ending, to the story, and real life will come after it. I can pick up where I left off.

It isn’t a story I’m telling.

It’s also a story I’m telling, in my head, as I go along.⁸⁷

She blurs the distinction between reality and the story; she poses a challenge to the category of objective truth by relativizing the truth itself and by suggesting that this might be her truth. The search for objective truth is a crucial attempt of modernity, and postmodernity challenges this search. Cooke argues, “postmodern literary texts often resist closure by offering multiple plots and alternative endings.

⁸⁴ Atwood, *Negotiating with the Dead*, 7.

⁸⁵ Wisker, *Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale*, 38.

⁸⁶ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 116.

⁸⁷ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 48.

In this way, postmodernists not only tell a story, but they also tell the story of how stories told and understood.”⁸⁸ Offred, by telling her story, challenges the objectivity of truth; she warns the reader “context is all.”⁸⁹ While Offred considers context as everything, objectivity remains neutral towards context. The book can be categorized within postmodern literary text through its emphasis on narrative knowledge, but “The Historical Notes” at the end of the book represents the modern categorization of truth, history, and reality. In a sense, *HT* gives the clash of modern and postmodern categories, the conflict of positivist knowledge and narrative knowledge. Offred’s narrative can be situated within postmodern knowledge whereas knowledge in “Historical Notes” claims to be scientific. Fredric Jameson claims that one of the main characteristics of the period of capitalism is “the relative retreat of the claims of narrative or storytelling knowledge in the face of those abstract, denotative, or logical and cognitive procedures generally associated with science and positivism.”⁹⁰ This is the era of scientific knowledge claiming legitimacy over truth, reality, and knowledge.

Lyotard defines postmodernism as “incredulity toward metanarratives. This incredulity is undoubtedly a product of progress in the sciences: but that progress, in turn, presupposes it.”⁹¹ These metanarratives are the product of modernity. With the Enlightenment, modern science is founded, and this new science has or claims to have legitimacy over truth and reality. The world has become the object of science and can be understood only by science itself. This claim over the truth gives science the power to dictate, shape, and manipulate the facts. Scientific knowledge, when claims the legitimacy over the truth and reality, seems to represent “the totality of knowledge,” but in reality, it does not; scientific knowledge excludes all other knowledges. Lyotard calls these knowledges “narrative knowledge,”⁹² whereas

⁸⁸ Margaret Atwood: *A Critical Companion*, 27.

⁸⁹ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 154.

⁹⁰ Foreword to *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Manchester University Press, 1984), xi.

⁹¹ *The Postmodern Condition*, xxiv.

Foucault calls these “subjugated knowledges,” which are “historical contents that have been buried and disguised in a functionalist coherence or formal systemization.”⁹³ In *HT*, both kinds of knowledges, scientific/narrative or scientific/subjugated knowledges are represented. Offred’s story, her storytelling can be considered as narrative knowledge or subjugated knowledge, whereas “the Historical Notes” represents positivism.

“The Historical Notes” is an academic panel discussion on Gileadean Studies. This discussion takes place at the University of Denay in Nunavut. Pieixoto is the keynote speaker, and he represents the man of the modern positivist science. He is the one who transcribes and publishes the tape records. He calls these tape records “soi-disant manuscript” because when the tape records are discovered, they had no title, no particular order, or number.⁹⁴ For Pieixoto, the tape records cannot be categorized as manuscript because they don’t have the form of a manuscript or document. They do not fit the categorization of what constitutes a proper manuscript. He discusses the tapes records; he is hesitant to make any moral judgment because “such judgments are of necessity culture-specific,”⁹⁵ and one has to consider what kind of social, political, and/or environmental problems that Gilead was under. He claims the necessity for the objectivity and neutrality of the scientist. He constantly questions the sincerity of the author, he says, “supposing the tapes to be genuine” or “if the author is telling the truth.” Then, he criticizes the author for not giving enough information about the “workings of the Gileadean empire,” which is more valuable in comparison to the author’s story. He says, “what would we not give, now, for even, for even twenty pages or so of printout from Waterford’s private computer!”⁹⁶

⁹² *The Postmodern Condition*, 7.

⁹³ Michel Foucault, “Two Lectures,” in *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham and Kate Soper (Pantheon Books, 1980), 81.

⁹⁴ Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 313-314.

⁹⁵ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 314.

Pieixoto represents the man of positive science; he searches for objectivity within the text while trying to analyze it within historical context “with little awareness that the context itself is a construct.”⁹⁷ He is looking for the historical truth of the Gileadean regime, but he cannot find because he looks for how the regime works at the institutional, that is, at the state level. The everyday life of an individual, for him, is not valuable and cannot reflect how the system works. Pieixoto demonstrates a state-centric approach. He seeks for certainty, which lacks in the text, and contextualized political action within the realm of state's actions. Uncertainty and contingency are the great enemies of modernism. Bauman argues that modern society emerged “out of the discovery that human order is vulnerable, contingent, and devoid of reliable foundation...The response to the shock was a dream and an effort to make order solid, obligatory, and reliably founded.”⁹⁸ In establishing this solid order, everything becomes to be ordered, measured, categorized, and standardized. The norm and the normal are built upon strict classification. The social whole is programmed around “unitary and totalizing truth.”⁹⁹

The search for the univocal truth is one of the main traits of modernism. Searching for the universal truth eliminates the particulars or “subsumes particulars under universals indifferent and insensitive to sensuous particularity.”¹⁰⁰ In opposition to this unitary and totalizing truth, Offred tells her story in uncertainty; the opposite poles for modernity are given together, such as truth and untruth, reality and imagination, and there are multiple interpretations of her story. Pieixoto, on the other hand, tries to remove the contingencies and seek for the exact explanation. He

⁹⁶ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 322.

⁹⁷ Arnold E Davidson, "Future Tense: Making History in *The Handmaid's Tale*," in *Margaret Atwood: Vision and Forms*, 118.

⁹⁸ *Intimations of Postmodernity* (Routledge, 2003), xi.

⁹⁹ Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, 12.

¹⁰⁰ Adorno, *The Culture Industry*, 5.

tries to achieve “the univocal, final, true account.”¹⁰¹ Pieixoto himself transcribes the tapes; he is not aware of the fact that “the very process of transcription and editing makes such a univocal truth impossible to find.”¹⁰² Univocal truth erases the differences, and the claim for universality creates a totality of the universe, which may pave the way for totalitarianism.

The idea of objective truth and reality imposed by scientific knowledge has a deteriorating effect not only because it excludes all other kinds of knowledges but also because science is dominated by industry. As science becomes part of the production apparatus and industry dominates the science; the truth of the market becomes to be inextricably linked to the truth of the science. “Scientific knowledge is a kind of discourse,”¹⁰³ it produces knowledge necessary for the improvement of the market/industry; as a result, individual needs that are shaped through this scientific knowledge also helps to the maintenance and the improvement of the industry. Knowledge becomes a “productive force,”¹⁰⁴ in fact, it “has become the principal force of production over the last few decades.”¹⁰⁵ In a capitalist society, “science was useful to the extent that it was transformed into industrial technique,”¹⁰⁶ and in relation to that, reason or rationality is transformed into “pervasion of technological rationality - the use of technology as an instrument of repression, an instrument of domination.”¹⁰⁷ Science becomes the primary determinant not only of scientific knowledge but also of social life.¹⁰⁸ In this social

¹⁰¹ Dominick Grace, ““The Handmaid’s Tale”: Historical Notes” and Documentary Subversion,” in *Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale*, ed. Harold Bloom (Chelsea House Publishers, 2001), 162.

¹⁰² Grace, “The Handmaid’s Tale”: Historical Notes” and Documentary Subversion,” 162.

¹⁰³ Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, 3.

¹⁰⁴ Stanley Aronowitz, introduction to *Critical Theory*, Horkheimer, xv.

¹⁰⁵ *The Postmodern Condition*, 5.

¹⁰⁶ Stanley Aronowitz, introduction to *Critical Theory*, xv.

¹⁰⁷ Marcuse, *Towards a Critical Theory of Society*, 84.

life, “culture...is infecting everything with sameness.”¹⁰⁹ The mechanized and standardized forms create a mass society and mass culture in return.

3.1.3. "We Lived, as usual, by Ignoring:" Mass Society in *The Handmaid's Tale*

The analysis of the advanced industrial society and its influence on the individual were previously discussed in this chapter. Atomization, isolation, the lack of spontaneity, passivity, and in relation to these, conformity and irresponsibility are the concrete results for individuals; these are also repercussions of mass society on individuals. *The Handmaid's Tale* portrays a society of neglect (both in the ‘free’ past and in the dystopic present). The past society is projected as a consumerist society in which liberty or freedom of choice and consumerism are equated; “‘freedom of choice’ has become a consumerist slogan.”¹¹⁰ Some of the Aunts’ names are given in the book. At the end of the book, it is argued, “Aunts should take names derived from commercial products available to women in the immediate pre-Gilead period, and thus familiar and reassuring to them.¹¹¹ These names are either the cosmetic company or other consumer-goods company, and the choice of these names is not a coincidence; the Aunts in *HT* are in a crucial position for transmitting the values of the new regime and establishing the authority of the regime. Nathalie Cooke claims that these names are chosen to “signal their alliance with the system.”¹¹² The alliance between the regime and the capitalist mass production is given without exaggeration. The capitalist mode of production creates new markets as well as new goods and services to consume, and *HT* portrays these productions as “too much choice.” Aunt Lydia argues that the past society was “a

¹⁰⁸ Horkheimer, *Critical Theory*, 4.

¹⁰⁹ Adorno, *The Culture Industry*, 94.

¹¹⁰ Fiona Tolan, " Feminist Utopias and Questions of Liberty: Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale as Critique of Second Wave Feminism," *Women: a cultural review* 16.1 (2005): 28.

¹¹¹ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 321.

¹¹² Margaret Atwood: *A Critical Companion*, 127.

society dying...of too much choice,”¹¹³ and there was only freedom to; Gilead, on the other hand, offers “freedom from,” which should not be “underrated.”¹¹⁴ The scope of the positive liberty is narrowed; an individual’s capacity to act is reduced to the freedom to choose, to consumerism.

In the era of mass consumption, the function of the economy has changed from sustenance of life to the demands of culture, which are the demands of mass culture. In this course, individuals become a passive recipient of the choices offered without really satisfying their human needs. The market determines the needs, and the productions of the market do not meet human needs and desires; they are rather produced “for the sake of profit, for the sake of acquiring further capital.”¹¹⁵ Besides the production for the sake of profit, the market produces the goods and services in such a way to produce harmony in society, harmony between individual needs and societal needs. Marcuse argues that this harmony is desirable only if “society offered the individual the conditions for his development as a human being in accord with the available possibilities of freedom, peace, and happiness.”¹¹⁶ However, if these conditions do not exist, this harmony is destructive; it creates conformity and loss of action and, eventually, loss of freedom.

Conformity creates passivity and blocks the potentialities of all kinds. Conformity absorbs will to change, and this is one of the greatest achievements of advanced industrial societies.¹¹⁷ Conformity in advanced industrial societies is achieved and maintained through various ways such as through the creation of false needs, equation of societal needs with individual needs, through providing incentives such as high level of living standards and better conditions. In a sense, “non-conformity with the system itself appears to be socially useless.”¹¹⁸ In *HT*, the

¹¹³ Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale*, 35.

¹¹⁴ Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale*, 34.

¹¹⁵ J.M. Bernstein, "Introduction to," *The Culture Industry* (Routledge, 1991), 5.

¹¹⁶ Marcuse, *Negations*, 191.

¹¹⁷ Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, xIii.

conformity with the regime in pre-Gilead can be explained as “apathy...too little activity in the face of growing political and environmental threats.”¹¹⁹ Apathy or ignoring the problems is a central theme in *HT*. The narrator often speaks about ignoring;

We lived, as usual, by ignoring... There were stories in the newspaper...They were about other women, and the men who did such things were other men. None of them were the men we knew. The newspaper stories were like dreams to us, bad dreams dreamt by others...We were the people who were not in the papers. We lived in the blank white spaces at the edges of print.¹²⁰

The apathy and ignoring what goes on is irresponsibility towards oneself and one's community. The advanced industrial society is designed in such a way that it leads to a decline of responsibility and guilt. Although one of the greatest achievements of modernity is autonomous and free individuals, the advanced industrial society demolishes this achievement through the “transfer of power from the human individual to the technical and bureaucratic apparatus, from living to dead labor, from personal to remote control.”¹²¹ Technical rationality “functions according to the standards of efficiency and precision.”¹²² Technical rationality and bureaucracy require “precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and material and personal costs.”¹²³ Bureaucracy and/or technical apparatus require depersonalization and dehumanization; what matters is the efficiency; and the means rather than the goals become crucial and eventually, these means “turn into ends.”¹²⁴ In a society in which all things are valued in relation to its efficiency, and the measurement is done

¹¹⁸ Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, 4.

¹¹⁹ Kuźnicki, *Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Fiction: Fire is Being Eaten*, 56.

¹²⁰ Atwood, *The Handmaids' Tale*, 66-67.

¹²¹ Marcuse, *Towards a Critical Theory of Society*, 65.

¹²² Marcuse, *Technology, War and Fascism*, 77.

¹²³ Weber, "Technical Advantages of Bureaucratic Organization," 214.

¹²⁴ Bauman, *The Holocaust and Modernity*, 106.

according to the quantitative progress, there is no room for individual action or spontaneity. Domination of bureaucratic and technical rationality results in the loss of individual autonomy and the loss of individual autonomy precedes the loss of responsibility towards oneself and towards others. Marcuse claims that the “transfer of power from individual to technical” is actually a “transfer of guilt-feeling responsibility - it releases the individual from being an autonomous person.”¹²⁵

The narrator of *HT*, Offred, projects herself, both in the past and in her present, as passive. Although there are some points, she reflects this passivity as something she regrets, and mostly passivity is described as harmless. At one point, she says, “I wish this story were different. I wish it were more civilized. I wish it showed me in a better light, if not happier, then at least more active.”¹²⁶ In this case, she regrets her passivity. But most of the time, passivity is a general way for her to do things. For instance, Offred’s walking partner Ofglen, who is an active member of the Mayday rescue movement, commits suicide after she has learned the Eyes would come after her. New Ofglen tells this to Offred, and she feels relief; for she realizes that if Ofglen got caught, she might talk about Offred and the resistance movement. Then Offred thinks that she has not done anything wrong. She talks to herself, “I haven’t done anything, I tell myself, not really. All I did was know. All I did was not tell.”¹²⁷ Not telling is a form of passivity, but in this particular action, Offred thinks that nothing is wrong. However, in Gilead, telling the wrongdoings of others is a duty; to be a spy is a duty. “She is my spy, as I am hers. If either of us slips through the net because of something that happens on one of our daily walks, the other will be accountable.”¹²⁸ She describes her passivity, of not telling as doing nothing wrong, but in Gilead, not telling is guilt; it is a crime against society. The Gileadean regime is built against the individualized atomized society. In an atomized society, the individual becomes free from familial, social, and communal

¹²⁵ Marcuse, *Towards a Critical Theory of Society*, 65.

¹²⁶ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 279.

¹²⁷ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 297.

¹²⁸ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 29.

ties. The actions of others are insignificant as long as these actions do not harm individuals. Their responsibilities towards themselves and their community are abolished and replaced by a responsibility that is measured through “the criteria of instrumental rationality and practical achievement.”¹²⁹ As opposed to the atomized society, Gilead is designed based on these communal ties; Gilead is a family, and within a family, everyone is responsible for the actions of others. So not telling someone’s wrong means irresponsibility towards this family.

The isolation from one’s own environment is rendered impossible in Gilead, whereas in advanced industrial society, isolation is one of the chief characteristics of individuals. Pre-Gilead is portrayed as an advanced industrial society, and in the transition period to a totalitarian regime, there have been severe law amendments; women are fired from their jobs, they lose their money, they lose their right to work and to hold property. Protests and marches are organized against these new laws, but Offred did not attend any of these. She says, “I didn’t go on any of the marches. Luke said it would be futile, and I had to think about them, my family, him, and her.”¹³⁰ She puts her family before her rights and freedom, the rights and freedom that protect her and her family. She “‘makes a life for herself,’ a life involving no community or political commitment, but the only commitment to ‘having a man.’”¹³¹ She maintains her commitment to ‘having a man’ in Gilead, she does not want to leave Gilead when she has a chance to, she does not want to “cross the border to freedom”¹³² anymore after she fell in love with Nick. Offred regrets her attitude of neglect at some point, and she says, “I took too much for granted; I trusted in fate, back then.”¹³³ Offred, both in pre-Gilead and in Gilead, portrays a passive, compliant character unlike her mother and her best friend Moira, who are part of the

¹²⁹ Zygmunt Bauman, *The Intimations of Postmodernity*, xxii.

¹³⁰ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 189.

¹³¹ Madonne Miner, “‘Trust Me’: Reading the Romance Plot in Margaret Atwood’s *The Handmaid’s Tale*,” in *Margaret Atwood’s Handmaid’s Tale*, 36.

¹³² *The Handmaid's Tale*, 283.

¹³³ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 37.

feminist and queer movement. Both her mother and Moira are described as active members. They fight for their rights and freedom and realize that all these rights and freedoms are significant and necessitate constant action because rights and freedoms are gained and not given. Her mother, who is an active member of the feminist movement during the 1960s and 1970s, says before the Gileadean regime is established, “young people don’t appreciate things... don’t know what we had to go through, just to get you where you are... Don’t you know how many women’s lives, how many women’s bodies, the tanks had to roll over just to get that far.”¹³⁴ Offred answers this accusation as saying, “let’s not get into an argument about nothing,” and this answer makes her mother furious. She replied, “You call it nothing. You don’t understand, do you? You don’t understand at all what I’m talking about.”¹³⁵ Offred is an isolated individual; she takes her rights and freedoms for granted, considered these as given, she is not part of the community that she lives, she does not fight for her rights and freedoms, and eventually, she has lost all the privileges and rights she could enjoy. Ignoring and irresponsibility, both in pre-Gilead and in Gilead, become the instrument through which the totalitarian regime is built and maintained.

Advanced industrial society blocks the potentialities and alternatives by presenting the living reality as a stable and secure position. As Bauman points out, “the civilizing formula of modernity called for surrendering at least a part of the agent’s freedom in exchange for the promise of security drawn from (assumed) moral and (prospective) social certainty.”¹³⁶ In this stability and security, freedom is exchanged for the rising living standards, “the diffusion of what were once considered luxuries to the middle and lower classes,”¹³⁷ and the diffusion of rights and freedom to people in general, and these conditions make the protest senseless. The mass society also blocks potentialities by making people feel alone, and in this

¹³⁴ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 131.

¹³⁵ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 131.

¹³⁶ *The Intimations of Postmodernity*, xxiv.

¹³⁷ Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1978), 65.

way, it renders politics meaningless. Self-preservation becomes the sole motivation for action. Marcuse states, “as there is a decrease in the number of those who have the freedom of individual performance, there is an increase in the number of those whose individuality is reduced to self-preservation by standardization.”¹³⁸ Self-preservation, for most cases, invalidates collective action. In such conditions, a lack of collective action is accompanied by a lack of politics, which may result in the loss of rights and freedoms. Politics requires a certain level of awareness of the socio-economic and political conditions, conditions that people experience, and they suffer; it requires individual responsibility; it is an awareness that isolated individuals lack, and awareness “to feel, judge and act with others.”¹³⁹

To conclude this section, Offred is a singular example for an isolated individual in advanced industrial society, in which getting involved in politics seems useless and unnecessary, everyone seems alone, and the will to change is repressed. However, Atwood, in this novel, emphasizes the human capacity to think, to act, to judge, and to be with the others. Not taking responsibility and taking responsibility can be seen as a matter of choice, but, for Atwood, our human capacity requires taking responsibility. Political involvement is not a matter of choice, and the more we ignore, the more we lose our humanity as well as our freedom. Atwood’s point is that the conditions we live in may not last forever, even the small changes can make drastic effects, and each choice we have made or not made can affect our life. “Although they are familiar, harmless-looking, everyday objects, they are, in the final analysis, life-or-death choices.”¹⁴⁰ The choices we have made may seem insignificant or private, individual choices but these choices, as displayed in *the Handmaid's Tale*, have power to affect and change our social and public life.

¹³⁸ Marcuse, *Technology, War, Fascism*, 53.

¹³⁹ Peter G. Stillman, and S. Anne Johnson, "Identity, Complicity, and Resistance in The Handmaid's Tale," *Utopian Studies* (1994): 81.

¹⁴⁰ Atwood, *Moving Targets*, 71.

3.2. The Dissolution of Modernity as We Know it; *MaddAddam* Trilogy

MaddAddam trilogy consists of three books written between 2003 and 2013 (*Oryx and Crake*, 2003; *The Year of the Flood*, 2009; *MaddAddam*, 2013), and within these three books, Atwood discusses many politically relevant subjects; the subjects that endanger our individual and collective lives such as corporatization, privatization, consumer culture, the commodification of body as well as life, increase in the visibility and/or banality of violence, development in biotech, biomedicine, and genetics and, of course, environmental crisis. A brief comparison between *HT* and *MaddAddam* trilogy would help situate their place within the dystopian genre.

The Handmaid's Tale owes much to Orwell's *1984*, as Atwood herself indicates.¹⁴¹ The Orwellian model can be summed up as a dystopic society whose repressive regime rules through totalitarian means; it controls the political, social, and economic life (the means of production, communication tools, education, private life, etc.); the regime destroys its political environment, there is neither politics nor legitimate opposition, there are only totalitarian policies and power; control and surveillance mechanisms are strong and spread throughout the society; opposition is severely repressed, punished, and tortured, violence and deaths/murders are publicly displayed; last but not least there is a domination of language, which "reduces the possibility of even thinking oppositionally."¹⁴² Technology has a secondary position and is mostly used for control and surveillance. The roads towards such a dystopic society may vary, but in the end, it is the political structure that forms and maintains dystopia. The Orwellian model displays a panoptical regime of surveillance in the sense that the surveyed always knows that she is being watched without seeing the surveillant. *HT* follows this model and shares these characteristics; different from the Orwellian model and dystopian genre in general, in *HT*, religion is the definitive character of a totalitarian regime, but as it is stated previously, dystopian genres start with an anti-religious standing and then creates a new kind of religion for the masses. Another divergence from the Orwellian model

¹⁴¹ Curious Pursuits, 338.

¹⁴² Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 409.

crucial for this study, is that *HT* offers two ways out (Atwood considers these ways out as “little utopic”¹⁴³) from dystopic society; the first one lies at the past of the book (which is our present), and the second one is presented in the Historical Notes’ part (which takes place in the future where Gileadean regime is collapsed). However, these two ways out are not utopic in themselves, but they can be corrected if the reasons for a totalitarian takeover would be given attention.

Although *HT* was written in 1985, Atwood chooses to follow the path of Orwell by focusing primarily on the state’s terror and giving a secondary position to scientific development and technological innovations. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, Atwood forms another kind of dystopia, in which scientific and technological developments are given the constituent roles. Atwood claims that the twentieth century produces two kinds of contradictory dystopias - “the jackbooted state totalitarianism of Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty Four*, and the hedonistic ersatz paradise of *Brave New World*,” and “we face the prospects of two contradictory dystopias at once - open markets closed minds - because state surveillance is back again with a vengeance.”¹⁴⁴ Open markets do not necessarily lead to the opening of the minds, and *MaddAddam* trilogy acknowledges this argument.

In *MaddAddam* trilogy, there seems a shift from the Orwellian model to the Huxleyan model; Atwood’s narrative moves from “the jackbooted state totalitarianism of Orwell’s *Nineteen EightyFour*” to “the hedonistic ersatz paradise of *Brave New World*,”¹⁴⁵ and this move is a deliberate choice. It is not terror, and the state totalitarianism is at stake; rather, it is the impacts of capitalism together with science and technology that is demonstrated; science and industry take control over the society. Claeys argues, “Huxley believed that science could benefit as well as degrade humanity,”¹⁴⁶ Atwood agrees and defends this position in the trilogy, both science’s benefits and the degradation of humanity and its values can be

¹⁴³ Atwood, *In Other Worlds*, 90.

¹⁴⁴ *Curious Pursuits*, 339.

¹⁴⁵ *Curious Pursuits*, 339.

¹⁴⁶ *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 366.

observed. In this sense, *MaddAddam* follows a Huxleyan model; it analyzes “the qualitative vacuum of a culture that has lost its ‘great’ narrative.”¹⁴⁷ Trilogy displays a different kind of rule than *HT*: It is a corporation-controlled society; on the one hand, there is technocracy of the scientists who work for the corporations, and on the other hand, there is anarchy.¹⁴⁸ Anarchy rules in the Pleeblands, in the cities, whereas corporate rules are applied within the Compounds (“where the top people lived”¹⁴⁹). Anarchy exists but within the boundaries permitted by CorpSeCorpse, which is a private security corporation. Although commentators claim that books are the apocalyptic, Atwood herself argues that these books “are not apocalyptic” because it is only most of the human race “that’s annihilated.” The annihilation of most of the human race cannot be considered as apocalyptic because there are survivals among humans, and also animals and other species still exist. So, the dystopia presented in the trilogy is not the annihilation of the human race. It is the world that led to annihilation.¹⁵⁰

HT and the trilogy seem different in kind; one formed around state’s terror and the other formed around a kind of a stateless corporate society in which science and technology rule over society. But, in this study, it is claimed that the detailed analysis of the roads that pave the way for dystopian pasts and presents represented in the books would reveal that Atwood’s motives for writing dystopia and her projections of dystopia derive from the same fear; the moral and ethical vacuum, the loss of responsibility towards oneself and the others, the loss of practise of freedom, the loss of action and judgment. She insists on the importance of fiction writing; she tells

Fiction writing is the guardian of the moral and ethical sense of community...fiction is one of the few forms left through which we may examine our society...through which we can see ourselves and the ways in which we behave towards each other, through which we can see others and judge them, and ourselves.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁷ Stephen Dunning, "Margaret Atwood's Oryx and Crake: The Terror of the Therapeutic," *Canadian Literature* (2005): 86.

¹⁴⁸ *In Other Worlds*, 91.

¹⁴⁹ Atwood, *Oryx and Crake*, 30.

¹⁵⁰ *In Other Worlds*, 93.

Atwood declares that her writings are speculative fiction; through speculative fiction or through, as they are generally recognized, dystopian fiction, she tries to show the moral and ethical situations that we are in. She examines and evaluates the conditions that lead to that kind of morality or moral vacuum; she observes and makes us judge ourselves and others. Only in these ways can we achieve a different and perhaps a better society. The previous chapter dedicated to the roads that pave the way for totalitarian takeover in *HT*, and in this section, the causes that bring an end of most of the humans' lives in *MaddAddam* trilogy will be analyzed. In this section, the evolution of capitalism, transition to neoliberal policies and consequent structural changes, their impacts on the organization of society as well as on our modernity, and their projection in *MaddAddam* trilogy will be analyzed.

3.2.1. Capitalism, Neoliberalism, and the State

The shift from dystopia based on state totalitarianism to a dystopia in which the state ceases to exist, corporations take control of the apparatuses of the state such as education, health, and more importantly, security, is in parallel with the changes in the structure of the economics, which affect political and cultural circumstances as well. The structural change is interpreted differently, such as post-Fordism, post-industrialism,¹⁵² disorganized capitalism,¹⁵³ or universalization of capitalism.¹⁵⁴ Each of these approaches to the emerging changes offers different perspectives on the nature of the relationship between capital and labor, industrial and occupational structure, as well as the relationship between state and society, politics, and culture. Although diverse interpretations are possible for this structural change, the driving force behind all these approaches can be recognized as the transition to neoliberal

¹⁵¹ *Second Words*, 346.

¹⁵² Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, 14.

¹⁵³ Lash and Urry, *The End of Organized Capitalism* (Univ of Wisconsin Press, 1987).

¹⁵⁴ Ellen Meikins Wood, "Modernity, Postmodernity or Capitalism?," *Review of International Political Economy* (1997): 551.

policies. For the sake of the coherence, rather than differences, the resemblances and the common arguments on the reasons for the structural changes and their effects on modernity will be discussed. First, the reasons of the structural changes, which are, to put it very simply, the failures of the Keynesian policies, the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system, the increase in the international competitiveness in the sphere of economics, and the legitimization crisis will be briefly given. Afterwards, neoliberalism and its effects will be discussed.

3.2.1.1. Crisis of the 1970s

After the two consecutive World Wars devastated all spheres of political and economic life, one of the solutions to the deterioration was the Keynesian policies. Keynesian policies, in general, aim at increasing the demand. It offers a demand-side economy. For Keynes, economic stagnation results from the lack of demands, and to increase aggregate demand, government spending should be increased. After the World War II, most of Europe and also the USA shift to Keynesian policies. For Keynes, the state “should focus on full employment, economic growth, and the welfare of its citizen and that state power should be freely deployed, alongside or, if necessary, intervening in or even substituting for market processes to achieve these ends.”¹⁵⁵ As a result, the state became the key actor. It actively involved and intervened in industrial policies, acted as a guarantor between capital and labor, and also provided welfare systems.¹⁵⁶ In this era, economic growth is achieved in advanced capitalist states, and the period between 1945-1970 is called Golden Age. During the 1950s and 1960s, national and global economic expansion has achieved its peak; but it comes with the problems of capital accumulation. The profits of the capitalists decrease due to excess capitalist accumulation. Capital accumulation problems do not result from the lack of consumption or lack of effective demand.¹⁵⁷ The inflation rises due to the increase in government spending, due to the increase

¹⁵⁵ David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford University Press, 2007), 10.

¹⁵⁶ Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 10-11.

¹⁵⁷ Costas Lapavitsas and Makoto Itoh, *Para ve Finansın Ekonomi Politiği* (Yordam Kitap, 2012), 193.

in the bargaining power of the labor union power, and the rise of labor wage and unemployment goes hand in hand. “Every capitalist expansion necessarily comes to an end as a consequence of emerging and spreading excess productive capacities (that is, the inability to sell profitably at optimum use of productive facilities).”¹⁵⁸ So the Keynesian policies were stuck due to stagflation and the rise of unemployment and inflation at the same time. The 1970s marked the era of the stagflation and, as a result, the erosion of the Keynesian policies.

The US economic hegemony in this Golden era was based both on its economic power and the stability of the Bretton Woods system. The economic power of the USA, however, started to deteriorate because of the improvement of the economic power of the capitalist states such as West Germany and Japan. Their international industrial competitiveness increased. The USA benefited from the fixed exchange rates; it expanded export markets.¹⁵⁹ However, the rise of the competitiveness of the other advanced capitalist countries started to push US hegemony. The advanced technological industry of the US was transferred to other capitalist states and used there successively, whereas innovations in the US industry diminished.¹⁶⁰ Meanwhile Japan was also benefiting from the fixed exchange rates due to its competitiveness in international markets. However, the trade surplus of the US continued to decrease, and its military expenditure went up due to the Vietnam War. In such conditions, its hegemonic position in economics was shattered. The US lost its economic power to protect the Bretton Woods system¹⁶¹, and it was abandoned in 1971. And as a result, the US lost its hegemony in the economic sphere.

Needless to say, the increase in competitiveness did not only emerge in the advanced capitalist state. The states that have raw materials use their power against

¹⁵⁸ Douglas Fitzgerald Dowd, *Capitalism and Its Economics: A Critical History* (Pluto Press, 2004), 159.

¹⁵⁹ Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, p.11.

¹⁶⁰ Lapavitsas and Itoh, *Para ve Finansın Ekonomi Politiği*, 191.

¹⁶¹ Eric Hobsbawm, "Tarihi Perspektif içinde Kapitalizmin Bunalımı," *Dünya Kapitalizminin Krizi*, ed. Nail Satılıgan and Sungur Savran (Belge Yayınları, 2009), 86.

capitalist states. They act as a monopoly in the petrol crisis.¹⁶² Oil producing states, due to the oil embargo, gained financial power vis-a-vis the rest of the world,¹⁶³ and they use this power against capitalist corporations; it means that the capitalist cannot use the resources of the third world as they want.¹⁶⁴

Finally, economic crises were transferred to the political sphere and create a legitimization crisis. Economic crises have led to governments “take on responsibility for more and more areas of the economy and civil society.”¹⁶⁵ Keynesian policies have led to an increase in state intervention to the areas previously uncontrolled by the government. As a result, more areas of life have been politicized. Growing administrative planning in the areas that were once self-legislating, such as the cultural sphere, increases the demands on the state and puts pressure on them. With the expansion of the state’s activity to the cultural sphere, the boundary between the political and the cultural system was blurred. The cultural sphere, too, “fall into the administrative planning area,”¹⁶⁶ and as Habermas argues, increase in the administrative planning in the areas that once have the power of self-legislation “produces a universal pressure for legitimization.”¹⁶⁷ The state has to administer more areas of life, and at the same time, the decisions on these areas create political debates and conflicts due to excessive demands. These demands are generally about the “consensus-formation in the planning process”¹⁶⁸ due to the increased demands on the “participation and consultation over decisions.”¹⁶⁹ In the case of the

¹⁶² Hobsbawm, "Tarihi Perspektif içinde Kapitalizmin Bunalımı," 86.

¹⁶³ Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 27.

¹⁶⁴ Hobsbawm, "Tarihi Perspektif içinde Kapitalizmin Bunalımı," 86.

¹⁶⁵ Davild Held, *Models of Democracy* (Polity Press, 2006), 194.

¹⁶⁶ Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis*, trans. Thomas Carthy (Heinemann Educational Books, 1980), 71

¹⁶⁷ *Legitimation Crisis*, 72.

¹⁶⁸ Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis*, 72.

unfulfillment of demands, states experienced a legitimization crisis, and this has happened in the 1970s.

To sum up, the Golden Age of economic growth and expansion was slowed down by several causes. On the national level, the burden of Keynesian policies on governments, diminishing tax revenues, excess of social expenditures, the rise of labor wage, and unemployment, together with inflation, have resulted in the questioning of the validity of Keynesian economics. On the international level, the US lost its hegemonic position, vis-a-vis the advanced capitalist states. West Germany and Japan have recovered their economy and their industry; they have gained competitiveness in the international market. The loss of the US hegemonic position in economics resulted in the abandonment of the Bretton Woods system. With the transference of economic crisis to the political sphere, a “rationality crisis”¹⁷⁰ or a “crisis of rational administration”¹⁷¹ emerge and led to the legitimization crisis in general.

The solution to these crises has been found within the liberal academic circle; the Mont Pelerin Society. The academics and intellectuals within this society attacked Keynesian economic policy due to its commitment to the state’s intervention to economics as well as its demand-side approach. They oppose Keynesian economics and propose a non-interventionist state as they believed that the “state decisions on matters of investment and capital accumulation were bound to be wrong because the information available to the state could not rival that contained in the market signals.”¹⁷² Although until 1979, the liberal policies of the Mont Pelerin Society have existed on the margins, these policies have become dominant in economics and politics with the election of Thatcher in Britain. Thatcher has abandoned Keynesianism in favor of the supply-side policies, encouraged

¹⁶⁹ Held, *Models of Democracy*, 196.

¹⁷⁰ Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis*, 68.

¹⁷¹ Held, *Models of Democracy*, 194.

¹⁷² Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 27.

private initiatives, and reduced of social welfare expenditures. With these policies, the consolidation of neoliberalism has been sustained as a regulating policy.¹⁷³

3.2.1.2. Neoliberalism

The crises of the 1970s have led to the spread and domination of neoliberal policies throughout the world. Neoliberalism covers policies that reduce the government's roles in economics and encourage privatization and private entrepreneurship. Reduction in government intervention and regulation of the market, decrease in governments' welfare spending, and privatizations of welfare services are among the frequently used policies. The shift to neoliberal policies in the late 1970s and especially in the 1980s creates a slippery ground with respect to freedom and security. Although liberalism puts too much emphasis on freedom, Harvey argues that the freedoms that neoliberal state embodies "reflect the interest of private property owners, businesses, multinational corporations, and financial capital."¹⁷⁴ It is the freedom of the market and the capitalists that is enhanced and guaranteed by the neoliberal policies while individual freedom and security are decreasing. In short, the liberal argument on liberty and freedom, for Harvey, "primarily functioned as a mark for practices that are all about the maintenance, reconstitution, and restoration of elite class power;"¹⁷⁵ the elite class power that was reduced due to the Keynesian policies.

Neoliberalism requires freedom for the maximization of the profit. This freedom entails limited intervention of the government to the market, decentralization of the capital, deregulation, and privatization. Freedom of the market means losing secure conditions for individuals such as the loss of access to the social services. As the state is considered more and more as a problem rather than the solution, the retreatment of the state from all visible aspects of economic as well as social life was considered as the main remedy to the crisis. Maybe the most

¹⁷³ Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 22.

¹⁷⁴ *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 7.

¹⁷⁵ *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 188.

challenging change comes with the dissolution of the welfare services and privatization of these services. Deregulation and non-interventionist policies of the government towards the market, namely, freedom in the market when followed by privatization of what were once welfare services, have disruptive effects on individuals. Individuals are left alone, held responsible for their successes and failures, while structural errors are being disregarded. In this process, “inequalities, privileges and disadvantages are often seen as the exclusive outcome of individual actions...rather than of structurally determined political and economic forces.”¹⁷⁶ States are no longer responsible for the well-being of its citizens; instead, citizens are given full responsibility for their well-being. As a result, impoverishment has spread to larger segments of society, success and failures are individualized and individual victims are blamed for their failures.¹⁷⁷ The effects of neoliberalism on individuals and also on culture will be discussed in detail throughout the next section. Still, it is important to highlight some of the structural changes that occur in this period.

There are different terms for this period, such as post-Fordism, post-industrialism, or, more generally, postmodern era. In comparison to Fordism or the industrial era, this new era has marked several shifts related to each other, which are the transformation of the nature of production, consumption, and also of capitalism itself. Fordism or the industrial era, as it was stated before in this chapter, can be summed up as massive and rigid bureaucracies, the concentration of capital, and standardization through mass production and mass consumption. As opposed to these, the post-industrial or post-Fordist era has marked the decentralization of individual from the collective, of capital, and bureaucracies, flexible forms of work and production, and also specialized consumption.¹⁷⁸ Inflexible production, which is a product of the Fordist era, means mass and standardized production, whereas flexible production offers possibilities and choices according to the lifestyle and cultural background. Following this type of production, there emerges a new kind

¹⁷⁶ Held, *Models of Democracy*, 199.

¹⁷⁷ Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 76.

¹⁷⁸ Lash and Urry, *The End of Organized Capitalism*, 5.

of consumption, which is specialized consumption. Specialized consumption, Lash argues, “is not only a matter of the physic investment of consumer with style...it is also a question of the development for more specialized use-values.¹⁷⁹ The shifts in production and consumption reflect the neoliberal attitude towards freedom, freedom to choose, freedom to be how one wants to be, freedom to form the self. Overall in this era, the culture becomes an economic sector.¹⁸⁰ What is observed in this era is a new emphasis on the individual, a new form of identity formation decentered from the collective identity,¹⁸¹ and the emergence of unique individual desires and wishes apart from the societal needs. These affect the production and consumption process. These desires and wishes become more and more cultural and thus alter the production and consumption.

Not only production and consumption have altered; there is also a change in the nature of work.¹⁸² Capitalism has spread throughout the Third World through the imposition of neoliberal policies by international organizations such as the IMF and World Bank. This spread can be considered as the universalization of capitalism. Ellen Meiksins Wood uses this term for explaining the contemporary capitalism. She argues that this era does not mark a new phase of capitalism or postmodernism; instead, we are living in an age in which “capitalism itself reaching maturity.¹⁸³ For her, the universalization of capitalism means “the increasing imposition of capitalist imperatives, a capitalist ‘logic of the process,’ on all aspects of social life.”¹⁸⁴ With the loosening power of the state in social and economic spheres, capitalist logic has penetrated in these spheres. A shift emerged with the

¹⁷⁹ Lash, *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 40.

¹⁸⁰ Lash, *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 43.

¹⁸¹ Lash, *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 27.

¹⁸² Lash and Urry, *The End of Organized Capitalism*, 6, Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradiction of Capitalism*, 14.

¹⁸³ Ellen Meiksins Wood, "Modernity, Postmodernity or Capitalism?," 558.

¹⁸⁴ Wood, "Modernity, Postmodernity or Capitalism?," 554.

spread of capitalism in the “occupational structure of the First World economies towards ‘service industry and occupations,’¹⁸⁵ which, in turn, creates “a new centrality of theoretical knowledge in economic innovation and policy.”¹⁸⁶ This newly emerging society is sometimes called an information society. In this society, education becomes the basis of the “occupational stratification...knowledge has been significantly appropriated away from the working class and embodied within the institutions of science, the professions, and education.”¹⁸⁷ Although these changes in the occupational structure began in the late 1950s and 1960s, its impact on the precariousness of individuals has been felt more with the transition to neoliberal policies.

The changes that are brought with the neoliberal policies have another and broader consequence; the change in the nature of modernity. Giddens argues, the most known sociologists look for a single determining factor for the transformation of the nature of modernity; capitalism for Marx, industrialism for Durkheim, rationalization for Weber.¹⁸⁸ The one-dimensional explanation for the changes that occurred in this era would be misleading; a multi-dimensional approach would be more appropriate since these factors, capitalism, industrialism, and rationalization, cannot be taken in their singularity; a relational reading would be more explanatory. All these dynamics have changed in this era, and the result of these changes is the emergence of new interpretations of modernity. As dystopias are products of modernity, with the changing dynamics of modernity, dystopias have altered too. Thus, it is essential to evaluate the changing dynamics before moving into the analysis of *MaddAddam* trilogy.

¹⁸⁵ Lash and Urry, *The End of Organized Capitalism*, 6

¹⁸⁶ Bell, *The Cultural Contradiction of Capitalism*, 14.

¹⁸⁷ Lash and Urry, *The End of Organized Capitalism*, 6, Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradiction of Capitalism*, 174.

¹⁸⁸ Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Polity Press, 199), 11.

3.2.2. New Perspectives on Modernity

These transformations occurred in the nature of production, of consumption, and of capitalism itself signal a broader transformation, the transformation of the modernity itself. This phenomenon is mostly referred to as postmodernism, but after the 1990s, different interpretations of modernity have started to emerge due to the “dissatisfaction with postmodernism.”¹⁸⁹ So the first reaction to modernism comes from postmodernism, and the arguments of postmodernism, in a way, shape and give way to the new perspectives on modernity. A brief introduction to postmodernism is provided in the analysis of *The Handmaid's Tale*. However, a more detailed one is necessary to evaluate the validity of the postmodernity thesis and/or what comes after postmodernity, liquid modernity, and second or reflexive modernity theses concerning *MaddAddam* trilogy.

3.2.2.1. Postmodernity

Fredric Jameson relates the emergence of postmodernism to the “consumer or multinational capitalism,”¹⁹⁰ and he defines it as a reaction against high modernism and the boundaries set by the separation between high culture and low or mass culture.¹⁹¹ So Jameson situates postmodernism within the cultural realm. Scott Lash also claims postmodernism’s confinement within the cultural realm.¹⁹² However, it is also important to re-emphasize that culture becomes an economic sector as well as it becomes a subject of power and politics during the 1960s. So, postmodernity that is seemingly confined within the cultural realm does affect all spheres of lives. So, what is postmodern that starts within the cultural realm and spreads all other realms?

¹⁸⁹ Raymond LM Lee, "Reinventing Modernity: Reflexive Modernization vs Liquid Modernity vs Multiple Modernities," *European Journal of Social* (2006): 355.

¹⁹⁰ "Postmodernism and Consumer Society," *Postmodern Culture*, 125.

¹⁹¹ "Postmodernism and Consumer Society," *Postmodern Culture*, 111-112.

¹⁹² *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 4.

Lash argues that postmodernism is “a process of de-differentiation.” Modernism, he claims, is a process of differentiation, through which the cultural realm is differentiated from the social, from the religious, and the sacred realm. The cultural realm gains full autonomy and develops self-legislating rules. It forms its “own conventions and mode of valuation.”¹⁹³ Modernist culture also differentiates the high culture from the mass culture; high culture is accessible only to elites, whereas low culture or mass culture is confined to the mass. Low culture produces commodification that modernism was critical of.¹⁹⁴ Problematics of modernity and postmodernity are different; “modernism conceives representations as being problematic whereas postmodernism problematizes reality;”¹⁹⁵ because postmodernists follow the argument that representations start to constitute our reality, so it is the reality that is problematic.¹⁹⁶ Postmodernism is a kind of critique; it provides a radical break with the understanding of high culture, art, and aesthetics; it is a critique of the claim of the totality of scientific knowledge.¹⁹⁷ The postmodern world is pluralized, fragmentized, and decentralized. Postmodernism breaks and transgresses the boundaries that were fixed by modernity. Lyotard argues a postmodern text cannot be produced by pre-established rules and cannot be judged according to the pre-established principles. Postmodern text is seeking these principles and rules without being bound by them. “Postmodern would have to be understood according to the paradox of the future (post) anterior (modo).”¹⁹⁸ Postmodern is always in a relationship with the past as it transgresses it and with the future as it is uncertain what comes in the future.

¹⁹³ *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 9.

¹⁹⁴ *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 19.

¹⁹⁵ *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 13.

¹⁹⁶ *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 24.

¹⁹⁷ Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, 2.

¹⁹⁸ *The Postmodern Condition*, 81.

Lyotard argues that postmodernism “is not modernism at its end but in the nascent state, and this state is constant.”¹⁹⁹ Postmodernism is a condition that is cyclical until new modernism emerges.²⁰⁰ Until new modernity emerges, this postmodern condition will repeat itself. Lyotard insists on the importance of the language and the ongoing process of the meaning creation, and for him, the emergence of new modernity depends on this criterion; the possibility to “have a form of legitimation based solely on paralogy”²⁰¹ and paralogy means “a move played in the pragmatics of knowledge.”²⁰² Lyotard questions the sources of the modernity’s legitimation. Bauman, who was once considered as postmodernist but then has changed his attitude towards postmodernism, defines postmodernity “as the fully developed modernity, as modernity that acknowledged the effects it was producing throughout its history... as modernity conscious of its true nature-modernity for itself.”²⁰³ So for Bauman, postmodernity is the modernity that questions itself, its consequences, and its unpredictable effects. He defines the features of postmodernity in earlier writing as “institutionalized pluralism, variety, contingency, and ambivalence,”²⁰⁴ whereas modernity can be characterized as struggles for “universality, homogeneity, monotony, and clarity.”²⁰⁵ Bauman’s change in attitude towards postmodernism reflects the general concern towards postmodernism. He defines postmodernism as a “state of mind marked above all by

¹⁹⁹ *The Postmodern Condition*, 79.

²⁰⁰ Fredric Jameson, “Foreword to,” *The Postmodern Condition*. xvi.

²⁰¹ *The Postmodern Condition*, 61.

²⁰² *The Postmodern Condition*, 61.

²⁰³ "A Sociological Theory of Postmodernity," *Thesis Eleven* (1991): 33.

²⁰⁴ "A Sociological Theory of Postmodernity," 33.

²⁰⁵ "A Sociological Theory of Postmodernity," 33.

its all-deriding, all-eroding, all-dissolving destructiveness.”²⁰⁶ He maintains, “postmodern mind is...a critique that finds it ever more difficult to go on being critical just because it has destroyed everything it used to be critical about.”²⁰⁷ The postmodern mind, critical of everything, destroys everything, but in return, it proposes nothing.²⁰⁸ Although Bauman is, at first, identified with postmodernism, because of his expectations from theory to rebuilding the things that it has destructed, he departs him from the theory of postmodernity and postmodern mind, and this was a general attitude towards postmodernism among the scholars.

Postmodernism, on the one hand, opposes to the meta-narratives in general. It tries to decentralize power relations, insists on the uncertainty and relativity of the subjects’ positions and proposes a de-totalization as Lyotard’s famous sentence indicates; “let us wage war against totality.”²⁰⁹ The postmodern world is de-totalizing. On the other hand, it does not propose something to replace the universals, the meta-narratives, something to hold on; nor does it fill the vacuum created by deconstruction; there are no proposed ways of reconstructing the world. Bauman claims this is the ethical paradox of the postmodern culture: “it restores to agents the fullness of moral choice and responsibility while simultaneously depriving them of the comfort of the universal guidance that modern self-confidence once promised.”²¹⁰ It leaves individuals groundless in a sense. Nevertheless, with the postmodern interpretation of modernity, modernity is to be understood differently, and there is no turning back from there. It destabilizes the legitimacy of scientific knowledge, the demarcation between high and low culture, the understanding of history, of fixed boundaries, of order and stability itself. Agnes Heller explains clearly what has changed with the postmodern perspective;

²⁰⁶ *Intimations of Postmodernity*, vii-vii.

²⁰⁷ *Intimations of Postmodernity*, viii.

²⁰⁸ *Intimations of Postmodernity*, ix.

²⁰⁹ *The Postmodern Condition*, 82.

²¹⁰ *Intimations of Postmodernity*, xxii.

We see ourselves differently than before. And since we look at modernity differently than before, we see it differently, not only as far as its content but also as its structure is concerned. We no longer see it as a Whole...rather we see history as a mosaic that consists of heterogeneous pieces of colored glass, most of which do not even fit together.²¹¹

Postmodern perspective deconstructs the world as we know it, and the sociological theories come after postmodern theory take some of the features of postmodernism as their bases such as uncertainty, flexibility, pluralism, and non-hierarchy.

3.2.2.2. Liquid Modernity

The concept of liquid modernity developed by Bauman in the early 2000s. In the late 1990s, Bauman has started to depart from postmodernity due to its lack of belief and lack of agenda in the betterment of living conditions. Although Bauman accuses postmodernity because of its abandonment of effort and denial of belief,²¹² postmodernity has altered the way one perceives the world. The totality has been removed from the political and philosophical spheres; it is the fluidity or liquidity that define the current order of things.²¹³ In this fluid world, modern life is a task which yet unfulfilled, but it is a “perpetual and perhaps never-ending challenge and necessity, the very meaning of staying alive and well.”²¹⁴ In this perpetual challenge postmodernism falls short of offering how to stay alive and be well. Bauman’s arguments move from postmodernity to the liquid modernity due to his search for the ways to deal with the current conditions.

First of all, it is important to emphasize that Bauman does not perceive postmodernity as the end of modernity. He claims that postmodernity is modernity reaching its maturity. It acknowledges itself and its consequences; the consequences that could not be anticipated before. He argues that the society in the twentieth and twenty-first century are both modern, but the first one is modern in a different way;

²¹¹ “What is ‘Post-Modern’ – A Quarter of a Century After,” *Moderne begreifen*. DUV (2007): 38

²¹² *Intimations of Postmodernity*, xvii.

²¹³ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (John Wiley & Sons, 2013), 22.

²¹⁴ *Liquid Modernity*, 134.

its modernity is an “incomplete modernization.”²¹⁵ So what was less modern about the twentieth century? The answer is its solid institutions and centralization of power due to the vulnerability of human order. The response to these contingencies and vulnerabilities “was a dream and effort to make order solid, obligatory, and reliably founded. This response problematizes contingency as an enemy and order as a task.”²¹⁶

For Bauman, being modern means melting the solids. But in the first place, it was derived from the “wish to discover or invent...lasting solidity.” He maintains, “melting the solids meant first and foremost shedding the irrelevant obligations standing in the way of rational calculation of effects.”²¹⁷ It was an economic order that is first established through melting the solids. He equates the solid modernity with the era of heavy capitalism in which labor and capital are dependent on each other, in which capital “was fixed to the grounded.”²¹⁸ In the stage of heavy capitalism, labors were fixed in time and space; time was everything, and mastery over time and space was the real power. Bauman claims the secret of managers’ power lies in these; “immobilizing their subordinates in space through denying them the right to move and through the routinization of the time-rhythm they had to obey was the principal strategy in their exercise of power.”²¹⁹ In opposition to these, in the era of light capitalism, neither time nor space could be an obstacle towards mobility. “In the software universe of light-speed travel, space may be traversed, literally, in no time... space no more sets limits to action and its effects, and counts little or does not count at all.”²²⁰ The era of light capitalism is the era of liquid modernity. Liquid modernity starts with neoliberal policies such as deregulation,

²¹⁵ *Liquid Modernity*, 28.

²¹⁶ Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity*, xi.

²¹⁷ *Liquid Modernity*, 3-4.

²¹⁸ *Liquid Modernity*, 58.

²¹⁹ *Liquid Modernity*, 10.

²²⁰ *Liquid Modernity*, 117.

liberalization, and privatization. In liquid modernity, the social forms that are established in modern times are melting,²²¹ and the “smaller, lighter, faster is seen as good.”²²² In liquid modern conditions, social forms are melting and could not keep their shape for long. Power and politics are separated, and politics stays in the local, whereas power becomes global. The communal ties and the sense of belonging to a community have been lost, and interhuman bonds disappear. Society becomes to be perceived as a network; short-term planning and thinking replace the long-term thinking, and individuals’ successes and failures become individuals’ own duties and responsibilities, without any structural or institutional guarantees.²²³

With the transition to neoliberalism, the previous institutional structure has started to lose its influence in economic, social, and political spheres. The liquid modernity emphasizes this loss of influence of institutional structure in the emerging global order. The territorial boundaries of the nation-state lost its influence due to the liberalization of financial markets, and market powers increase globally. The fixed, grounded capital started to “travels light - with cabin luggage only, which includes no more than a briefcase, a cellular telephone, and a portable computer.”²²⁴ As capital moves in fluidity and labor market expands throughout the Third World, laborers everywhere in the world feel insecure about their job and uncertainty about their future. Besides the free movement of capital, there are further uncertainties derive basically from privatization and individualization.

Neoliberals’ attacks on Keynesian policies were not only about the state’s intervention in the economy. There was strong opposition to the government’s spending on welfare policies such as health, education, and accommodation. Through neoliberal policies, all these services, once provided by the government, are privatized. Privatization of welfare spending put pressure on individuals’ shoulder. Privatization of services followed by privatization of successes and

²²¹ David Lyon, and Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid surveillance: A Conversation* (Cambridge, Malden: Polity, 2013), 6.

²²² *Liquid Surveillance*, 4.

²²³ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty* (Polity Press, 2007), 1-4.

²²⁴ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 58.

failures, which can be characterized as the individualization. In liquid times, Bauman argues, there are two transformations that affect individuals' social position; the first one is the overvaluation of the individual, his/her freedom from the social bonds. The second one, related to the first one, is the increase in the vulnerability of individuals. Without services provided by the state and lack of communal and social bonds, the individual feels vulnerable, and this vulnerability is universal.²²⁵ In this new modernity, "an individualized, privatized version of modernity, with the burden of pattern-weaving and the responsibility for failure falling primarily on the individual's shoulder."²²⁶ Not only failure but also success depends on individual effort. Thus, the structural deficiencies are disregarded; structural problems such as unemployment are considered as individual's failure. As state services cease, the social and collective bonds diminish, and the solidarities are eroded, individuals have to find the solutions to the troubles they face by themselves. In these conditions, individuals feel more insecure and uncertain. This uncertainty, Bauman argues, is an "individualizing force. It divides instead of uniting,"²²⁷ and individuals become more alienated and vulnerable against structural problems, and thus, they cannot defend their rights.²²⁸

Alienated individuals are further made vulnerable via the privatization of public assets and commons. Through these new markets, capital has given "the power of entry into many areas of economic, social, political life that were hitherto closed to it."²²⁹ The free movement of capital into every sphere of life leads to the commodification of everything. The capitalist state is successful and efficient "to the extent that it succeeds in the universalization of the commodity form."²³⁰ And

²²⁵ Zygmunt Bauman, and Mark Haugaard, "Liquid Modernity and Power: A Dialogue with Zygmunt Bauman," *Journal Power* 1.2. (2008): 128.

²²⁶ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 7-8.

²²⁷ *Liquid Modernity*, 148.

²²⁸ Raymond LM Lee, "Bauman, Liquid Modernity and Dilemmas of Development," *Thesis Eleven* 83.1 (2005): 66.

²²⁹ Harvey, *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism* (Oxford University Press, 2014), 235.

this transformation triggers further consumerism. Bauman argues liquid modern societies are based on consumerism and have a “consumer-focused economy.”²³¹ In light capitalism, or liquid modernity, everything has a short lifespan; to increase consumerism, the products do not last long, fashion is always changing, and new product lines are rapidly created.²³² In the liquid modern world, “everyone...is...a nomad of novelty because fluidity creates new needs that are not constrained by space and time.”²³³ Everyone is pushed towards consuming more. In this society, everything “is a matter of choice, except the compulsion to choose - the compulsion which grows into addiction and so is no longer perceived as a compulsion.”²³⁴

To conclude this section, liquid modernity creates and maintains a perpetual present; there are no lasting products, long-term planning, or thinking. Living the day is the utopia of the liquid modern societies. In this perpetual present, uncertainty becomes the basis of domination and social division.²³⁵ In liquid modern societies, domination has been altered. In contrast, in solid modernity, it is “domination-through-order-building,” in contemporary societies, “domination-through-uncertainty is the state of ambient insecurity, anxiety, and fear.”²³⁶ Individuals are left alone to cope with this uncertainty; everything is privatized, from the welfare services to the idea of progress and development. Collective thinking and behavior are diminished; the public realm is lost because “private...colonizes the public space.”²³⁷ And Bauman claims that revitalization of the public space and its power

²³⁰ Claus Offe, *Contradictions of the Welfare State*, ed. John Keane (Hutchinson & Co, 1984), 137.

²³¹ Bauman, and Haugaard, "Liquid Modernity and Power: A Dialogue with Zygmunt Bauman," 125.

²³² Harvey, *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*, 236.

²³³ Lee, "Reinventing Modernity: Reflexive Modernization vs Liquid Modernity vs Multiple Modernities," 361.

²³⁴ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 73.

²³⁵ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 121.

²³⁶ Bauman and Haugaard, “"Liquid Modernity and Power: A Dialogue with Zygmunt Bauman," 112.

is the task of the critical theory today. Although individuals seem to have more freedom, the loss of certainty and security impede the freedom that we have. Because of this loss of security and the loss of the public sphere, Bauman argues, the gap between individual *de jure* and individual *de facto* is widening; without being truly citizen within an autonomous society, individuals cannot be autonomous and cannot gain control over their fate and make autonomous choices as they truly wish. In short, they cannot enjoy true freedom.²³⁸

3.2.2.3. Reflexive Modernity

Reflexive modernity thesis developed in the 1990s by Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens, and Scott Lash. This theory is an attempt to conceptualize the change occurred in the relationship between the structure and agency, in the social system, and the everyday life of the individuals. It can also be considered as an alternative to postmodern deconstruction as “it is a theory...oriented to questions of reconstruction.”²³⁹ All three of these names use the term reflexive modernity for the contemporary conditions. They share basic assumptions, but they differ in terms of the dimensions of the reflexivity and in terms of the proposed solutions to the current social problems. Beck and Giddens insist for the terming the transition not as postmodernity but as second modernity or reflexive modernity, whereas Lash is more akin to framing the changes in the context of postmodernity. To put it differently, Lash argues for the vitality of postmodern culture in understanding and coping with the current problems of modernity.

For all three sociologists, there have been several changes that move society into another one, that move modernity into another one. They identify modernity we experience today as second modernity, and the society is the risk society, whereas the society in the first modernity was industrial society. There are several features

²³⁷ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 39.

²³⁸ *Liquid Modernity*, 39.

²³⁹ Lee, “Reinventing Modernity: Reflexive Modernization vs. Liquid Modernity vs. Multiple Modernities,” 356.

of the first modernity; it is based on nation-states; the idea of controllability, certainty, and security are fundamental for the functioning of society and individuals.²⁴⁰ Fordist production is the basis of the economy; science and scientific knowledge have unquestioned validity and claim to truth, and it is shaped by the principle of either/or and also of order and action.²⁴¹ The first modernity is industrial society; its institutions are organized around the nuclear family, state, and class relations. Beck and Giddens assert the basic principles are maintained in the second modernity. These principles are “rational reason, individual reproduction, the principle of egalitarianism, the principle of functional inclusion, and the demarcation of nature from society.”²⁴² The principles of first modernity are maintained whereas the institutions within it disappear, and sociological concepts that determine the way of thinkings become “zombie categories” that can be defined as “‘living dead’ categories that govern our thinking but are not really able to capture the contemporary milieu.”²⁴³

The strict categorization, the principle of either/or, the ‘institutional boundary-drawing’ of the first modernity, is collapsed; the new order is based on contingency, uncertainty, and risk. Although Beck and Giddens do not give too much credit to the role of postmodern culture in the collapse of these principles, Lash argues, “the inevitability of contingency, of living in the impossibility of mastery of a more complex social reality is largely postmodern.”²⁴⁴ Either/or principle is replaced by the both/and principle; strict categorizations are falsified instead, the plurality of categories, as well as meanings, are justified, so the institutions of first modernity that are based upon these categorizations have started

²⁴⁰ Ulrich Beck, *World Risk Society* (Polity Press, 2000), 1-2.

²⁴¹ Ulrich Beck, and Christoph Lau, "Second Modernity as a Research Agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the ‘Meta-Change’ of Modern Society," *The British Journal of Sociology* 56.4 (2005): 527.

²⁴² Beck, and Lau, "Second Modernity as a Research Agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the ‘Meta-Change’ of Modern Society," 532.

²⁴³ Beck, "Interview with Ulrich Beck," *Journal of Consumer Culture* (2001): 262.

²⁴⁴ Scott Lash, “Reflexive Modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension,” *Theory, Culture & Society* (1993): 3-4.

to be questioned. Second modernity, from this point, can be defined as a “process of modernization itself that calls the institutional order of first modernity into question, steals its clarity, and forces it to make decisions.”²⁴⁵ It is the “modernization of the modernity”²⁴⁶ as well as a “radicalized and universalized” modernity.²⁴⁷

Risk society is a product of second modernity. Although first modernity is organized around the nation-states, the risk society is global, and its principle is not the distribution of goods as in the first modernity; rather, it is the distribution of “bads.” The first modernity is established to eliminate risk and dangers; its fundamental premise is to control, to know in certainty, and to provide security. Radicalized modernity, Beck argues, consumes these foundations and transforms these in such a way that these foundations are collapsed.²⁴⁸ In short, the insurance principle that is the basis of the social organization of the first modernity is no longer valid in the second modernity.²⁴⁹ Instead, we live in a constant threat of risks, visible and invisible, feeling of insecurity, and uncertainty. The society is now a risk society, and the modernity we experience is second or reflexive. Beck defines risk society as “*a systematic way of dealing with hazards and insecurities induced and introduced by modernization itself* [emphasis in original].”²⁵⁰ So modernization itself causes the risks we face today, and now it is the second modernity that tries to cope with the risks created by the first modernity.

²⁴⁵ Beck, and Lau, "Second Modernity as a Research Agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the 'Meta-Change' of Modern Society," 528.

²⁴⁶ Mads P. Sørensen, and Allan Christiansen, *Ulrich Beck: An Introduction to the Theory of Second Modernity and the Risk Society* (Routledge, 2013), 35.

²⁴⁷ Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 3.

²⁴⁸ Beck, and Lau, "Second Modernity as a Research Agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the 'Meta-Change' of Modern Society," 526.

²⁴⁹ Lash, “Reflexive Modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension,” 3.

²⁵⁰ Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (Sage, 1992), 21.

Beck argues since the mid-twentieth century, the institutions of the first modernity have been proved insufficient in coping with the dangers and risks that have emerged, and now these new dangers and risks have created an environment in which modernity is questioned, or more appropriately, the institutions of modernity are questioned whereas its ideals are still valid. There are several reasons for this paradigm shift from modernity to reflexive modernity, and Beck summarizes these as follows; “globalization, individualization, gender revolution, underemployment, and global risks.”²⁵¹ Globalization means interconnectedness and interdependence. Giddens defines globalization “as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.”²⁵² The intensification of these relations is made possible both through modernity and capitalism; both of these forces are inherently globalizing. These forces create “an expansion of global division of labor,” which brings forth global interdependence and also of shifts in the distribution of regions.²⁵³ Globalization reveals the plural paths of modernity and development as well as varieties of modernities; it, in a sense, brings forth the both/and principle, which is a basic principle of second modernity.

Another significant driving force for reflexive modernity is individualization. Beck defines individualization as a structural concept; it is not related to individualism, it is not related to the self, or how to become a person; it is somewhat related to “institutionalized individualism in which rights and entitlements are given to individuals and these rights presuppose employment, which requires education. Both employment and education necessitate mobility, and Beck sums up, “individualization thus implies, paradoxically, a collective lifestyle.”²⁵⁴ Individualization has negative effects, such as the loosening of the

²⁵¹ Beck, *World Risk Society*, 2.

²⁵² Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 64.

²⁵³ Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 75-76.

²⁵⁴ Beck, *World Risk Society*, 9.

traditional bonds and supports, “the loss of the supplementary income,” as well as the redefinition of inequalities in terms of “individualization of social risks.” Beck and Giddens argue, in a social and political environment where inequalities are defined not in terms of class but in terms of psychological dispositions because of the individualization, alliances are no longer established around class relations but rather as temporary groups. Individuals, in such circumstances, are left alone without pre-determinate social roles and givens, and “each person’s biography is...placed in his or her own hands, open and dependent on the decision.”²⁵⁵ Giddens’ emphasis on detraditionalization also has an impact on individualization. The actors and the institutions are ‘detraditionalized’ and ‘disembedded’ from the tradition; these give them more space to act. The agency becomes more autonomous from the structure as well as the role of the structure has diminished. Lash claims, “second modernity reflexivity presumes a move towards immanence that breaks with the dualism of structure and agency.”²⁵⁶ He maintains that individuals in the second modernity are reflexive as opposed to the individual in the first modernity who is reflective and shaped by dualities starting with the object/subject position. In the first modernity, the subject is constituted through the given roles, whereas in the second modernity, the institutions who established such roles are in crises and “the subject has become...‘nomadic’...- the subject must be much more the rule-finder-him-or-herself.”²⁵⁷

Although globalization and individualization have affected the modernity, we experience and have a crucial role in its transformation, what special attention of Beck and Giddens is given to the global environmental risks. They try to find viable and sustainable solutions to these risks. The reflexive modernity implies the modernization of the modernity itself, its self-questioning, and also its efforts to repair the damages that have been done because of the modernization, or more appropriately, because of the industrialization process. Industrial societies have created “irreversible harm.” These harms, although remain invisible, “are based on

²⁵⁵ Beck, *Risk Society*, 135.

²⁵⁶ Lash, "Reflexivity as Non-linearity," *Theory, Culture & Society* (2003): 50.

²⁵⁷ Lash, "Reflexivity as Non-linearity," 53.

causal interpretations, and thus initially only exist in terms of the knowledge about them.”²⁵⁸ Industrial societies are established to eliminate risks and dangers and to eliminate the insecurity. In risk societies, elimination of risk and dangers become harder as well as new risks and dangers - man-made risks and dangers- emerge and have been revealed. But their visibility in the public sphere depends on the scientific measurements. In other words, the discourse of risks is determined through scientific rationality; and Beck asserts that scientific rationality is insufficient;

Science’s rationality claims to be able to investigate objectively the hazardousness of a risk permanently refutes itself...The dimensions of hazard are limited from the very beginning to technical manageability...Incalculable threats add up to an unknown residual risk when becomes the industrial endowment for everyone everywhere.²⁵⁹

According to Beck, the measurement and calculation of risk only by scientific rationality provides a limited perspective. Not only are hazards defined by their manageability, but also it is almost impossible to foresee the risks that we might have. Risks are now everywhere; although wealthier countries have transferred hazardous industries to poor countries and wealthier people can afford security for now, risks will affect everyone eventually. Beck and Giddens argue that risk societies are not class societies. Although class relations or, more accurately, inequalities in class relations are maintained in risk societies, risks have an equalizing force; everyone will be affected by the environmental risks, both the poor and the rich. They argue the power of risk societies resides in this; “risk societies contain themselves a grass-roots developmental dynamics that destroys the boundaries, through which people are forced together in the uniform position of civilization’s self-endangering.”²⁶⁰ Risk has a uniting force because it will affect everyone without demarcating the rich and the poor.

Beck’s proposed solution to the crises we have now and we will face in the future is comprised of joint efforts by the scientific rationality, social rationality, and the civil society. The reflexive modernity requires critical and reflexive thinking for the future crisis due to their invisibility and their acute possibilities. Scientists should

²⁵⁸ Beck, *Risk Society*, 22.

²⁵⁹ *Risk Society*, 29.

²⁶⁰ Beck, *Risk Society*, 47.

recognize risks because the very existence of risk depends on scientific rationality. However, the same scientists, Beck argues, are also responsible for the growth of the risks so that they are incapable of reacting accurately.²⁶¹ Beck emphasizes, “scientific rationality without social rationality remains empty, but social rationality without scientific rationality remains blind.”²⁶² Scientific and social rationality should work together to decrease the hazardous effects and prevent possibilities to become a reality. In a sense, science should be democratized “so that calculations of risks are taken out of the hands of an elite separated from the concrete experiences of everyday life.”²⁶³

The democratization of science or, more generally, scientific rationality has also been a crucial topic in Habermas’ thought. Habermas also emphasizes the reflexivity of the modern era. He argues secular consciousness becomes reflexive²⁶⁴ in the sense that secular rationality begins to face its own limit, or more accurately, “the limits of enlightenment.”²⁶⁵ Market and administrative power are guided by instrumental action, and thus the balance between three vehicles through which social integration is achieved has been endangered. These vehicles are “values, norms, and language.”²⁶⁶ These vehicles are also considered as cultural sources. He maintains that it is “in the interest of the constitutional state to conserve all cultural sources that nurture citizens’ solidarity and their normative awareness.” What he offers is a dialogue between religion, which belongs to the cultural sphere, and secularism; because, for him, secular reason can “learn from religion while at the same time remain agnostic.”²⁶⁷ Similar to Beck, through this dialogue between

²⁶¹ Beck, *Risk Society*, 59.

²⁶² Beck, *Risk Society*, 29.

²⁶³ Jeffrey C. Alexander "Critical Reflections on Reflexive Modernization," *Theory, Culture & Society* 13.4 (1996): 134.

²⁶⁴ Jürgen Habermas, *Between Naturalism and Religion: Philosophical Essays* (Polity, 2008), 6.

²⁶⁵ Habermas, *Between Naturalism and Religion*, 112.

²⁶⁶ Habermas, *Between Naturalism and Religion*, 111.

scientific rationality and social rationality, the participation of citizens in the public debates can be guaranteed. Thus, the drawbacks of “an uncontrolled modernization of society”²⁶⁸ can be overcome, and democratic bonds and solidarity can be achieved.

According to Beck, the dualities that are the basis of the institutions of industrial societies, such as nature/society and either/or cannot respond to the new risks. Beck argues for the “possibility that a new structural logic may be emerging beyond the dualities of first modernity...new must itself be conceived of in terms of the both/and principle.”²⁶⁹ And counter-power to risk society is global civil society. This civil society is, Beck argues, “based on the figure of the political consumer...being able to refuse to make a purchase, at any time and in any place.”²⁷⁰ Beck also asserts the importance of sub-politics, which is a sphere between politics and non-politics, such as techno-economic developments. Sub-politics is like an “‘agenda-setting’ for the government from below.”²⁷¹ Through sub-politics individual action and collective action are connected, and this is where alternative society lies. Beck claims, “potential for structuring society migrates from the political system into a sub-political system of scientific-technological and economic modernization.”²⁷²

For Giddens, there are two types of reflexivity, one is institutional, and the other is individual. Institutional reflexivity means “the circulation of scientific and expert knowledge on the foundations of social action.”²⁷³ With modernity, he

²⁶⁷ Habermas, *Between Naturalism and Religion*, 143.

²⁶⁸ Habermas, *Between Naturalism and Religion*, 107.

²⁶⁹ Beck, and Lau, "Second Modernity as a Research Agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the ‘Meta-Change’ of Modern Society.", p.541.

²⁷⁰ Beck, *Power in the Global Age: A New Global Political Economy* (Polity, 2005), 7.

²⁷¹ Matt Dawson, "Bauman, Beck, Giddens and Our Understanding of Politics in Late Modernity," *Journal of Power* 3.2 (2010): 197.

²⁷² *Risk Society*, 186.

argues, reflexivity becomes the very basis of the system of reproduction, all social practices are examined and reexamined because of the ongoing information flow, and this flow has altered the social practices.²⁷⁴ Now, knowledge does not mean to know in certainty; knowledge does not have a stabilizing effect. We are faced with “ontological insecurity” and the reflexivity in modernity “is mediated through expert systems.”²⁷⁵ The second reflexivity is individual reflexivity, the construction of self reflexively. Giddens puts great importance on self-fulfillment and autonomous agency, and life politics is the emancipatory politics for Giddens. He defines life politics as “radical engagements which seek to further the possibilities of a fulfilling and satisfying life for all, and in respect of which there are no ‘others.’”²⁷⁶ Self is also constructed reflexively; “an individual must find his or her identity amid the strategies and options provided by abstract systems.”²⁷⁷ Abstract systems, for him, are sorts of security providers in the modern world,²⁷⁸ and the individual must have a concern for his/her fulfillment within these systems. Although individuals are freer and autonomous in this modernity, expert systems are necessary for Giddens because, for him, expert systems can impose order in times of crisis. Thus, they are a crucial part of his solution to the growing risks. The role is given the expertise rather than the individual agent. “In the place of mass reflexivity through life politics, governments, and through this, the intellectuals who advise them, become the agent of change.”²⁷⁹ Life politics, although demanded by individuals, is shaped and applied by governments. So, Giddens, in a sense,”

²⁷³ Beck, *World Risk Society*, 111.

²⁷⁴ *The Consequences of Modernity*, 38.

²⁷⁵ Lash, "Reflexive modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension," 8.

²⁷⁶ *The Consequences of Modernity*, 156.

²⁷⁷ Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 124.

²⁷⁸ *The Consequences of Modernity*, 112.

²⁷⁹ Dawson, "Bauman, Beck, Giddens and Our Understanding of Politics in Late Modernity," 194.

‘downgrades’ agents by advocating institutional, governmental action as the primary creator, rather than responding to life politics.”²⁸⁰

Lash has criticized Beck and Giddens and claims they offer a “cognitivist notions of reflexivity,”²⁸¹ whereas he adds the dimension of aesthetic to reflexivity. The cognitivist notion of reflexivity means “subsumption of object by subject, of contingency by order.”²⁸² However, the aesthetic dimension of reflexivity problematizes such subsumption; reflexivity cannot only be understood in terms of rationality (scientific or social); aesthetics constitutes an important part of the self as well as the nature of economic growth as “products are increasingly associated with images.”²⁸³ Beck and Giddens speak of contingency, risk, and reflexivity. However, they still try to find a way to order such contingency and risk, and they offer “radicalized rationality” to cope with such contingencies and risks. Beck and Giddens emphasize the notion of reflexivity, but for Lash, this reflexivity lacks what current conditions necessitate; the aesthetic dimension. He argues, “if reflexivity is self-monitoring, then ‘aesthetic reflexivity’ would be a sort of hermeneutic self-monitoring.”²⁸⁴ The aesthetic dimension clears away the universals and the subject positions because reflexivity “involves a logic of flows.”²⁸⁵ Subjects, Lash argues, is always in movement and involved in this world. The subject is nomadic, so the roles and the rules, roles, and rules are de-normalized. Lash also criticizes Beck for perceiving institutions as social. Instead, Lash argues in second reflexive modernity institutions are “socio-technical,” which means they are social as well as they are technical in the sense that they pose constitutive rules rather than regulatory rules; the rules that “let us play the game,” thus “they may not be recognizable to us as

²⁸⁰ Dawson, "Bauman, Beck, Giddens and Our Understanding of Politics in Late Modernity," 200.

²⁸¹ Lash, “Reflexive Modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension,” 9.

²⁸² Lash, “Reflexive Modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension,” 9.

²⁸³ Lash, “Reflexive Modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension,” 19.

²⁸⁴ Lash, “Reflexive Modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension,” 8.

²⁸⁵ Lash, "Reflexivity as non-linearity," 49.

institutions.”²⁸⁶ Platforms, communications protocols, standards, intellectual property are among these institutions according to Lash, and it is in between the social and technical, we experience the reflexivity of second modernity, and we experience our freedom and “we invent the political.”²⁸⁷

So, the reflexivity of Beck and Giddens fall short to respond to the demands of the new chaos of the second modernity. They propose a regulatory schema for politics, what is involved in politics and non-politics, whereas for Lash, it is the constitutive schema that matters now. The cultural, which is considered as political since the 1960s, is excluded from their perspectives. For instance, Jeffrey Alexander criticizes Beck for ignoring the cultural turn in sociology through which the sphere and the definition of the political have been expanded through the areas that were not political before. Jeffrey Alexander claims sub-parliamentary politics has already played an important role in politics, but Beck ignores these.²⁸⁸ Although Beck argues for a radical change that “poses a challenge to Enlightenment-based modernity and opens up a space in which people choose new and unexpected forms of the social and the political,”²⁸⁹ he still tries to define the boundaries of these new and unexpected forms of the social and the political. Beck and Giddens fail to recognize conditions such as contingency, uncertainty, and insecurity are not modern, rather postmodern, and any boundary-drawing may end up with exclusion.

Early twentieth-century dystopias reflect the solid, first modernity’s ideas and institutions. The promise of order, security, and predictability are the basis of the regimes, and the regimes are generally totalitarian. These dystopias provide a totalizing universe and a regime of truth and objectivity. These dystopias project a strong state, rapid industrialization, and effective use of the mechanisms of control and surveillance. The boundaries are strict in these dystopias; you’re either a friend or an enemy. Contemporary dystopias, together with contemporary utopias, on the

²⁸⁶ Lash, "Reflexivity as non-linearity," 54.

²⁸⁷ Lash, "Reflexivity as non-linearity," 54.

²⁸⁸ "Critical Reflections on Reflexive Modernization," 135.

²⁸⁹ Beck, and Christoph Lau, "Second Modernity as a Research Agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the 'Meta-Change' of Modern Society," 525.

other hand, propose “reflexivity and provisionality.”²⁹⁰ Meta-narratives of the first modernity, totality, universality, order, and security have been lost. There is a clash between narrative or storytelling and scientific knowledge in these dystopias. Storytelling is an important component of Atwood’s dystopias; it can be argued that both *The Handmaid’s Tale* and *MaddAddam* trilogy are postmodern literary texts. But *The Handmaid’s Tale* deals with the problems of first, solid modernity and is stuck in the transition period. In contrast, *MaddAddam* trilogy reveals the issues of the second, liquid modernity as well as the risk society. These issues are increasing contingency, insecurity, and uncertainty. These issues have become central concerns for individual lives. Furthermore, in contemporary dystopias, including *MaddAddam* trilogy, the depicted societies are in global dangers; there are global environmental threats and threat of extinction not only of natural resources but also of living species. And there has been a tendency in developing awareness to such issues so one can speak of the emergence of reflexivity, a reflexive questioning towards insecurity, global environmental problems and human-made damages and hazards. Next section, these issues will be analyzed in relation to the theories of modernity.

3.2.3. Reflections of the Theories of Modernity in *MaddAddam* Trilogy

Bauman, in an interview with Jacobsen and Tester, states that the relationship between sociology and literature is a kind of a family relation; they are like siblings, their relationship is a “mixture of rivalry and mutual support,” and they share the same goal, which is “piercing the curtain.”²⁹¹ Atwood’s trilogy shares the same goal, “piercing the curtain” to look out from the window to see what is there, to analyze what is seen, and at the end, to show that there can be different windows as well as a variety of ways to see and to experience what is there. Sociology and literature, especially utopian and dystopian genres within the literature, analyze the dynamics of society and the individuals within it. These dynamics started to be

²⁹⁰ Levitas, *Utopia as a Method*, 111.

²⁹¹ Michael Hviid Jacobsen and Keith Tester, “Sociology, Nostalgia, Utopia and Mortality: A Conversation with Zygmunt Bauman,” *European Journal of Social Theory* 10.2 (2007): 315.

global with the spread of neoliberal policies throughout the world. At the same time, individuals are mostly affected by these dynamics. As Beck states, the functions of the institutions of the first modernity (the nation-state, the welfare-state, the nuclear family, the class) “are now transferred outwards and inwards: outwards to global or international organizations; inwards to the individual.”²⁹² And from this perspective, the projection of modernity in *MaddAddam* trilogy will be analyzed through two levels of inquiries; on the macro level in parallel with the theses of modernities; the focus will be on the projections of global changes and their consequences and, on the micro-level, the focus will be on individuals and their positions vis-a-vis the transformations and changes. The themes will be discussed in this section are the loss of the nation-state, privatization, corporatization, global risk society, commodification and consumer culture, and individualization

3.2.3.1. Global World is “Vast Uncontrolled Experiment”

MaddAddam trilogy contains many concerns regarding our future, concerns about environmental problems, political inactivity, economic crises, about vulnerability, and lack of belief in finding an alternative to the current system. Many contemporary theories share these concerns; they emphasize the destructive effects of capitalism with regard to the natural and cultural/political environment, the inability to act within the dilemma of freedom and domination, the vulnerability and insecurity that individuals experienced. Contemporary theories put great importance on the changes that emerged in the late 1970s and accelerated in 1990 that have altered establishments and institutions. The postmodernity thesis and the theses of liquid modernity and second or reflexive modernity are not different. A slight difference can be observed in the postmodernity thesis because it is generally confined within the cultural realm as Lash claims.²⁹³ However, the loss of strict demarcation between culture and politics, culture, and economics or between the culture and nature makes it difficult to define the boundaries of the cultural realm

²⁹² "Beyond Class and Nation: Reframing Social Inequalities in a Globalizing World," *The British Journal of Sociology* 58.4 (2007): 682.

²⁹³ *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 4.

and thus postmodernism's place; culture becomes an economic sector as well as it becomes political.²⁹⁴ Postmodernity deals more with problematizing meta-narrative of modernity rather than its organizations and institutions but loosening the power of the meta-narratives have altered the structure and the organizations of the institutions of the modernity and thus modernity itself. The spread of capitalist logic in all spheres of life paves the way for the "domination of instrumental rationality or the determining role of the economy."²⁹⁵ It results in an ever-growing effect of the market on the everyday life of individuals and their choices, the spread of consumerism and commodification. Familial and social bonds have lost their functions as such they no longer provide additional security or promote solidarity. Uncertainty and insecurity become a general attitude towards life and towards the future. Structural deficiencies are disregarded in such conditions, and individuals have to take the responsibility of their lives, of their success, as well as of their failures. So, it is plausible to start with organization of society projected in *MaddAddam* trilogy and the consequences of this organization with respect to the perspectives of modernity.

3.2.3.1.1. The Loss of Nation-State, Privatization, and Corporatization in *MaddAddam Trilogy*

As it is stated above, there has been a paradigm shift in *MaddAddam* trilogy, a shift from the totalitarian regime of a nation-state to technology-based, corporate rule of the society. This rule is also a totalitarian one but with other means. The trilogy is often described as an environmental dystopia that focuses on ecological collapses. However, to define this as only environmental is to limit its scope. It can be described best as "traditional dystopian vision is married to the environmental dystopian vision: collapsing global environment is exploited by dominant corporations through biopolitical controls."²⁹⁶ Atwood portrays a society of

²⁹⁴ *Sociology of Postmodernism*, 40.

²⁹⁵ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 4.

corporatism, consumerism, commodification resulted with environmental catastrophes. It is, in a sense, the big corporations replace the “power-seeking bureaucrats.”²⁹⁷ This shift reflects a general tendency in the dystopian genre; “in contemporary visions in general, then, Big Brother has often replaced by Big Business,”²⁹⁸ and Atwood reflects the same vision. The characteristics of the universalization of capitalist logic, “the logic of commodification, accumulation, and the profit maximization penetrating every aspect of our life,”²⁹⁹ are the building blocks of the trilogy together with the science and technology at their services. The poverty in the whole world and the environmental crises such as the loss of the many animal species, the rise in the sea-level, climate change are the basic themes that are used to describe the dystopic society in *MaddAddam*. The dystopic world portrayed in *MaddAddam* is an advanced capitalist society in which the state’s services are privatized, violence is widespread, nature is destroyed, and everything is objectified and commodified. Although the world portrayed after the ‘Waterless Flood’ that has swept most of the human race can also be considered as dystopic, Atwood claims the opposite “what survives after the cataclysmic event is not dystopia.”³⁰⁰ So dystopia portrayed in the trilogy is just the late capitalist society; what comes after may be identified rather as a “utopian impulse.”³⁰¹

The most salient feature of the trilogy is that there is no reference to the state. The state is completely out of the picture. Rather than the state, the corporations

²⁹⁶ Patricia Stapleton, “‘The People in the Chaos Cannot Learn’: Dystopian Vision in Atwood’s MADDADDAM Trilogy,” in *The Age of Dystopian: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*, ed. Louisa MacKay Demerjian (Cambridge Scholar Publishing, 2016), 25-26.

²⁹⁷ Chris Berg, "'Goddamn You All to Hell!': The Revealing Politics of Dystopian Movies," *Institute of Public Affairs Review: A Quarterly Review of Politics and Public Affairs*, The 60.1 (2008): 39.

²⁹⁸ Anna Bedford, "Survival in the Post-Apocalypse: Ecofeminism in MaddAddam," in *Margaret Atwood’s Apocalypses*, ed. Karma Waltonen (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), 75.

²⁹⁹ Ellen Meiksins Wood, "Modernity, Postmodernity or Capitalism?," 551.

³⁰⁰ *In Other Worlds*, 93.

³⁰¹ Anna Lindhé, "Restoring the Divine Within: The Inner Apocalypse in Margaret Atwood’s The Year of the Flood," in *Margaret Atwood’s Apocalypses*, 43.

exist, and the corporations provide the basic state services such as education, health, and security; so, welfare services are privatized. The state has lost its appearance as well as its functions in these novels. Even the “monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force” is disposed by the security apparatuses of the corporations; by CorpSeCorp, which started as a private security firm but soon “taken over when the local police services collapse for lack of funding.”³⁰² So, CorpSeCorps is the legitimate security forces in the trilogy. It is responsible for the public security, has the power to outlaw weapons, and it has the power to close local businesses. The CorpSeCorps scrutinize all legal or illegal actions running in Pleeblands or Compounds. These illegal actions are either allowed by CorpSeCorps due to common interests or prevented by it due to the clash of interests.

Life is divided into two; life in the Pleeblands and life in Compounds; CorpSeCorps is responsible for the public security in both places. In the Pleeblands, the rules are flexible and bendable, and almost anarchy exists, and CorpSeCorps is recognized as “better than total anarchy.”³⁰³ The Compounds are established for the settlement of the scientists and their families and designated to keep the insiders safe. The idea for such an establishment is similar to those of castles, Jimmy’s father told to Jimmy; “castle was keeping you and your buddies nice and safe inside, and for keeping everybody else outside.”³⁰⁴ In that sense, the life in the Compounds presents utopia, because it portrays a society “surrounded by a Wall designed to keep others out.”³⁰⁵ Cities are recognized as the first utopia, Lewis Mumford suggests,³⁰⁶ but in the trilogy, the relation between the city and the utopia is diverted; city life represents dystopia, whereas compound life presents an utopian ideal. As Bauman argues in contemporary societies, “cities are swiftly turning from shelters

³⁰² Atwood, *The Year of the Flood*, 30.

³⁰³ *The Year of the Flood*, 41.

³⁰⁴ *Oryx and Crake*, 32.

³⁰⁵ Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 8.

³⁰⁶ "Utopia, "the City and the Machine." *Daedalus* (1965): 271.

against danger's principal source."³⁰⁷ So demonstrating the city as a dystopia is in parallel with the contemporary representation of the city in social theory. The security and surveillance within the Compounds are tight, but the use of violence or the proportion of the resort to violence is less than the Pleeblands. Pleeblands are "no-go zones"; there is an overabundance of violence, diseases, and people in the Pleeblands are more disposable in comparison to the people in the Compounds. The scientists are valuable, but this does not mean that they are not disposable; they are too. CorpSeCorps is responsible for disposing of what should be disposed of in both places.

Besides security, education is also privatized. The most prestigious schools are within the Compounds; in the Pleeblands, the education level is highly low, and there is no well-known university in the Pleeblands. Education is mostly focused on life sciences, especially biomedicine, biotech, and bioengineering, and this education serves the industry; science is not for social development and individual well-being; it is for capitalism and maximization of profit. There is only Martha Graham Academy that provides education in art. Art is no longer valuable in comparison to science. For instance, after finishing Martha Graham Academy, Jimmy starts to work at a company called AnooYoo, and his job is basically to sell things that people do not need originally, to manipulate their wishes "into buying what in fact cannot be bought."³⁰⁸ All education becomes pragmatic and means for further development of capitalism. In capitalist states, education does not necessarily have "the purpose of providing knowledge and abilities to young people."³⁰⁹ Rather, it is an "instrumental variable" through which individual labor power can be transformed into a commodity on the market. Trilogy demonstrates this capitalist logic through which "universalization of the commodity form"³¹⁰

³⁰⁷ *Liquid Times*, 72.

³⁰⁸ Shannon Hengen, "Moral/Environmental Debt in Payback and Oryx and Crake," in *Margaret Atwood: The Robber Bride, The Blind Assassin, Oryx and Crake*, ed. J. Brooks Bouson (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2010), 137.

³⁰⁹ Claus Offe, *Contradictions of Welfare States*, 137.

³¹⁰ Offe, *Contradictions of Welfare States*, 138.

becomes the basic criteria for success but with a slight difference. Rather than presenting an enabling state for further accumulation of capital, trilogy demonstrates a loss of the nation-state. Corporations open their own centers of education for their future researches; they put ‘individuals to use their labor power as commodities on the labor market.’³¹¹ Researches funded by the Corporations, which means the subject of these researches chosen by the Compounds in accordance with their interests; basically, these researches and projects have to “have a profitable commercial application.”³¹² The science has a double meaning; on the side of the corporate, it serves the industry and profit maximization; on the side of the scientists, it is for “science for science’s sake.”³¹³ Those scientists who have ethical concerns regarding researches who believe in science’s power for making life better for all human beings and who try to take responsibility for their actions are either runaways or they are murdered, or they choose to join resistance movements.

Health services and technologies may be the most crucial topic for the trilogy. Health services are also privatized. Unless one has insurance, medical treatment is not possible. Thus, the jobs that provide health benefits and insurances are found attractive in such an insecure world even though they may not be the first choice for individuals.³¹⁴ The medical industry is one of the most developed sectors in the trilogy; the corporates are biomedicine or biotech corporates, and thus many improvements regarding health are given in detail. The most powerful corporations are bodily oriented bio-techs and these companies “control the population by exploiting human vanity and fear of death with genetically-engineered products.”³¹⁵ New species are produced for human organs or tissues to grow in their bodies; genetically engineered babies are born. All kinds of aesthetic treatments are

³¹¹ Offe, *Contradictions of Welfare States*, 137.

³¹² *MaddAddam*, 292.

³¹³ Sławomir Kuźnicki. *Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Fiction: Fire is Being Eaten*, 84.

³¹⁴ *The Year of the Flood*, 352.

³¹⁵ Patricia Stapleton, “‘The People in the Chaos Cannot Learn’: Dystopian Vision in Atwood’s MADDADDAM Trilogy,” 24.

possible. In the Pleeblands, most people cannot afford treatment since health services are privatized; only rich people can afford medical treatment. The people in the Pleeblands become part of an experiment without knowing it. The new drugs are tested on them, and they become “guinea pigs.”³¹⁶ These people cannot afford to be treated otherwise. But at the same time, the drug industry is growing and strengthening. Atwood stresses the importance and overdevelopment of the drug industry in late capitalist society. People are made to believe that “there is precious little that cannot be ‘cured’ by taking a pill,”³¹⁷ so that the drug industry would be more powerful by its innovations. Although medicine is highly developed, and many illnesses can be prevented through new technologies, in the trilogy, there is always a danger of new illnesses and diseases, and ways to make money from the illness. The drug industry, for further accumulation of capital, creates new illnesses and the cures at the same time; “they put the hostile bioforms into their vitamin pills...naturally they develop the antidotes at the same time as they’re customizing the bugs, but they hold these in reserve, they practice the economics of scarcity, so they’re guaranteed high profits.”³¹⁸ As Harvey points out, the drug industry necessitates “need creation rather than need satisfaction,”³¹⁹ and trilogy perfectly exemplifies this need creation.

Since the late 1970s, many of the public services are privatized as part of the neoliberal transformation. Atwood projects these transformations starting with welfare services such as education and health. Private education and private health services are common all around the world, and this is neither surprising nor dystopic for the readers. In the trilogy, privatization has been completed, and it is the rule now. Trilogy demonstrates a future in which the state has retreated from all duties and services, which seems like a very near future. The power of the dystopia derives, particularly from this point; dystopia makes the reader take some steps forward from

³¹⁶ *The Year of the Flood*, 125.

³¹⁷ Earl Ingersoll, "Survival in Margaret Atwood's Novel Oryx and Crake," in *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Margaret Atwood*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2009), 118.

³¹⁸ *Oryx and Crake*, 248.

³¹⁹ *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*, 248.

where she is and observe the developments as well as consequences of such developments. In this way, possible scenarios for the future can be envisioned. “Dystopias open a very thin intervening space between a future announced as inescapable and, because of this very inevitability, an anterior present still opened to changes. The reader is expected to behave as the recipient of an alarm message.”³²⁰ Privatization has been experienced all around the world, and it is a fact that it is becoming more and more difficult to afford some basic services. Nevertheless, states do not vanish altogether yet. What is striking may be the disappearance of states for good as well as the privatization of all security forces. The state has a monopoly on the legitimate use of force, as Weber puts it. Privatization of the security forces can be considered as a strike to the individual rights and freedoms. CorpSeCorp is first a private security firm and then take control of the local police forces due to the lack of funding for police forces.³²¹ It is first responsible for the protection of the interests of the corporations. The interests of the corporations are always put ahead the social as well as individual interests. The crimes are against the corporations, and the criminals are the enemies of the corporations. In such a condition, there is no justice; there is only the protection of the interests of the corporations. When the justice system is collapsed, individual rights and freedoms are nullified.

Contemporary social and political theories severely discuss the loss of the nation-state. The power of the nation-state is diminishing and what is taking place “is creative self-destruction of the nation-state-dominated legitimate world order.”³²² Although *MaddAddam* trilogy does not totally project the global world order, the videos from the third world, the story of Oryx prove that the conditions are not different in other places. There is no state with its basic functions, there is unemployment and poverty such that little children are sold, and it is not a singular practice as it is interpreted as custom.³²³ In this new global order, power “once

³²⁰Frédéric Claisse, and Pierre Delvenne, "Building on Anticipation: Dystopia as Empowerment," *Current Sociology* 63.2 (2015): 161.

³²¹ *The Year of the Flood*, 30.

³²² Beck, *Power in the Global Age*, xv.

locked in a tight embrace with state politics, is now evaporating into the global.”³²⁴ Bauman argues power and politics are separated, and power becomes global, whereas politics remains local, and the global world is politically uncontrolled. In *Trilogy*, there is no reference to politics. The demonstrations and resistances against giant corporations occur. Still, protests and public actions become pointless because “any kind of public action involving crowds and sign-waving and then storefront smashing would be shot off at the knees.”³²⁵ The politics and the political disappear as well as the states. The services that state previously performed are transferred to the global powers, and those services “become a playground for the notoriously capricious and inherently unpredictable market forces and/or are left to the private initiative and care of individuals.”³²⁶ In this world, not only power but also problems are global.

3.2.3.1.2. "It's Game Over Forever:" Risk Society in *MaddAddam* Trilogy

Global problems constitute a crucial issue in *MaddAddam* trilogy, and these problems are environmental problems, extinction of animals and plants, opening the gap between rich and poor, global unemployment, and insecurity. These global problems accelerated with the spread of capitalism all around the world. Capitalism has a globalizing force not only in terms of accumulation but also in terms of its destructive effects. Giddens claims that the globalizing potential of capitalism derives from its being an economic order rather than a political order; he maintains “it has been able to penetrate far-flung areas of the world which the states of its origin could not have brought wholly under their political sway.”³²⁷ There exist a

³²³ *Oryx and Crake*, 138.

³²⁴ Lyon, and Bauman, *Liquid surveillance: A conversation*, 12.

³²⁵ *MaddAddam*, 295.

³²⁶ *Liquid Times*, 2.

³²⁷ Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*. p. 69.

global market and global capitalism, but there are no global governments to remedy the problems of global capitalism.

The absence of a global government obstructs the control of global power, and the global market constitutes a form of “organized irresponsibility.” There is no check and balance system that can control the responsibility of global market forces. Beck argues that the global market is “an institutional form so impersonal as to have no responsibilities, even to itself.”³²⁸ *MaddAddam* trilogy represents a perfect example of such irresponsibility of the global market forces. The market seeks to maximize its profit, and in such circumstances, profit becomes “the highest’ good” regardless of any harm to humans, animals, and the environment.”³²⁹ In this respect, the only responsibility of the market is to maximize the profit and to use every means to achieve this sole purpose. Although there is no global government and no effective politics, growing global problems persist, and no one takes responsibility for the ongoing degradation of the environment and of human beings. In the trilogy, Gardeners, MaddAddamites, and Crake blame humanity for all these degradations.

Crake strongly posits

They cannot understand what they are doing to the sea and the sky and the plants and the animals. They cannot understand that they are killing them, and that they will end by killing themselves. And there are so many of them, and each of them is doing part of the killing, whether they know it or not. And when you tell them to stop, they don’t hear you.³³⁰

The reasons why the trilogy is generally classified as the environmental dystopia derives from two features of the trilogy; first, the trilogy focuses mainly on environmental degradation created by humans, and the second, those who survive after Waterless Flood are the Crakers and humans who are respectful to the environment and against the exploitation of the natural resources as well as living species. Throughout the books, the emphasis is on how humans are the source of environmental deterioration. Crake’s virus that annihilated most of the human race proves this point. The environmental problem, from Crake’s perspective, would

³²⁸ *Risk Society*, p. 6.

³²⁹ Shannon Hengen, "Moral/Environmental Debt in Payback and Oryx and Crake," 137.

³³⁰ *MaddAddam*, 353-354.

only be solved through the elimination of the human race.³³¹ The elimination of the human race would result in the annihilation of civilization. Crake tries to destroy the civilization that we have built; he knows that it cannot be rebuilt because all the natural resources are exploited. If there were no metal, there would be “no iron age, no bronze age, no age of steel, and all the rest of it.”³³² Crake believes that “all it takes...is the elimination of one generation. One generation of anything...break the link in time between one generation and the next, and it’s game over forever...”³³³ It is game over for the human civilization.

The exploitation of natural resources and raw materials, gas emissions, radioactive emissions and their impacts on climate and other irrevocable mistakes that humans have made constitute the basis of the theories of reflexivity or second modernity. These irrevocable damages that have been done to the world, Beck’s argument follows, are the result of the industrial society. He claims the hazards in pre-modern and modern times are different from each other; in pre-modern times, hazards are “non-man-made,” and in classical industrial societies, these hazards are ‘man-made risks,’ and in a risk society, these are replaced by the “man-made disasters.”³³⁴ The risks that are faced today are a global risk, and they are not confined to a territory; they “endanger all forms of life on this planet.”³³⁵ Industrial societies have created enormous hazards, and these hazards were unpredictable and unknown consequences of the industrialization process. Now in the era of risk society, these unknown consequences of the process are recognized as well as revealed; and the risk society aims at the elimination of these consequences to avoid catastrophes because risk society is “a catastrophic society. In it, the exceptional

³³¹Stephen Dunning, "Margaret Atwood's Oryx and Crake: The Terror of the Therapeutic," 95.

³³² *Oryx and Crake*, 261.

³³³ *Oryx and Crake*, 261-262.

³³⁴ Mads P. Sørensen, and Allan Christiansen, *Ulrich Beck: An Introduction to the Theory of Second Modernity and the Risk Society*, 15.

³³⁵ Beck, *Risk society*, 22.

condition threatens to become the norm.”³³⁶ Through analysis of capitalism’s relation to nature, the triggering force behind the risk society can be clarified.

In the industrialization process, nature is considered as something to be dominated and exploited for the sake of further growth and to produce commodity values. The growth of capital accumulation directly depends on the institutions of the first modernity, but its expansion also necessitates the exploitation of nature.³³⁷ Nature, for capitalism, is nothing but “a vast store of potential use values.”³³⁸ First modernity, as it is evaluated before, is based on dualities; one of the essential dualities that modernity is based on is between society and nature. Society and nature were considered as “mutually exclusive.”³³⁹ At the end of the twentieth century, the demarcation of nature from society has been blurred; nature is now recognized as part of the society, as part of the culture. It becomes a historical product, and the deterioration of nature has a vital influence on social and political settings. Beck states, “because it is a nature circulating and utilized within the system, nature has become political.³⁴⁰ The mastery over nature, nature’s irrevocable exploitation, and, more importantly, the knowledge of the dangers of these are the characteristics of a risk society. As Beck firmly puts it, societies “can no longer ignore the dangers...all the other kinds of risks...we have...entered the risk society.”³⁴¹

Risk society is a global society; the risk is global not only in terms of its intensity but also everyone is affected by the increasing contingency and insecurity

³³⁶ Beck, *Risk Society*, 22.

³³⁷ Craig Calhoun, "What Threatens Capitalism Now?," *Does Capitalism Have a Future* (Oxford University Press, 2013), 146.

³³⁸ Harvey, *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*, 250.

³³⁹ Beck, *World Risk Society*, 4.

³⁴⁰ *Risk Society*, 82.

³⁴¹ Sørensen, and Christiansen, *Ulrich Beck: An Introduction to the Theory of Second Modernity and the Risk Society*, 10.

(although not equally).³⁴² In *MaddAddam* trilogy, human-made hazards are the focal points; everyone believes that humans will toll the death knell; as Gardener's leader stresses, "any further cursing of the ground would be done not by God but by the man himself."³⁴³ Natural resources and raw materials are exploited; in conditions of "dwindling resources,"³⁴⁴ there is overpopulation and not enough resources. Many animal species extinct or at least endangered; life in the Pleeblands is so open to hazards, human-made hazards, viruses, and germs that people who live in the Compounds use protections for going to Pleeblands. In their travel to Pleeblands, Crake and Jimmy use nose cones to protect themselves against the polluted air because, in the Pleeblands, there is "more junk blowing in the wind, fewer whirlpool purifying towers dotted around." Also, Crake gives an injection to Jimmy to protect him against "a lot of guck and contagious plasm."³⁴⁵

The Compound people, the scientists, are protected against the germs, viruses, and diseases, but life in the compounds has its own dangers. As long as the scientists abide by the rules of the corporations and keep doing corporations' researches, they are relatively safe. Still, if scientists question the content of the researches they have made, then their lives are in danger. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, nobody is immune to hazards. But of course, not everyone is affected equally. The rich and the poor affected differently. As Beck argues, "wealth accumulates at the top, risks at the bottom."³⁴⁶ The trilogy is set in the USA, and people are divided according to their work. There are corporate people, and there are scientists, and then the rest. The life for the rest is never secure; they don't have secure jobs, they don't mostly have health insurance, and they are open to the experiments of the Corporations, and they mostly try to survive. The scientists are among the wealthier;

³⁴² Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 123.

³⁴³ *The Year of the Flood*, 109.

³⁴⁴ *Oryx and Crake*, 139.

³⁴⁵ *Oryx and Crake*, 338.

³⁴⁶ *Risk Society*, 35.

their lives are more secure as long as they pursue the interests of the corporations. The individual life of the compound people may be secure in the short run, but in the long run, they would be affected by the global risks. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, the news is always about the plagues being spread, famines, floods, wars in the third world, and the emergence of new germs.³⁴⁷ Even the compound people cannot be protected in such circumstances; the virus spread through BlyssPlusPill is the evidence for this.

In the trilogy, examples are given from the third world countries, which are provided through the Crake's and Jimmy's website surfs. The violence is presented online on these websites. For instance, in "hedsoff.com,"³⁴⁸ public executions in China are displayed; "shortcircuit.com, brainfrizz.com, and deathrowlice.com" show lethal injections.³⁴⁹ There are also porn sites that "filmed while doing things they'd be put in jail for back in their home countries."³⁵⁰ Born and live in Compounds, Jimmy believes that these videos are filmed in "the locations were supposed to be countries where life was cheap, and kids were plentiful, and where you could buy anything you wanted."³⁵¹ But he is not aware of the fact that life in the Pleeblands is no different from these locations. The personal, subjective experiences are different in the short run; the ability to cope with insecurity and contingency is low among the poor, whereas wealthier people can afford "the safety and freedom from the risk."³⁵² In the short run, the poor and the rich would have different means to cope with these problems, or more accurately, the poor experience economic insecurity together with other insecurities; possess no means to cope with economic insecurity, whereas the rich can overcome the risks

³⁴⁷ *Oryx and Crake*, 298.

³⁴⁸ *Oryx and Crake*, 94.

³⁴⁹ *Oryx and Crake*, 95.

³⁵⁰ *Oryx and Crake*, 103.

³⁵¹ *Oryx and Crake*, 103.

³⁵² Beck, *Risk Society*, 35.

endangered by economic security. In the long run, the risk is not experienced subjectively and “displays and equalizing effect within their scope and among those affected by them.” In the long run, “we are all in the same boat.”³⁵³ Global risks have an equalizing effect, but risks derive from economic insecurity do not have such an effect. Beck asserts that one of the conditions that lead to risk society is the satisfaction of material wants as well as economic security. Levitas rightly posits that this condition has not been met, not for all people equally; thus, Beck fails to perceive that “the sense of insecurity under these conditions derives from economic insecurity as well as from environmental hazards.”³⁵⁴ *MaddAddam* trilogy displays not only global human-made risks but also risks derive from economic insecurity, and the impacts of economic insecurity for individuals will be discussed in the next section.

The most crucial and relevant argument of Beck and Giddens in reflexive modernization theory is the role of the science and scientific rationality in the risk society. Beck and Giddens argue, technoscientific rationality fails in coping with the growing risks and threats.³⁵⁵ Moreover, they suggest that not only science fails to react to growing risks, but also they are responsible for the growth of the risks. Beck asserts, “the sciences become the legitimating patrons of global industrial pollution and contamination of air, water, foodstuffs, etc., as well as the related generalized sickness and death of plants, animals, and people.”³⁵⁶ As the purpose of technoscientific rationality is utility, “the hazards connected with it are considered only later and often not at all.”³⁵⁷ Scientific knowledge becomes a principal force of production, and knowledge becomes a commodity,³⁵⁸ and scientific knowledge is

³⁵³ Ruth Levitas, "Discourses of Risk and Utopia," in *The Risk Society and Beyond: Critical Issues for Social Theory*, ed. Barbara Adam, et.al. (Sage, 2000), 208.

³⁵⁴ Levitas, "Discourses of Risk and Utopia," 205.

³⁵⁵ Beck, *Risk Society*, 59.

³⁵⁶ *Risk Society*, 59.

³⁵⁷ *Risk Society*, 60.

demonopolized.³⁵⁹ In such circumstances, the trust in scientific rationality in the definition and calculation of risks is undermined, and the loss of trust in scientific rationality made reflexive modernization as well as reflexive scientification possible. With reflexive modernity, modernity becomes self-questioning and aware of its destructive effects whether scientific rationality declares it or not, and with reflexive scientification, there emerges an opportunity “to emancipate social practice from science through science.”³⁶⁰ That is where Beck and Giddens put forward the idea of a collaboration between social and scientific rationality. They claim, there is a gap between social and scientific rationality “in dealing with the hazardous potential of civilization,” and the gap can be closed through a combination of social and scientific rationality.

In *MaddAddam* trilogy, one can observe the economic rationality merged with scientific rationality, whereas there is a lack of social rationality. In the trilogy, science serves the industry; its inventions accelerated consumerism and make technoscientific totalitarian rule possible.³⁶¹ There is no reference to the sources of social rationality, such as arts, philosophy, and social sciences. Martha Graham Academy is an Art Academy, but what they offer mostly serves the industry rather than cultivating philosophical and social rationality; the Academy “had utilitarian aims.”³⁶² In a conversation with Crake, Jimmy, as a man of words, explains the art’s special position in humans’ lives. He says, “when any civilization is dust and ashes...art is all that’s leftover—images, words, music. Imaginative structures. Meaning- human meaning, that is - is defined by them. You have to admit that.”³⁶³ Crake responds to this argument by saying art, for an artist, is “an empty

³⁵⁸ Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, 5.

³⁵⁹ *Risk Society*, 156.

³⁶⁰ *Risk Society*, 157.

³⁶¹ Sławomir Kuźnicki, *Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Fiction: Fire is Being Eaten*, 85.

³⁶² *Oryx and Crake*, 220.

³⁶³ *Oryx and Crake*, 197.

drainpipe...a stab at getting laid.”³⁶⁴ Art is considered as useless for Crake as well as for many scientists. Jimmy, although born and living in the Compounds, is different from the Compound people, and also from the scientists. He “appreciated the humanizing role of art and culture.”³⁶⁵ Even after the Waterless Flood, he holds on to the words. Jimmy is presented as an “ethical monitor”³⁶⁶ in the novels, and words are his ways of describing the world and “keep him in touch with his humanity.”³⁶⁷ For other Compound people, science, not the words, is the way of describing the world.

The science and technology are not neutral domains as it is discussed in the previous section, and *MaddAddam* trilogy presents a perfect example for this. Technology can be used for the betterment of human lives and conditions, but it can also degrade the value of humans and their lives. In the trilogy, Atwood warns us about the “growing, and potentially lethal power of scientists to manipulate and alter human biology.”³⁶⁸ The scientists portrayed in the trilogy stimulate the binary thinking of the modernity, between reason and emotion. They are portrayed as they lack emotions, especially empathy; thus, they lack social rationality and ethical values. Most of the scientists do not calculate the consequences of their actions. They do not question their actions in terms of social rationality, whether it is ethical or unethical, moral or immoral. Their discoveries and their experiments are/will be dangerous such as the creation of diseases and germs, the creation of new species. As Crake strongly suggests, “the whole world is now one vast uncontrolled experiment...and the doctrine of unintended consequences is in full spate.”³⁶⁹ The

³⁶⁴ *Oryx and Crake*, 198.

³⁶⁵ Mark Bosco, “The Apocalyptic Imagination in Oryx and Crake,” in *Margaret Atwood: The Robber Bride, The Blind Assassin, Oryx and Crake*, 162.

³⁶⁶ Heidi Slettedahl Macpherson, *The Cambridge Introduction to Margaret Atwood* (Cambridge University Press, 2010), 81.

³⁶⁷ J. Brooks Bouson, “‘It’s Game Over Forever’: Atwood’s Satiric Vision of a Bioengineered Posthuman Future in Oryx and Crake,” *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 39.3 (2004): 152.

³⁶⁸ Bouson, “‘It’s Game Over Forever’: Atwood’s Satiric Vision of a Bioengineered Posthuman Future in Oryx and Crake,” 151.

consequences would be devastating not only for the environment because of its unlimited exploitation but also for living species.

In *MaddAddam* trilogy, two groups try to overcome the hazardous effects of the late capitalist societies, its scientific rationality, and economic rationality; these are known as the Gardeners and the MaddAddamites. The Gardeners are

a green religious founded by Adam One. Its leaders, the Adams and the Eves, teach the convergence of Nature and Scripture, the love of all creatures, the dangers of technology, the wickedness of the Corps, the avoidance of violence, and the tending of vegetables and bees on pleebland slum rooftops.³⁷⁰

Gardeners propose a mixture of Christianity and science. They resist the corporate lives; they are composed of the scientists who previously worked for the corporations or still work for the corporations. The vision of the Gardeners is a kind of “reconciliation between spirituality and science.”³⁷¹ Gardeners are environmentalists; they believe in the sacredness of living species of all kinds and nature. They are passivists; they choose not to engage in violence of any kind towards anyone. They believe in the Waterless Flood through which the planet earth would be cleaned up from all the destructive forces, and only the Gardeners would be alive after because they are respectful to nature and what God has given them. The other group who was once a member of the Gardeners and then split from them is MaddAddamites. MaddAddamites is also composed of the scientists who used to work for the corporations, but they do not believe that without violence, the regime would be altered. They perform bio-attacks to the infrastructures³⁷² because the leader of the MaddAddam (Zeb) believed that “if you could destroy the infrastructure...then the planet could repair itself. Before it was too late and everything was extinct.”³⁷³ Zeb believes that corporations should be stopped before

³⁶⁹ Oryx and Crake, 267.

³⁷⁰ *MaddAddam*, 3.

³⁷¹ Kuźnicki, *Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Fiction: Fire is Being Eaten*, 157.

³⁷² *The Year of the Flood*, 327.

³⁷³ *The Year of the Flood*, 399.

it is too late, and resort to violence is necessary as well as legitimate in such conditions.

Gardeners and the MaddAddamites and also Crake present a resistance movement against the commodification of science and scientific knowledge. Other scientists have tried to perfect the world, humans, and other species without any ethical background. Animal species and human biology are altered by scientific technology; biology is controlled and manipulated by science, new species are created for the sake of humans' use, and new products are developed for further consumption. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, science is displayed as an instrument for profit maximization. In such circumstances, with the help of development in science and technology, everything is commodified. From the perspective of Gardeners, MaddAddamites, and Crake, civilization and humanity are the leading causes of environmental hazards, and scientific developments accelerated the damages done to the earth. Science is used both to control nature and human nature, and Crake is an example of this. For him, science is a means "to control human nature by creating his bioengineered and environmentally friendly hominids, the Crakers, as a replacement for humanity."³⁷⁴ Although Crake also opposes commodification and tries to eliminate its devastating consequences, without the instrumental logic of capitalism, he could not succeed in the annihilation of human beings; his success depends on his "ability to mimic the language of the corporations' capitalism."³⁷⁵

3.2.3.1.3. "There Was Nothing of Interest...Apart from Buying and Selling:" Commodification and Consumer Culture

The commodification of scientific and technological developments constitutes a crucial feature of consumer culture. Advanced industrial society is identified with consumerism and consumer culture. Offe argues in capitalist states, commodity form is the equilibrium point, and "accumulation takes place as long as

³⁷⁴ Bouson, ""It's Game Over Forever": Atwood's Satiric Vision of a Bioengineered Posthuman Future in Oryx and Crake." 141.

³⁷⁵ Terra Walston Joseph, "Victims of Global Capitalism in Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Imaginary," *The Age of Dystopian: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*, 43.

every value appears in the form of a commodity.”³⁷⁶ So commodification and consumerism are not new for advanced capitalist societies. However, there has been a paradigm shift in the consumption process. Bauman claims in the era of “deregulation, liberalization, flexibilization, increased fluidity,”³⁷⁷ consumption becomes the main reproduction force; “consumption is the new mechanism of reproduction of society.”³⁷⁸ Social and individual lives, as well as the economy, began to be organized around consumption rather than production. A society in which life is organized around consumption; production becomes a “servant of consumption.”³⁷⁹ This consumer-focused economy “relies on the excess of offers, their accelerated aging, and the quick dissipation of their seductive power.”³⁸⁰ Both function and meaning of the consumption have been altered. Consumption, on the one hand, becomes a reproductive force, and on the other hand, we no longer consume the products but the signs; “the objects of consumption themselves have value for us as signs.”³⁸¹

Advanced industrial societies are characterized as consumer societies. With the transition to neoliberal policies, the characters of the consumer societies have been altered. Consumption becomes the main reproductive force in the sense that consumers replace producers, and the “main sources of profits...tend to be ideas rather than material objects.”³⁸² Hardt and Negri identify this shift as a transition to immaterial labor. They define immaterial labor as the creation of “immaterial products, such as knowledge, information, communication, a relationship, or

³⁷⁶ *Contradictions of Welfare States*, 140.

³⁷⁷ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 5.

³⁷⁸ Will Atkinson, "Not All that Was Solid Has Melted into Air (or Liquid): A Critique of Bauman on Individualization and Class in Liquid Modernity," *The Sociological Review* 56.1 (2008): 4.

³⁷⁹ Lee, "Bauman, Liquid Modernity and Dilemmas of Development," 69.

³⁸⁰ Bauman, and Haugaard, "Liquid modernity and power: A dialogue with Zygmunt Bauman," 125.

³⁸¹ Lash and Urry, *The End of Organized Capitalism*, 288.

³⁸² Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 151.

emotional labor.”³⁸³ The production of immaterial labor has altered the relationship between the capital and the consumers; now, signs rather than commodities mediate this relationship. The meaning of commodity changes as well; Baudrillard states, “commodities are no longer defined by their use, but rather what they signify. And what they signify is defined not by what they do but their relationship to the entire system of commodities and signs.”³⁸⁴ In sum, use-value is replaced by sign-value, and appearances become the reality of the economy.³⁸⁵

In *MaddAddam* trilogy, the Pleeblands is portrayed where nothing is going on except “buying and selling, plus a lot of criminal activity.”³⁸⁶ There is an endless consumption; everything is for sale, and “everything has a price.”³⁸⁷ Life in the Compounds is no different as science serves the industry. There is a slight difference, though; within the Compound life, what is consumed is “real in the sense that they occur in nature, whereas in the Pleeblands, artificial, human-made products are consumed. However, the boundary between the real and the artificial or between the real and the fake has long been blurred as Crake points out, “after it happens, that’s what they look like in real time. The process is no longer important.”

The Corps are the sole economic actors, and the body-oriented corporations are the most powerful ones;³⁸⁸ these are HealthWyzer, OrganInc Farms, RejoovenEssence. HealthWyzer is a company that promotes health and wellness; it is a kind of Drug Company; OrganInc Farms develops genetically engineered human organs as well as new animal species, and RejoovenEssence specialized on human genetics, its betterment, its perfection, and more importantly, humans’ “wish

³⁸³ Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (Penguin Press, 2004), 108.

³⁸⁴ *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures* (Sage, 1998), 7.

³⁸⁵ Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, 68.

³⁸⁶ *Oryx and Crake*, 231.

³⁸⁷ *Oryx and Crake*, 159.

³⁸⁸ Patricia Stapleton, “The People in the Chaos Cannot Learn’: Dystopian Vision in Atwood’s MADDADDAM Trilogy,” 24.

to stop time.”³⁸⁹ Liquid modernity is defined by uncertainty, insecurity, and unpredictability. These characteristics have affected all kinds of networks, relationships, commitments as well as products; all these have become fluid and constantly changing; there aren’t any long-lasting networks, relationships and products; and in this world, body is the ultimate source of the reliability and certainty in the liquid modern times. The body “has become the last shelter and sanctuary of continuity and duration.”³⁹⁰ That’s why bodily-oriented compounds are portrayed as the most powerful ones in *MaddAddam* trilogy.

Nothing lasts forever except the body; the body would be there as long as the individual exists, whereas every relationship, networks, and commitments are constantly changing and open to disappear. In the era of uncertainty and insecurity, the body is all an individual has. As the body is the new sanctuary, it becomes the ultimate place that individuals must invest in. Thus, the body becomes an object, and body-related subjects become more important than ever, as Baudrillard claims, “the body sells products. Beauty sells products. Eroticism sells products.”³⁹¹ *MaddAddam* trilogy projects this perception about the body and its importance in an individual’s everyday life. Genetics sciences are the most developed ones. These sciences claim to promote health, wellness, and perfection because these are supposed to be what people wish for. “What people want is perfection...in a simple order.”³⁹² In contemporary societies, the body replaced the soul in the sense that whereas in earlier periods, the soul needed to be glorified, purified, and redeemed, and now it is the body that should be glorified. Thus, body-related concepts such as beauty and fitness have gained the utmost importance; they become the main goals of individuals. In such circumstances, health starts to be recognized something other than the biological imperative of survival, Baudrillard argues. Health is considered now together with fitness, and fitness is something to be displayed; and in the

³⁸⁹ *Oryx and Crake*, 344.

³⁹⁰ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 183.

³⁹¹ *The Consumer Society*, 135.

³⁹² *Oryx and Crake*, 288.

consumption economy, “what one displays, what one shows, is a sign of achievement.”³⁹³ Every physical feature can be obtained through genetic engineering, and with the changing conception of beauty, this market would be highly profitable. RejoovenEssense’s field works compose of health and beauty related subjects; they aim at the creation of a whole population through “pre-selected characteristics. Beauty, of course, that would be high in demand. And docility: several world leaders had expressed interest in that.”³⁹⁴ Besides beauty and fitness, alterations in identity determinants such as alterations in fingerprints, voiceprints, eye color, skin pigmentation, and retina³⁹⁵ are possible. Changes in such personal identity makers help criminals and runaways to remove their traces. Those who do not want to be found have the opportunity to be invisible or to be someone else, of course, with a price. As long as one pays the price, she can be whoever she wants, looks as beautiful as she wishes. To sum up, appearances and identities are commodified in *MaddAddam* trilogy.

In liquid modernity, the present and the novelty are glorified; the past has long gone, and the future is unpredictable, there is only present, “an eternal present built into liquid modernity,”³⁹⁶ and in this eternal present, everything is rapidly changing and keeping up with what is new and going along with the fashion are the tasks of the individuals. New needs are always created; everything is a matter of choice, “except the compulsion to choose.”³⁹⁷ There is an overabundance of products, choices, and consumption. Pleasure and enjoyment become the ultimate goal of an individual’s life. Enjoyment itself becomes an obligation. Consumerist man, Baudrillard argues, “sees himself as an enjoyment and satisfaction business.

³⁹³ Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, 68.

³⁹⁴ *Oryx and Crake*, 357.

³⁹⁵ *The Year of the Flood*, 311-313.

³⁹⁶ Lee, "Reinventing Modernity: Reflexive Modernization vs Liquid Modernity vs Multiple Modernities," 362.

³⁹⁷ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 73.

He sees it as his duty to be happy.”³⁹⁸ And in parallel to these, the market sells pleasure and enjoyment, and there is no limit; consumerism, as Bauman argues, “founded upon the liberation of wishful fantasies.”³⁹⁹ In *MaddAddam* trilogy, there is a market for every fantasy, and everything can become a product; a sufficient amount of money can buy everything. Even dead bodies have a market; the local Pleeblands “ran corpse disposals, harvesting organs for transplant, then running the gutted carcasses through the SecretBurgers grinders.”⁴⁰⁰ Violence, sex, and pornography are commodified and watched online through web sites. Endangered animals are traded and served in a gourmet restaurant.⁴⁰¹ Everything has an exchange value, from human hair, a human egg, and sex to human bones, which are used for jewelry.⁴⁰² The Corps trades scientists for disease germs and formulas⁴⁰³ or children become the raw material “if there was no man to work in the fields or the rice paddies.”⁴⁰⁴ In such a consumer society, everything is commodified.

Consumption culture is not specific to the late capitalist societies; it emerges with the spread of capitalist logic in social and cultural aspects of life. However, it becomes the reproductive force in late capitalist societies. Although it refers to a system of exchange, Bauman considers consumption as a lonely activity even though it is performed with others.⁴⁰⁵ As it is considered as a lonely activity, it ends up with alienation and isolation from others. However, this perception of

³⁹⁸ *The Consumer Society*, 80.

³⁹⁹ *Liquid Modernity*, 75.

⁴⁰⁰ *The Year of the Flood*, 40.

⁴⁰¹ *The Year of the Flood*, 37.

⁴⁰² *MaddAddam*, 392.

⁴⁰³ *The Year of the Flood*, 350.

⁴⁰⁴ *Oryx and Crake*, 135.

⁴⁰⁵ *Liquid Modernity*, 163.

consumption ignores consumption's function as a "system of exchange and the equivalent of language."⁴⁰⁶ Consumption may seem like a lonely activity, but Baudrillard states consumption is not about enjoyment; it is a function of production; it is about "manipulation of social signifiers."⁴⁰⁷ It is not only about buying things; as Daniel Miller points out, it is an active process that we transformed the value of the goods, we transform the use-value into sign-value.⁴⁰⁸ Thus consumption is a social process; consumers should always consider her needs, she has to pursue her own happiness; it is her right to do so. It is like a moral duty to engage in consumption activities; otherwise, "he has and becoming asocial."⁴⁰⁹ What can be considered as a lone activity is not the consumption itself but the individual's own efforts to perform her obligation in the social process of consumption, in finding happiness and well being without pre-given socially prescribed tasks, duties, and roles. The individual is alone in this process while the process itself is social and Atwood, in *MaddAddam* trilogy, projects not only the detrimental effects of the consumer culture on the macro level, she also evaluates its effects on an individual's social, political, and moral standing.

3.2.3.2. "The Art of The Possible": Individualization in *MaddAddam* Trilogy

Atwood, in her novels (fiction or non-fiction), always emphasizes the individuals' relations to their environment and interconnectedness of individuals with one another as well as with their environment. For her, the retreat from the external world is associated with powerlessness, and Atwood rejects the idea of powerlessness,⁴¹⁰ there is always an alternative if there is freedom. For Atwood,

⁴⁰⁶ *The Consumer Society*, 60.

⁴⁰⁷ *The Consumer Society*, 60.

⁴⁰⁸ *Consumption and its Consequences* (Polity, 2012), 64.

⁴⁰⁹ *The Consumer Society*, 80.

⁴¹⁰ Alice M. Palumbo, "On the Border: Margaret Atwood's Novels," in *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Margaret Atwood*, 26 .

freedom does not mean doing whatever one wants; freedom means “the power to use what you’re given in the best way you can.”⁴¹¹ To use what is given requires attachment to the external world; an isolated and alienated individual cannot perceive the external world. Freedom may be an individual practice, but it also requires the presence of others, being with others, and knowledge and perception of the external world. However, in contemporary societies, freedom is regarded as “freedom of choice” rather than a perpetual practice. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, global transformations are given with an emphasis on their effects on individuals’ lives. Individuals’ lives are organized around freedom; each individual is given the autonomy and responsibility towards their life, their future, and fulfilling their wishes. However, such autonomy and responsibility also create struggle, uncertainty, and vulnerability. Each individual’s struggle is unique, but the source of these struggles can be attached to the individualization process in late capitalist societies, and *MaddAddam* trilogy demonstrates this process together with the global transformations.

Neoliberal transformations and universalization of capitalism have not only altered relations of economics and state-society relations but also affected the individuals. The retreat of the state and its institutions from the organization of society, diminishing welfare policies, loosening the power of class relations, of collective actions, and also of the nuclear family have affected individual positioning. Individuals have lost their social and communal bonds. Not only interhuman bonds lost their value, but also collective lives have diminished. Contemporary political life spreads the seeds of pessimism rather than optimism because of the perception that “capitalism is the only game in town, and there is neither analysis of, nor challenge to, it.”⁴¹² The perception of the inevitability of capitalism paves the way for the dominance of dystopia in contemporary political theory. The realities of liquid modernity such as “decay, degradation, and dissolution of social categories...need to be viewed in terms of the dystopian

⁴¹¹ Jo Brans, "Using What You're Given," in *Waltzing Again: New and Selected Conversations with Margaret Atwood*, 89.

⁴¹² Levitas, "Discourses of Risk and Utopia," 205.

imagination,” Schmeink argues and thus constitutes the “dystopian present.”⁴¹³ This section deals with the individuals in the dystopian present.

Beck identifies contemporary life with de-traditionalization, which means “natural ordering recedes, and individuals are forced to make choices in all spheres of life.”⁴¹⁴ Individuals are made responsible in this process; this responsibility covers all their choices, actions, and their consequences. This process, Bauman argues, starts with the overvaluation of individuals⁴¹⁵; through this overvaluation of individuals, social and communal bonds are recognized as an obstacle between an individual and her freedom. Individuals are freed from these obstacles, but the result of this is not the liberation of individuals but the acceleration of their vulnerabilities. Giddens and Beck also use the word “disembedded individualization” for this process; structural obstacles in the way of individualization are removed.⁴¹⁶ According to them, in this process, previous inequalities are removed. Beck argues the logic of risk distribution occurs where “genuine material need can be objectively reduced and socially isolated through the development of human and technological productivity.”⁴¹⁷ Beck and Giddens offer a re-embedded mechanism to these disembedded individuals through collective action by participating “new kinds of community and sociality,”⁴¹⁸ such as sub-politics or life politics. For Bauman, on the other hand, the process is not disembedding and then re-embedding; it is disembedding without re-embedding,⁴¹⁹ and without re-embedding mechanisms,

⁴¹³ Lars Schmeink, *Biopunk Dystopias: Genetic Engineering, Society and Science Fiction* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2016), 69.

⁴¹⁴ Lash, "Reflexive Modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension," 5.

⁴¹⁵ *Liquid Times*, p. 57.

⁴¹⁶ Dawson, "Bauman, Beck, Giddens and Our Understanding of Politics in Late Modernity," 191.

⁴¹⁷ *Risk Society*, 19.

⁴¹⁸ Sørensen, and Christiansen, *Ulrich Beck: An Introduction to the Theory of Second Modernity and the Risk Society*, 51.

inequalities are further created rather than removed⁴²⁰, and vulnerabilities are increased.

In *MaddAddam* trilogy, as opposed to the arguments of Beck and Giddens, materials needs are not reduced to a minimum if material needs are to be understood as access to the basic services such as health services, housing, and education. These services play pivotal roles in determining one's career, especially in the Pleeblands. Economic inequalities are expanding rather than removed. The gap between the rich and the poor is so open that they cannot even come across with each other unless the rich intend to do so. Their lives are completely segregated. However, Beck's claims on the creation of new kinds of community and sociality can be observed in *MaddAddam* trilogy. There are many different communities; different religious groups emerge (those who believe in the sacredness of liobam - a man-made species, a hybrid form of lion/lamb), new cults are formed (such as PetrOleum - believe in the holiness of the oil), different environmentalist groups are formed. Membership in these communities may suffice the need for belonging in a community and provide with the communal ties that do not exist in the late capitalist societies. All the narrators in *MaddAddam* trilogy have become a member in a community at least once in their lifetimes. The vitality of a community and the sense of belonging for individuals will be discussed in the last chapter; the focus will be on individualization in this section.

Individualization necessitates a trade-off, Bauman argues, a trade-off between freedom and security. "Freedom was on offer in exchange for security."⁴²¹ The security provided through having a family, being a citizen, and being a member of a community have been lost in the late capitalist societies. These are considered as "structural brakes on individual freedom,"⁴²² and individuals are released from these brakes through liberalization and flexibilization, which "have led to the radical

⁴¹⁹ Atkinson, "Not All that Was Solid has melted into Air (or liquid): A Critique of Bauman on Individualization and Class in Liquid Modernity," 5.

⁴²⁰ Dawson, "Bauman, Beck, Giddens and Our Understanding of Politics in Late Modernity," 201.

⁴²¹ Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World, (Blackwell Publishing, 2002), 22.

⁴²² Nicholas Gane, "Zygmunt Bauman: Liquid Modernity and Beyond," *Acta Sociologica* 44.3 (2001): 269.

disengagement of ‘free agents’ from the system, and the unlocking of individual choices from collective projects and actions.”⁴²³ Freeing agents from the system and collectivity have drastic effects on the agents, on individuals; it is, first of all, an exchange between freedom and security. They enjoy their freedom in exchange for security. Individualization forces individuals to take themselves as a task and give them the responsibility for achieving this task and handle the consequences alone. In this process, all hopes and fears, dreams, and insecurities are privatized. Individualization “forces each individual to bear the weight of the global and collective risks and uncertainties on his or her own shoulder.”⁴²⁴ Freedom and security are the conditions of being human, but they “are hardly ever fully reconciled.”⁴²⁵ In late capitalist societies, freedom is increasing, but this freedom is the freedom to choose. This individual freedom gaining momentum through “privatized individuality,” is actually unfreedom Bauman claims.⁴²⁶ For him, without security, freedom cannot be fully enjoyed.

In *MaddAddam* trilogy, the effect of individualization on the people in Compound and Pleeland is different. The lives in the Compound provide greater security in comparison to the pleelands. The Compound people have more physical security compared to the Pleelanders; violence in the compounds is less visible than the Pleelands. The Compound people also have economic security; they have their homes, their jobs, and their real meals, whereas, in the Pleelands, none of these are secure. The Compound people are part of a community in a sense; they are either part of ‘the top people’ or scientists; they belong somewhere. The people in the Pleelands suffer more from the individualization process in terms of economic and physical security. That can be explained through the gap between the rich and the poor. The poor cannot afford a secure life. Their lives are exposed to danger in every way; there are not enough jobs, violence rates are high, and everyone is

⁴²³ Gane, "Zygmunt Bauman: Liquid Modernity and Beyond," 269.

⁴²⁴ Sørensen, and Christiansen, *Ulrich Beck: An Introduction to the Theory of Second Modernity and the Risk Society*, 48.

⁴²⁵ Bauman, *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, 4.

⁴²⁶ *In Search of Politics* (Polity Press, 1999), 63.

disposable. In such an environment, the relationship among individuals is constituted on the basis of interests, on exchange. The concepts such as family, love, friendship, and commitments of any sort are considered as “useless”⁴²⁷ or “humiliating”⁴²⁸ because they put someone at a disadvantage position and resulted in giving too much power to the loved object, which is not wanted.⁴²⁹

When all the institutions of the first modernity, from family to state, have not functioned properly, individuals are the ones who decide on their fates. They have no familial support, no guarantees such as welfare policies, and they have nothing to trust. The family relations in *MaddAddam* are fragile; family is more of a shallow concept rather than an institution. The relationship between Jimmy and her mother displays a great example of family relations. Jimmy’s mother left compound life and her family because she “suffered from conscience long enough,” she does not want to participate in “a lifestyle that is not only meaningless in itself.”⁴³⁰ She is against everything that Compound life promotes; nevertheless, she seems to fall into the trap of liquid times. Jimmy thinks of her mother not trying her best for him, that she has discouraged when explaining things and gives up on him. Jimmy “wanted her to be brave, to try her best with him, to hammer away at the wall he’d put up against her, to keep on going.”⁴³¹ Her discouragement can be explained through Sennet’s argument on *The Culture of New Capitalism*. He argues, people are oriented to the short-term goals, and dependency is underrated. People are looking for potential abilities rather than personal achievements.⁴³² Potentiality gains importance, and it seems Jimmy’s mother does not see the potential in Jimmy, so she does not invest in Jimmy and get discouraged immediately. Another shallow

⁴²⁷ *The Year of the Flood*, 260.

⁴²⁸ *Oryx and Crake*, 227.

⁴²⁹ *Oryx and Crake*, 227.

⁴³⁰ *Oryx and Crake*, 69.

⁴³¹ *Oryx and Crake*, 24.

⁴³² (Yale University Press, 2006), 5.

family relation is given through Adam and Zeb. They are stepbrothers, and the father is the same, and mothers are different (they later learned that they are not brothers, their fathers are different as well). Their father forms a church, the church of PetrOleum, and participates in illegal activities and commits crimes. Zeb wants to expose his illegal activities, but Adam told him, “they’d accuse the two of us of mental instability.” When Zeb told Adam that they are his sons that they cannot do it to them, he replies, “Blood is thinner than money.”⁴³³ So families portrayed in the trilogy no longer provide supports, as Beck argues, they are there as institutions, but they are “zombie categories.” They are no longer function properly. The chance for collectivity and solidarity is dissolved even within the most basic unit of societies, within the family.

Decreasing collectivity and solidarity affect an individual’s positioning in society. In late capitalist societies or advanced liberal society, “individualization is fate, not a choice.”⁴³⁴ *MaddAddam* trilogy presents us with a totalizing capitalist system, and this system “is oriented towards putting private actors in a position to increase their efficiency and effectiveness according to the criteria of private exchange and accumulation.”⁴³⁵ What matters in a capitalist system is the private effort of individuals. In the late capitalist period, this position of individuals is further intensified; everything is privatized, from progress to fear. Every fear is to be coped individually; an individual’s achievement replaces collective well-being; everyone takes care of herself individually. The concept of the public is almost disappeared and replaced with private. For instance, there is no conception of public wellness, public wellness depends on people’s money, and so it is privatized. “Nobody could get public wellness coverage unless they had no money of their own whatsoever.”⁴³⁶ Another example can be found regarding the beneficiary of scientific developments. As it is stated above, biomedicine and biotech are portrayed

⁴³³ *MaddAddam*, 153.

⁴³⁴ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 34.

⁴³⁵ Offe, *Contradictions of the Welfare State*, 137.

⁴³⁶ *The Year of the Flood*, 31.

as highly developed in the trilogy. These developments are the source of hope for people but only people with money. Jimmy's mother and father enter in an argument about the scientific developments and who benefits from it. Jimmy's mother tells Jimmy's father, "Don't you remember the way we used to talk, everything we wanted to do? Making life better for people - not just people with money."⁴³⁷ So only a small portion of society can benefit from scientific and technological developments. Hope belongs to the one who can pay for it. Hope is also privatized.

Individuals are so concerned with their survival or with their goals that they cannot think another life. Envisioning of another life can be associated with remaining political. *MaddAddam* trilogy projects a consumer culture. In this culture, the consumerist individual is constantly reminded of her needs, her right to be happy, and her right to be satisfied. Life proposes endless possibilities and opportunities. Everything is possible in this life, and everything is a matter of choice. The opportunities and possibilities offered in consumerist societies are generally life choices, individual choices, what to eat, where to live, how to spend life, what to do in spare times, and how to construct oneself. These choices require no collectivity, and these choices and possibilities are experienced in isolation and without collective assistance.⁴³⁸ In a society where everyone chases her own opportunities and pursues her own dreams, the relationships between individuals are reduced to a minimum. They are mostly involved in their choices of goals "rather than finding the means to the ends which do not call for reflection."⁴³⁹ Their energies are directed towards the offerings of consumer culture. *MaddAddam* trilogy reflects the overabundance of choice within consumer culture.

This section on *MaddAddam* trilogy can be concluded through a brief commentary. Trilogy projects a risk society, and in risk societies, "handling fear and insecurity become an essential cultural qualification,"⁴⁴⁰ as well as an individual

⁴³⁷ *Oryx and Crake*, 64.

⁴³⁸ Nicholas Gane, "Zygmunt Bauman: Liquid Modernity and Beyond," 269.

⁴³⁹ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 61.

⁴⁴⁰ Beck, *Risk Society*, 76.

qualification. In the trilogy, fear of death, fear of losing the earth, insecurities about the present, about survival, and also uncertainties about the future constitute the main themes. The fear of death is generally discussed around genetic engineering; it is proposed as the “biggest problem of all.”⁴⁴¹ Fear of losing the earth is discussed around the logic of capitalism and through the eyes of the Gardeners and Maddamites; the groups that resist the capitalist logic and try to change the system. Insecurities about employment, housing, and living are produced socially as well as globally, but no public and political life deals with such insecurities. Thus, individuals have to deal with insecurities alone. Insecurity and uncertainty “hatch and breed the most awesome and least bearable of our fears.”⁴⁴² They produce a sense of vertigo and loss of control. The idea of controllability, certainty, and predictability have been lost in late capitalist societies; instead, insecurity and uncertainty have become the main problems. As collectivities fade away with the individualization process, collective activity against the emerging problems is not an option anymore. In such conditions, individual survival replaces the idea of collective well-being and an idea of shared progress. In late capitalist societies, “it is individual men and women on their own who are expected to use, individually, their own wits, resources, and industry to lift themselves to a more satisfactory condition.”⁴⁴³ The narrators of the trilogy use whatever they have to survive. Some use their body; some use their brain; everything can be a resource, everything is tradable in the trilogy in exchange for survival, because “giving things for nothing was too soft.”⁴⁴⁴ That projects the basis of the relationship in late capitalist societies. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, the idea of the inevitability of capitalism is internalized and maintained. The internalization of the capitalist logic is considered as a key to survival because there seems no alternative way of being.

⁴⁴¹ *The Year of the Flood*, 352.

⁴⁴² Bauman, *Liquid Times*, 26.

⁴⁴³ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 135.

⁴⁴⁴ *The Year of the Flood*, 388.

The consumer society accelerated the distrust in collective activities as well as politics; it creates a political, social, and moral vacuum. The uncertainty about the future makes future-oriented, long-term activities redundant. Weber argues Protestant ethic is at the basis of the future-oriented plans and actions. It is oriented to self-discipline through “delayed gratification.” However, liquid modern times acknowledge the present only; we live in a “perpetual present.”⁴⁴⁵ Thus delayed gratification makes no sense; gratification should be here, and now, the future is uncertain, and “saving for the future, the essence of Protestant ethic, is vitiated.”⁴⁴⁶ Thus it has been canceled out without nullification of the spirit of capitalism; capitalism further grows without ethical and moral background and leads to a moral vacuum for individuals. Gardeners and MaddAddamites adopt a more ethical approach towards earth, life, and all the living species. The leader of the Gardeners, Adam One, believes in “a more ethical and technically proficient future had replaced the depressing present.”⁴⁴⁷ However, Gardeners and the MaddAddamites are mainly composed of top scientists; they may believe in the possibility of an ethical way out or an ethical combination of science and development. For ordinary individuals, on the other hand, an alternative to capitalist culture is hard to find.

3.3. Concluding Remarks

The twentieth and twenty-first centuries produce more dystopias than utopias due to the perception of lack of alternatives as well as the perception of the inevitability of capitalism. It can be argued global capitalism has created a catastrophic present and has also increased the powerlessness and insecurity.⁴⁴⁸ Capitalism, the organization of society according to the capitalist logic, and the consequences of this are prevalent subjects for the dystopian genre. The analysis of

⁴⁴⁵ Jameson, “Postmodernism and Consumer Society,” 125.

⁴⁴⁶ Sennet, *The Culture of the New Capitalism*, 78.

⁴⁴⁷ *The Year of the Flood*, 295.

⁴⁴⁸ Levitas, "Discourses of Risk and Utopia," 199.

consequences of advanced industrial society as well as destructive effects of capitalism are at the heart of *The Handmaid's Tale* and *MaddAddam* trilogy. *The Handmaid's Tale* and *MaddAddam* trilogy are written in an era in which critiques have been directed to the modernity and in which different interpretations of modernity have emerged. In this era, the building blocks of modernity, such as order, stability, and certainty, have been broken and give way to more fluid and flexible organizations. The analyses of these transformations have pivotal role of social and political theory. At the same time, the analysis of drawbacks of such transformations, the possible consequences, and possible alternatives for the current system have been crucial topics for utopian and dystopian literature. The commonalities between utopia and sociology have been given in the first chapter. Utopia and social and political theories have a descriptive and analytical role in society. Though they have split in the early twentieth century due to the perception of antithetical of utopia and science and alignment of sociology with science rather than utopia.⁴⁴⁹ However, starting with the 1960s and 70s, utopian studies emerge as an academic inquiry,⁴⁵⁰ and “the retreat of social theory from utopia”⁴⁵¹ started to reverse. And in this study, dystopia and utopia are considered together. Thus, dystopia and sociology, or more generally, dystopia and social and political theories have much in common as well. Dystopias can be considered as experiences books, which provide with worse scenarios, function as a critique and change as utopias do. And they “dramatically expand the horizons of human possibility...they remind us of our strength and creativity.”⁴⁵²

For *The Handmaid's Tale*, it is argued there is an inherent relation between advanced industrial society and totalitarianism. This relationship is built on and deepened with the spread of instrumental rationality and logic of capitalism throughout the society. This society produces alienated and isolated individuals, and results with the lack of commitment to the collective action, ignoring the ongoing

⁴⁴⁹ Levitas, *Utopia as a Method*, 88-89.

⁴⁵⁰ Levitas, *Utopia as a Method*, 9.

⁴⁵¹ Krishan Kumar, "The Ends of Utopia," *New Literary History* (2010): 559.

⁴⁵² Laurence Davis, "Dystopia, Utopia and Sancho Panza," 23.

problems, and not taking responsibility. Advanced industrial societies create mass societies in which the rising standard of living makes non-conformity redundant and useless.⁴⁵³ Freedom is equated with freedom of choice, and freedom of choice is equated with consumerism. What is observed in *HT*, both in pre-Gilead and Gilead, is the lack of “taking a moral or political stand,” which eventually turns into “an apologist for evil.”⁴⁵⁴ Written in 1985, *HT* also reflects the characteristics of postmodernism and illustrates the clash between the principles of modernity and postmodernity. Atwood demonstrates modernity’s emphasis on objectivity of truth, the neutrality, and triumph of scientific rationality over social or aesthetic rationality, together with the postmodern emphasis on narrative knowledges and subjectivity of truth. Throughout the book, narrative and subjective knowledges are given together with scientific knowledge. Rather than a direct focus on the state’s action, *HT* focuses on personal and subjective experiences. That reflects the emergence of a new idea of politics, which is not based on the actions of the state.

HT also directs our attention to environmental degradation, loss of natural resources, decreasing birth rates due to radiation and pollution. These are the effects and consequences of advanced industrial societies. Environmental utopias and dystopias have become popular with the rise of environmental politics since the 1960s. However, the central focus of *HT* is not these environmental problems but the result of these problems, the totalitarian takeover. Atwood’s focus has shifted while she was writing *MaddAddam* trilogy. In the trilogy, environmental degradation and developments in science and technology are given a constitutive role, whereas the fear of state’s totalitarianism has given way to corporate rule. Nevertheless, it is significant to stress that the emphasis in both *HT* and trilogy is given to the lack of attachment to the world and the people and ignoring the ever-growing problems.

Starting from 1990, the apocalyptic scenarios became dominant within the dystopian genre,⁴⁵⁵ and Atwood’s trilogy is mostly discussed from an apocalyptic

⁴⁵³ Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, 4.

⁴⁵⁴ Amin Malak, "Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale and the Dystopian Tradition," in *Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale*, 10.

perspective. This perspective is highly related to the inevitability of capitalism. As capitalism is considered as inevitable, the current system and organization of things and living beings are perceived as given, so change seems impossible. The only alternative to the current system lies in the apocalyptic future. However, as previously stated, Atwood does not fictionalize an apocalyptic dystopia. In the trilogy, attempts for the transformation of global capitalism and efforts for reducing its impacts for the world and the individuals are displayed. For Atwood, dystopia is the current system rather than the annihilation of most of the human race, so the books are not apocalyptic.

For the trilogy, it is argued that transition to neoliberal policies pave the way for a new organization of society as well as new perspective of modernity since neoliberalism has affected and changed not only of institutions but also one's relationship with oneself, with others as well as with things. Atwood's trilogy reflects the concerns of the 2000s and the results of the transition to neoliberal policies. It is argued that with the transition to neoliberal policies, the power of the nation-states is diminishing to the point of their disappearances. All services that once provided by states are privatized. Commodification and consumerism have been spread all around the world, and everything is commodified. Global environmental risks are growing, and natural resources are consumed away, and there are few attempts to solve these problems, and these attempts are local, not global. There is a lack of societal, communal, and familial bonds; individuals feel alone, insecure, and powerless. Social and individual relations are liquified in the trilogy; individuals are given autonomy and freedom, but this autonomy and freedom are enjoyed without security. Science and technology are highly developed, but they contribute not to societal development but the further accumulation of capital. The blurring boundaries between natural and artificial, the principle of plurality, renouncement of either/or principle are given as the basis of the configuration of the society. In the trilogy, modernity's principle of order and stability are given way to contingency, uncertainty, and insecurity.

Contingencies, uncertainties, and insecurities exist both at the structural level and individual level. Although this chapter is organized around two levels of

⁴⁵⁵ Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 489.

inquiries and contains analyses of structural transformation at the macro level and their impacts on the level of the individuals, a deeper analysis can be made through a micro-level of analysis, which eventually leads us to the changes occurred in the macro level. Rather than a focus of structural changes and transformations, which are given throughout this chapter, the next chapter is devoted to offering an analysis of the micro-level through evaluating power relations in these dystopias. An analysis of power at the micro-level, which is barely given in the theories of modernity, would help us to reconsider and abandon the perception about the inevitability of capitalism. An analysis of power helps us to think better ways of living and doing things, which is essential for any societal transformation and societal transformation, at least the steps towards transformation, can be considered a fundamental function of utopias and dystopias.

CHAPTER 4

POWER STRUCTURES IN ATWOOD'S DYSTOPIAS

All utopias and dystopias are about authority and power as Ricoeur states. They look for alternative power relations and creating possibilities for the governance of the people. “Utopia is always an attempt to replace power by something else,”¹ whereas dystopia portrays how power corrupts or is corrupted. According to Atwood, power is about “who is entitled to do what to whom, with impunity; who profits by it.”² Atwood defines power as “our environment.”³ She perceives power and power relations as the constituent of all relations. Power, for her, is not something real and concrete; it is the result of individual perception and action upon each other. “Power after all is not real, not really there: people give it to each other.”⁴ In this sense power is relational. It is like the air we breathe, we cannot see it, we cannot hear it, but it is there.⁵ All kinds of relationships involve power relations. So, power is everywhere, in all of the relations we build; it does not have a certain character; it does not derive from a higher authority; it is not only about state mechanism; it varies with regard to who has the power, or whom we ascribe power. It is the conduct of human beings. As power is everywhere, it is also

¹ Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, 288.

² Atwood, *Second Words*, 394.

³ Margaret Atwood, “Notes on Power Politics,” *Acta Victoriana* 97.2 (1973): 7.

⁴ Atwood, “Notes on Power Politics,” 16.

⁵ Atwood, “Notes on Power Politics,” 7.

at the heart of dystopias in general. So, an analysis of power is necessary for an analysis of the relation between dystopias and social theories in general.

The analysis of the present through general theories of society, such as post-modernity thesis, liquid modernity, and risk society, facilitates to perceive the epochal shifts as well as the constituent parts of our present. They are valuable in explaining the general tendencies of our present, but the role of theory should be more than this in today's circumstances as it becomes harder to find alternatives for the current, ongoing crises. The theories of modernity, (first, second, liquid, even post-modernity) “formulate the global systemic theory which holds everything in place,”⁶ whereas the role of theory should involve an analysis of “the specificity of mechanisms of power, to locate the connections and extensions, to build little a strategic knowledge.”⁷ It is not to depreciate the theories of modernity, but rather to suggest looking for the underlying mechanisms through which our present is constituted. If our present constitutes a social whole, it would be better to analyze the techniques of power and their economic or political utility to understand “how these mechanisms come to be effectively incorporated into the social whole,”⁸ the social whole that the theories of modernity strongly evaluate.

An evaluation of the present in terms of epochal shifts would enable detecting the changes and differences within the present, but to perceive the present “less an epoch than an array of questions”⁹ opens the possibility to act upon the present. An analysis of the present is, then, analyzing what the present presents us and revealing the dynamics of its coherence and fragmenting it since “there is always more to the present that the present reveals us.”¹⁰ To act upon the present

⁶ Foucault, “Powers and Strategies,” *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge*, 145

⁷ Foucault, “Powers and Strategies,” 145

⁸ Foucault, “Two Lectures,” 101

⁹ Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose, “Introduction to,” in *Foucault and Political Reason: liberalism, Neo-liberalism and the Rationalities of Government*, ed. (The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 5.

¹⁰ Todd May, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), 56.

discloses non-inevitability of the present; revealing other possibilities and the possibilities of different experiences.¹¹ Through this action, the present is fragmentized as well as its inevitability and fixedness are destabilized;¹² so that practice of freedom becomes possible by acting upon the present as well as refigure experience.¹³

So the purpose of this chapter is to analyze what is underneath of these grand sociological theories in order not to refute them but to reveal the inherent possibility or possibilities to act upon their unit of analyses, upon the present. These sociological theories offer what exists whereas the analysis of the present critically engages in the present and analyzes it without rejecting what exists to observe new possibilities.¹⁴ The analysis of the present is the critique of what exists. This critique is “at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits that are imposed on us and an experiment with the possibility of going beyond.”¹⁵ This makes the analysis of the present closer to the utopian/dystopian fiction writings. Critique is the main activity that the utopian/dystopian writers engage and at the same time, it is their most effective instrument. As mentioned earlier, there are three possible and potential functions of utopia. These are “compensation, critique, and change.”¹⁶ Change is the possible outcome of the critique, or more accurately change would not be possible without critique. Critique is one of the main functions of dystopia as well. Booker states that through “critique of society on spatially or temporally distant settings, dystopian fictions provide fresh perspectives on problematic social and political practices that might otherwise be taken for granted or considered

¹¹ Graham Burchell, “Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self,” in *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and the Rationalities of Government*, 31.

¹² Barry, Osborne, and Rose, “Introduction to,” 5.

¹³ Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose, “Introduction to,” 6.

¹⁴ Thomas Lemke, *Biopolitics: An advanced Introduction* (NYU Press, 2011), 122.

¹⁵ Michel Foucault, “What is Enlightenment?” 132.

¹⁶ *Utopia as Method: The Imaginary Reconstitution of Society*, 107.

natural and inevitable.”¹⁷ Dystopias disclose that nothing is inevitable, everything, even the seemingly natural systems are open to change through critical thinking. In other words, dystopias, too, destabilize and fragment the presented social whole so that the change may take place or at least alternative ways of being and ways of doing would be revealed. So this chapter aims to trace the techniques and the mechanisms of power that make modernity liquid, and put society at risk in Atwood's dystopias. To pursue this aim first power will be defined and analyzed and then the strategies of the power will be revealed. Another element of power relations, which are the modes of subjectification that are produced and reproduced through these power structures, will be analyzed in the last chapter and this analysis will lead us to the concept of resistance.

The analysis of the power will be structured around the power mechanisms that shape and structure modernity. As it is discussed in the first chapter, dystopias are the product of modernity and the projects of modernity, as well as the problems of it, are demonstrated in political dystopias. Dystopias emerge as responses to the problems and crises emerged as results of modernity. The grand-narratives of modernity such as “reason and revolution, science and socialism, the idea of progress and the faith in the future,”¹⁸ constitute the sources of dystopia. These subjects are generally discussed around freedom and unfreedom. The idea of freedom and its absence have been fundamental subjects of various books within these genres as well as the social and political debates. Liberty and freedom are the sources of modernity and they are shared with capitalism. As Bell claims, common sources of modernity and capitalism are “the ideas of liberty and liberation, whose embodiments were “rugged individualism” in economic affairs and the “unrestrained self” in culture.”¹⁹ Modernity's relation to liberty brings liberalism and capitalism at the heart of the discussion but, now, from a different perspective. Liberalism, or more accurately, neoliberalism here, is taken neither as ideology nor

¹⁷ *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature*, 19.

¹⁸ Krishan Kumar, “Utopia's Shadow,” 19.

¹⁹ *The Cultural Contradiction of Capitalism*, xxiii.

as an economic theory²⁰ but “a whole way of being and thinking”²¹ as well “as an art of government...appears like the management of freedom,”²² and capitalism is interpreted here as an economic system depending upon the disciplining of the bodies as sources of labor as well as maximization of utility of life through regulation of the population. Capitalism depends on the “biopolitics of the discipline bodies,”²³ it requires the transformation of “the of life into labor.”²⁴ For the transformation of life time into labor disciplinary mechanisms are used; so disciplinary mechanisms are at the same time “preceded modern capitalism.” They are among “preconditions...although these technologies did not cause the rise of capitalism, they were prerequisites for its success.”²⁵ And neoliberalism is considered as “*the rationality of contemporary capitalism* [emphasis in original].”²⁶

Capitalism necessitates disciplinary mechanisms and disciplined bodies. As Foucault states capitalism “would not have been possible without the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production.”²⁷ However disciplined bodies are not the only elements in capitalism's development. Capitalism also necessitates “the adjustment of the phenomena of the population to the economic process.”²⁸ So on the one hand, we see the disciplined bodies and on the other hand, we see the

²⁰ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 45.

²¹ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at College de France 1978-1979*, ed. Arnold I. Davidson, trans. Grahan Burchell (Palgrave, 2008), 218.

²² Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 64.

²³ Frédéric Gros, “Is There a Biopolitical Subject? Foucault and the Birth of Biopolitics,” in *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, ed. Vermon W. Cisney, and Nicolae Morar (University of Chicago Press, 2015), 68.

²⁴ Gros, “Is There a Biopolitical Subject? Foucault and the Birth of Biopolitics,” 264.

²⁵ Paul Rabinow, *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought, with Major New Unpublished Material*, (Pantheon Books, 1984), 18.

²⁶ Pierre Dardot, and Christian Laval, *The New way of the World: On Neoliberal Society* (Verso Trade, 2014), 4.

²⁷ *The History of Sexuality* Vol.1, 141.

²⁸ *The History of Sexuality* Vol.1, 141.

emergence of the population as the new unit of the economic analysis. The regulation and the management of the population are different from the power that control individual bodies. For the regulation and the management of the population a new type power emerges; this power is biopower and Foucault claims biopower is one of the great inventions of bourgeois societies. Through biopower, biological life enters into the arena of political techniques, and these techniques are used to optimize, organize, and regulate the biological life of the population. Biopower is “the political economy of life.”²⁹ The disciplining of the bodies “- anatomo-politics of the human body-”³⁰ and the regulation of the population are two mechanisms that constitute biopower. These mechanisms are necessary for capitalism to transform “the time of life into useful and productive time.”³¹ Capitalism also “requires circulation of money and goods.”³² Circulation or mobility necessitates a certain level of liberty. This pole brings the management of freedom, liberalism, back to the scene. Foucault considers liberalism “as the general framework of biopolitics”³³ since liberalism no longer deals with the individual interests but with general interests, it deals with the population. It “deals with the phenomena of politics...government is now to be exercised over what we would call the phenomenal republic of interests.”³⁴ For Foucault entrance of life into political techniques and strategies constitute a “threshold of modernity” and change the conception of man. Since Aristotle, man is an animal with political capacity, whereas modern man “is an animal whose politics places his existence as a living being in question.”³⁵

²⁹ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 60.

³⁰ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* Vol.1, 139.

³¹ Gros, “Is There a Biopolitical Subject? Foucault and the Birth of Biopolitics,” 264.

³² Todd May, and Ladelle McWhorter, “Who’s Being Disciplined Now? Operations of Power in a Neoliberal World.” in *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, 249.

³³ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 22.

³⁴ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 45-46.

Modernity is about “the will to know the body to manipulate, alter, and modify it”³⁶ as well as it is about the control and regulation: control the effects, control the risks, and regulate the uncertainties. It is argued here that, if modernity is “an attitude,” if it is an “a way of thinking and feeling; a way too, of acting and behaving that one and at the same time marks a relation of belonging and presents itself a task,”³⁷ it is through biopower that attitude is constructed and maintained. In modernity, “power is not only concerned with life and rooted in subjects as living bodies and the population as a body of living subjects, but power also works toward specific ends that have been dictated by economics;”³⁸ and this relationship is constituted by biopower and through strategies of governmentality. Most of the utopias and dystopias are biopolitical; the target is the government of the whole population as well as the political economy of life. The justification of the regimes in utopias and dystopias is the achievement and maintenance of the well-being of the population. Population control, reproduction of healthy babies, healthy individuals, age control, and control of sexual relations are among the recurrent themes of the utopias and dystopias. It is life that is at stake in Atwood's dystopias; the power of life and the power over life are the two fundamental concerns and when life becomes the object and subject of power, one can consider biopower. So, this chapter will be an analysis of power, especially biopower.

4.1. The Perspectives of Biopower

Biopower offers a relation between life and politics and it has renewed interests with the works of Giorgio Agamben, Micheal Hardt and Antonio Negri, Paul Rabinow, Nicolas Rose, and many other philosophers, sociologists, and

³⁵ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 143.

³⁶ Francesco Paolo Adorno, “Power over Life, Politics of Death: Forms of Resistance to Biopower in Foucault,” in *The Government of Life: Foucault, Biopolitics, and Neoliberalism*, ed. Vanessa Lem and Miguel Vatter (Fordham University Press), 99.

³⁷ Foucault, “What is Enlightenment?” 113.

³⁸ Adorno, “Power Over Life, Politics of Death: Forms of Resistance to Biopower in Foucault,” p. 99.

political scientists. These names have followed Foucault's use of the term. They do not fully agree with what Foucault considers as biopolitics though they construct their own ideas with reference to him, they criticize and supplement what they consider missing in the works of Foucault. Although the term biopower is usually associated with Foucault, he is not the first one who uses the term but his use is radically different from the previous names that use it, his use constitutes a rupture and this is the reason why Foucault seems to invent the term.

There are at least two different lines of interpretations of biopolitics until Foucault revitalized the term. G.W. Harris is the first who uses the term but generally is attributed to Rudolf Kjellen. Kjellen perceives the state as a living organism or living entity. The state is treated as a collective subject that rules over its body and soul. National Socialism adopted this organicistic approach, and racial hygiene and genetic biology served as the biopolitical approach of National Socialism. For this approach biology and politics can be treated as two equal determinants, nature can be perceived as guidance for society and politics. In this approach, life is taken as the basis of politics.³⁹ The second line of interpretation takes life as the object of politics. Lemke argues that this approach emerged in the 1960s and at the beginning of the 1970s. This approach, rather than focusing on the biological foundations of politics, reveals life as the new object of politics. Protecting the natural environment, ecological regulation, health policy, and regulation of population emerge as the object of politics. Development in biotechnology, medicine, and genetic problematizes the sustainability of the development of life,⁴⁰ so that life begins to be the objects of politics.

These are only two different interpretations that occupy the political agenda. There are many other interpretations. There are arguments on biopolitical aspects of Platon's state racism and it is argued that, in opposition to Foucault, biopolitics is not a modern phenomenon, it can be traced to Ancient Greek philosophers.⁴¹ So it

³⁹ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 9-22.

⁴⁰ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 23-33.

⁴¹ Mika Ojakangas, *On the Greek Origins of Biopolitics: A Reinterpretation of the History of Biopower* (Routledge, 2016).

can be said that the use of the term is highly diverse and context-dependent. Foucault, however, opens up a new way to understand the meaning of the term. This new way is related to his method, which is genealogical and it means “to desubjugate historical knowledges, to set them free, or in other words to enable them to oppose and struggle against the coercion of a unitary, formal, and scientific theoretical discourse.”⁴² Foucault often uses the term biopolitics and biopower interchangeably. Foucault's approach to biopolitics offers a rupture from “the attempt to trace political processes and structures back to biological determinants.”⁴³ Instead of seeking biological determinants, Foucault focuses on the historical processes through which life became the center of politics. It is Foucault who first reveals that the biopower's characteristics as the political economy of life.

There are diverse interpretations and analyses of biopower and biopolitics. So in this section, the Foucauldian approach to power and biopower will be given first. In relation to Atwood's dystopia, only three approaches will be taken. These approaches are Foucault's approach, political theology approach, and new materialist approach to biopower.⁴⁴ Political theology approach, which is first theorized by Agamben will be included in this study due to its emphasis on the sovereign. In Foucault's approach, in contemporary life and politics, sovereign power has a limited role. As opposed to this argument, in this study it will be argued that sovereign power has still crucial in understanding contemporary politics. The political theology approach is crucial in analyzing totalitarian tendencies, totalitarianism, states of exception, and war-like situations. As one of the dystopias analyzed in this study presents us with a totalitarian regime, the political theology approached is included in the study. And political theology approach will also be used for the trilogy since sovereign's decisions on life-related subject such as the determination of the value of life or expendable lives are among the most significant subjects in trilogy. The new materialist approach, on the other hand, directs our

⁴² Michel Foucault, *Society must be Defended*, 10.

⁴³ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 33.

⁴⁴ S.E. Wilmer and Audronė Žukauskaitė, “Introduction,” in ed. *Resisting Biopolitics: Philosophical, Political, and Performative Strategies* (Routledge, 2016), 6.

attention to the matter and the life, vital capacities of all creatures as well as stresses the importance of thing-power. It includes an analysis of new scientific and technological developments. It shows us how concepts such as human/non-human, organic/inorganic, and natural/unnatural are altered with the new developments. It provides us with the sufficient knowledge about the vital processes, which is a prerequisite for the government of things and living beings. This is an important aspect of biopower as well as the *MaddAddam* trilogy. Thus, this approach will also be included.

4.1.1. Foucauldian Approach to Power and Biopower

Foucault considers power as an exercise.⁴⁵ Power is relational; “it is a way in which certain actions modify others...Power exists only when it is put into action, even if, it is integrated into a disparate field of possibilities.”⁴⁶ Power is multi-dimensional; it can be both productive and repressive. There are three modalities of power according to Foucault, and these are sovereign power, disciplinary power, and biopower. Each emerges in different historical conditions and these three different powers do not cancel out each other. Each of these produces a different kind of knowledges and discourses; each has its own unique apparatuses. These powers do not transcend one another, they do not oppose each other, they are complementary, and “support one another.”⁴⁷

The oldest technique of power is a sovereign power. Sovereign power is the power of the monarch over the territory and the individuals who live in it. It is the power “to take life or let live;”⁴⁸ the power to say no, it does not have a productive capacity; rather it sets the limits. It is a deductive power based on a juridical rule. It

⁴⁵ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Vintage Books, 1995), 28.

⁴⁶ Foucault, “Subject and Power,” *Critical Inquiry* 8.4 (1982): 786.

⁴⁷ Foucault, *Society must be Defended*, 39.

⁴⁸ Foucault, *Society must be Defended*, 241.

requires obedience to the laws.⁴⁹ In the eighteenth century, a new form of power has emerged; disciplinary power. Disciplinary power is different than sovereign power in several points. The first one, the target, or the area of influences of the sovereign power is the territory whereas it is the individual body for disciplinary power. Sovereign power is a deductive power; it works through limiting whereas disciplinary power is productive; it is a corrective power. It produces subjectivity through norms as well as a code of normalization.⁵⁰ Through code of normalization disciplinary power produces subjects or subjectivities that would conform to the bourgeois society to establish and maintain the industrial capitalist system. Disciplinary power “regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise.”⁵¹ With this power, Foucault argues, the human sciences and medical sciences emerge and start to dominate the discourses on truth and knowledge. Disciplinary power introduces the means of control and surveillance, and also the mechanisms that make internalization of surveillance possible.

The last modality of power that Foucault offers is biopower. Biopower emerges in the mid-eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries; the target is the population; the species of the human being. It presupposes control over living beings. Unlike sovereign power's right to kill and let live, biopower is about making live and letting die.⁵² Biological life is at the center of politics; it becomes both the subject and the object of politics. Biopower fosters life. The population becomes the final target of the government, the regulation and the measurement of the unexpected, contingencies, and risks become the general conduct of the governance and the security of the population has utmost importance. The minimization of the risks and the maximization of the utility and effectiveness of the population are the

⁴⁹ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Vol. I*, 83-85.

⁵⁰ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Vol. I*, 85.

⁵¹ Foucault, *Society must be Defended*, 38.

⁵² Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 170.

⁵² Foucault, *Society must be Defended*, 243.

main goals of biopower. These three modalities of power do not cancel each other out; disciplinary apparatus (surveillance, control, and normalization) is necessary for the control of the population, and the disciplining of the individuals for biopower and also sovereign power is at work within the juridical apparatus.

Biopower or biopolitics designates what “brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge-power an agent of transformation of human life.”⁵³ The political economy of life is its form of knowledge and security is its technical instrument.⁵⁴ Biopower or biopolitics addresses the population as a whole, and life becomes political. There are two poles of biopower; one is discipline, anatomo-politics of the human body and the other is regulation of the population.⁵⁵ Biopower uses the techniques of disciplinary power but at the same time it regulates the biological; “biological came under state control.”⁵⁶ Birth, death, illness, and everything related to the population's health become the subjects of politics. Biopower is about regulating the possibilities and chances, calculating the risks, and reducing it to a minimum for the sake of the management of life. Whereas disciplinary power regulates everything, biopower and its apparatus of security “let things happen.”⁵⁷ Biopolitics “reformulates concepts of political sovereignty and subjugates them to new forms of political knowledge,”⁵⁸ knowledges that are, in a sense, foreign to sovereign power and outside of its juridical existence.

The relation between liberalism and biopolitics is given briefly above; for Foucault, biopower is “the general framework of liberalism” and liberalism “is an

⁵³ Foucault, *History of Sexuality Vol.1*, 143.

⁵⁴ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at College de France 1977-1978*, ed. Arnold I. Davidson, trans. Graham Burchell (Palgrave, 2009), 108.

⁵⁵ Vernon W. Cisney and Nicolae Morar, “Introduction: Why Biopower Why Now?,” in *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, 6.

⁵⁶ Foucault, *Society must be Defended*, 239.

⁵⁷ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 45.

⁵⁸ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 33.

art of government.” The government here is used in broad terms and liberal governmentality will be discussed in a separate section later. What needs to be clarified here is the relation between pastoral power and its modern descendant, nation-states. Pastoral power is a technique whose ultimate aim

is to assure individual salvation in the next world. It is not merely a form of power which commands; it must also be prepared to sacrifice itself for the life and salvation of the flock. It is a form of power which does not look after just the whole community but each individual in particular. It cannot be exercised without knowing the inside people’s mind, without exploring their souls. It implies a knowledge of the conscience and an ability to direct it.⁵⁹

Pastoral power is about salvation; it necessitates readiness to sacrifice oneself, it requires individuals’ own efforts and willingness. Pastoral power is not just repressive, it is about the care and its role is “to ensure, sustain and improve” lives. Pastoral power or shepherd care for and look after the flock, both the flock and the sheep, treat the injuries and try to prevent sufferings.⁶⁰ Pastoral power is about salvation, and salvation belongs to the afterlife. Foucault claims the role of the pastoral power is maintained in modernity, but not through pastors or shepherds but modern nation-state. The modern state, according to Foucault, adopts the pastoral power with a difference; modern nation-states seek salvation in this world and the meaning of salvation has been altered, “salvation is transformed, to become, instead, health, well-being, sufficient wealth, standard of living, security.”⁶¹ Pastoral power is about the care of the self and others. And in modernity, governmentality makes care of the self and others possible through distributing power to various institutions, doctors, experts, and sovereign individuals. Governmentality is a technique of biopower, and analysis of governmentality will be given after perspectives of biopower are given.

As it is stated before, biopower is about the management of life, life becomes the subject as well as the object of politics. For Foucault, life is an object of knowledge and what is categorized as life has not taken shape until the nineteenth

⁵⁹ Foucault, “The Subject and Power,” 782.

⁶⁰ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 127.

⁶¹ Claire Blencowe, “Foucault’s and Arendt’s insider view of biopolitics: A Critique of Agamben,” *History of Human Sciences* (2010), 124.

century. The concept of life is itself interpreted differently and differences among the approaches to biopower derive firstly from these different interpretations. The political theology approach bases its argument on the division of life into two; zoe and bios whereas Foucault does not refer to such a division. The vital materialist approach gives vitality to life and extends its analysis to non-human beings. These are crucial in analyzing the selected books; in *The Handmaid's Tale*, as in the totalitarian regimes, the survival of individuals is at stake, their bare life. For *The Handmaid's Tale*, one can speak more about the power over life. Individual and collective lives of individuals are subjugated and manipulated for the maintenance of the totalitarian regime. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, one can speak about both the power over life as well as the power of life. Both these powers depend on the knowledge of the vital processes and government of these processes. In trilogy, a post-humanist dimension is added for the government of things and living beings. In a sense, the survival of the human race as well as the life on earth depend on the recognition of vitality of animals, plants, in short, living species. So a posthumanist analysis is necessary and new materialism makes this analysis possible.

4.1.2. The Political Theology Approach to Biopower

For Foucault, in contemporary societies sovereign power has a limited role, it does not have an omnipotent character whereas, from the political theology perspective, sovereign power is the leading figure for contemporary politics. The reason for naming this perspective as political theology is the perspective's adherence to Schmitt's theory of the sovereign, the correlation between theology and the political. Schmitt claims "all significant concepts of the modern theory of the state are secularized theological concepts."⁶² Agamben is the leading figure for the political theology perspective on biopower. Agamben analyses traditional and modern political philosophy. Agamben defines sovereign in relation to Schmitt's theory. Schmitt argues that the sovereign is who decides on the exception and the exception is much more interesting than the rule because it is the exception that proves everything, and it is the exception that determines the rule. Agamben

⁶² *Political Theology Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* (University of Chicago Press, 1985), 36.

maintains this argument about the sovereign. But for him, there is a paradox of sovereignty. The sovereign is outside and inside the juridical order,”⁶³ sovereign’s insideness and outsideness depend on the state, whether it is a state of exception or not. Agamben defines the state of exception as “no-man’s land between public law and political act.”⁶⁴ State of exception is not a law, rather it is the suspension of law, “law’s threshold or limit concept.”⁶⁵ The state of exception has much meaning, it refers to the suspension of law, it indicates the sovereign, and it is a constitutive element for the law itself. The state of exception is not a modern phenomenon but Agamben argues, in modern times, the state of exception is becoming a technique of government rather than an exceptional measure. It becomes constitutive to power.⁶⁶ In modern politics, the exception becomes the rule. In the words of Agamben, “in our age, the state of exception comes more and more to the foreground as the fundamental political structure and ultimately begins to become the rule.”⁶⁷ And when the exception becomes the rule, it is our life, bios, and zoe is in danger.

Agamben, following Ancient Greek terminology regarding the concept of life, distinguishes life into two; zoe, which means natural or biological life, and bios which means political life. The biological life is excluded from regular politics; its inclusion is an exceptional case and at the same time its inclusion is a sovereign decision. Biopolitics refers to the inclusion of natural life into the mechanisms and calculations of the state power, “the species and the individual as simple living body become what is at stake in a society’s political strategies.”⁶⁸ As opposed to Foucault, Agamben argues biopolitics is not a modern phenomenon; it is the original form of politics; “the production of a biopolitical body is the original activity of sovereign

⁶³ *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (Stanford University Press, 1998), 17.

⁶⁴ *State of Exception* (University of Chicago Press, 2005), 1.

⁶⁵ *State of Exception*, 4.

⁶⁶ *State of Exception*, 7.

⁶⁷ *Homo Sacer*, 19.

⁶⁸ *Homo Sacer*, 10.

power. In this sense, biopolitics is at least as old as the sovereign exception.”⁶⁹ For Agamben, the differentiation between the modern and ancient form of biopolitics is in ancient politics, the inclusion of bare life is an exception whereas in modern politics this exception becomes the rule.⁷⁰ Whereas Foucault argues modern politics cannot be explained through juridico-political discourse, through the discourse of sovereignty, for Agamben, it is still the sovereign power and juridical discourse shape the politics and the concentration camps are the biopolitical paradigm of modern politics. The major difference between modern democracies and the classic one is that the freedom and happiness of individuals are put to their bare life in modern democracies, and it is through their bare life individuals are subjected.⁷¹ Agamben argues that the convergence between modern democracy and totalitarianism may be originated from this aporia and claims that unless the link between *zoe* and *bios* is established, and bare life stays as an exception, modern politics will not produce beautiful life for citizens.

Lemke criticizes Agamben's conception of biopolitics by proposing three different sets of problems; “the juridical, the state-centric, and the quasi-ontological framing of biopolitics.”⁷² According to Lemke, Agamben's equation of sovereign and biopolitical disregards the “microphysics of power.” The sovereign is limited to the juridico-discursive model of power, which is one-dimensional and produces a negative and domination relation, which is opposed to the Foucauldian interpretation of power. Lemke maintains, “the binary juxtaposition of *bíos* and *zoé*, political existence and bare life, rule, and exception, refers to that juridical model of power that Foucault criticizes.”⁷³ Lemke claims Agamben owes much to Schmitt than to Foucault. Moreover, Lemke claims Agamben's analysis of biopolitics is

⁶⁹ *Homo Sacer*, 11.

⁷⁰ *Homo Sacer*, 19.

⁷¹ *Homo Sacer*, 13.

⁷² *Biopolitics*, 59.

⁷³ *Biopolitics*, 60.

ahistorical. Lemke argues that the concept of life as we understand today depends on the knowledge of life, which emerged only after the second half of the eighteenth century. “Only with the appearance of modern biology was “life” or the “life force” granted an identity as an independent working principle that described the emergence, preservation, and development of natural bodies.”⁷⁴ Only after life is granted such a meaning, the concept of biopolitical has emerged.

Nikolas Rose poses another critique for Agamben's conceptualization of biopower. Reading the concentration camps as the diagram of biopolitics is misleading. Agamben considers that camps as a possibility due to the increasing regulation and control; he considers this as a rule rather than an exception. It is true these states of exception become more ordinary in contemporary societies; still, the scope of biopower is more than this. Rose and Rabinow argue that “Holocaust is undoubtedly one configuration that modern power can take”⁷⁵ but this is still an exceptional case, it is not the rule as Agamben suggests. It is true that life and the value of life compose the biopolitical agenda, but it is not in the form of a sovereign decision to “make die.” Rose claims “to let die is not to make die - no “sovereign” wills or plans the sickness and death of our fellow citizens.”⁷⁶ By focusing on the sovereign's right to kill, Agamben loses an important dimension of power in general and biopower in particular. Power is multi-dimensional, and power can only be exercised on free subjects.⁷⁷ If people are not free, it will not be a power relation but rather a relation of domination. Besides, the biopower is a productive power and biopower's productive capacity is disregarded in Agamben's interpretation. The regulation of life aims at not destructing life but at fostering life. As Lemke points out Agamben “fails to recognize that biopolitics is essentially a political economy

⁷⁴ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 62.

⁷⁵ Paul Rabinow, and Nikolas Rose, “Biopower Today,” *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, 303.

⁷⁶ Nikolas Rose, *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century* (Princeton University Press, 2007), 58.

⁷⁷ Foucault, “The Subject and Power,” 789.

of life. His analysis remains under the spell of sovereign power and blind to all mechanisms that operate outside the law.”⁷⁸

Achille Mbembe is another figure, who follows the political theological interpretation of biopolitics. His concerns are regarding the sovereign, and following Foucault, he considers the ultimate power of the sovereign is “to dictate who may live and who must die.”⁷⁹ He maintains the exceptional character of the sovereign’s power as Agamben does; its lawlessness, its power over life, right to kill. According to Mbembe, life and death are the “foundational categories” of politics.⁸⁰ His works are related to the colonization and the colonies; he follows Agamben by suggesting that “the colony represents the site where sovereignty consists fundamentally in the exercise of power outside the law and where peace is more likely to take on the face of ‘a war without end.’⁸¹ Colonies, for him, presents the stage of siege since in colonies the right to kill is implemented without any rule, legal or institutional.⁸² The state of siege, he claims, “allows a modality of killing that does not distinguish between external and internal enemy. Entire populations are the target of the sovereign...Invisible killing is added to outright executions.”⁸³ Mbembe defines this condition as necropolitics, which is “the subjugation of life to the power of death.”⁸⁴

Biopolitics can be considered as the power of life as well as power over life. The political theology perspective stresses the negative side of biopolitics; the power over life. It, thus, provides an analysis of the politics of death, thanatopolitics. So,

⁷⁸ *Biopolitics*, 60.

⁷⁹ J-A. Mbembé “Necropolitics,” trans. Libby Meintjes, *Public Culture* 15.1. (2003), 23.

⁸⁰ Mbembé, 14.

⁸¹ Mbembé, 23.

⁸² Mbembe, “Necropolitics,” 25.

⁸³ Mbembe, “Necropolitics,” 30.

⁸⁴ Banu Bargu. *Starve and Immolate: The Politics of Human Weapons* (Columbia University Press, 2014), 78.

there is a divergence in the interpretation of biopower in Foucault and political theology perspective. On the one hand, the political theology perspective insists it is still the sovereign who decides who will live and who will die. On the other hand, Foucault argues when life is suppressed and killed it is done with the claim that this suppression “guarantees life.” Foucault argues in contemporary politics, killing is acceptable only if it guarantees life, only if it eliminates the threats “to the improvement of the species or race.” He states

The more inferior species die out, the more abnormal individuals are eliminated, the fewer degenerates there will be in the species as a whole, and the more I—as species rather than individual—can live, the stronger I will be, the more vigorous I will be. I will be able to proliferate.⁸⁵

For Foucault, the death of the other is acceptable only if it guarantees the betterment of a certain species or a certain race and this is a modern form of racism. And this is different from the sovereign's killing, which bases itself on the juridico-political discourse. It is biopower “in excess of sovereign right.”⁸⁶ The roles that are attributed to the sovereign, to the killing and the biopower diverge in these perspectives.

Political theology interpretation of biopower provides us a negative analysis of biopower, an analysis of power over life. In analyzing contemporary societies, political theology might seem insufficient since contemporary societies are organized around neoliberal rationality that bases itself on human capital and maximization of human capital, and being alive is the precondition of this capital. However, in totalitarian regimes and in war-like situations, where the sovereign is visible more than ever, the political theology perspective is valuable. There are many events in contemporary politics in which exceptions become the rule, those situations are still “hidden possibilities,” thus this analysis of biopower should not be disregarded. Also political theology perspective provides an analysis of life forms and this is crucial for *The Handmaid's Tale*, which is set in a totalitarian regime in which individuals' bare life is at stake. Rather than strict adherence to Foucault's concept of biopolitics, a combined approach is taken here. There is a “zone of

⁸⁵ Foucault, *Society must Be Defended*, 255.

⁸⁶ Foucault, *Society must Be Defended*, 254.

contact”⁸⁷ between biopower and sovereign power in decisions over life-related subjects and the political theology perspective provides the necessary concepts and arguments in such circumstances.

4.1.3. New Materialism and Biopower

New materialism emerges in the 1990s as a result of the decline of the materialist approaches as well as the rise in the poststructuralist theories.⁸⁸ New materialism opposes the 'linguistic turn' of poststructuralism and Marxist 'old materialism.'⁸⁹ New materialism advocates the idea that even though the postmodern theory attacks modern political theory, it maintains its dualist, transcendental, and humanist tradition.⁹⁰ It also asserts vitality to the matter. The new scientific and technological innovations in the natural sciences have great importance in the theorization of new materialism, especially in the area of biomedicine and biotechnology.⁹¹ These developments challenged the social and political organizations, and urge to reorient the conception of matter, life, organic/inorganic, and human beings. New materialism offers a new ontology for matter, opens the possibility for new actancy,⁹² and tries to form a new relationship based on “mutual dependence of material, biocultural and symbolic forces in

⁸⁷ Mitchell Dean, *Governing Societies: Political Perspectives on Domestic and International Rule*, (McGraw-Hill Education, 2007), 157.

⁸⁸ Thomas Lemke, “New Materialisms: Foucault and the ‘Government of Things,’” *Theory, Culture & Society* (2015), 4.

⁸⁹ Sarah Ellenzweig, and John H. Zammito, “Introduction: New Materialism: Looking Forward, Looking Back,” in ed. *The New Politics of Materialism: History, Philosophy, Science* (Routledge, 2017), 4.

⁹⁰ Iris Van der Tuin, and Rick Dolphijn, “The Transversality of New Materialism.” *Women: A Cultural Review* (2010), 164.

⁹¹ Diana Coole, and Samantha Frost, “Introducing the New Materialisms,” in *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics* (Duke University Press, 2010), 18.

⁹² Jane Bennet uses this concept of actant and she argues “an actant can be either human or nonhuman: it is that which does something has sufficient coherence to perform actions, produce effects and alter situations.” “The Force of Things: Step Toward an Ecology of Matter,” 2004, 355,

making of social and political practices.”⁹³ Although it has diverse interpretations in different fields, the common points in all of them are overcoming “anthropocentric” and humanistic tradition as well as the binary divisions such as nature/culture, real/artificial, human/nonhuman-inhuman, organic/inorganic, and so on. Rather than such oppositional thinking, new materialism proposes interconnectedness between humans, other species, and their material world. New materialism is about the repudiation of a “passive mechanistic worldview.”⁹⁴ The world and the things are not passive, inert, and mechanical for this view. It offers a new and extended understanding of life and living beings and a new relation “between life and death.”⁹⁵ New materialism proposes an extension of an agency to non-human and inhuman or more accurately offers the idea of actancy and forms a post humanistic thinking. It seeks out a new ontology, which does not derive from an oppositional way of thinking. Transcending this oppositional way of thinking, and recognition of new forms of lives constitute the very basis of *MaddAddam* trilogy. In *MaddAddam* trilogy not only boundaries between organic/inorganic, real/artificial, nature/culture have been crossed but also the boundary between human and inhuman has been overstepped due to scientific inventions such as human-tissue organ growing in genetically engineered animals and the invention of hybrid species such as Crakers. Therefore an analysis of new materialism is a prerequisite for an analysis of power.

There are varieties of new materialism; Diana Coole and Samantha Frost identify three tendencies within new materialism.

First among them is an ontological reorientation...an orientation that is posthumanist...The second theme entails consideration of a raft biopolitical and bioethical issues concerning the status of life and of the human...Third....a critical and nondogmatic reengagement with political economy, where the nature of, and relationship between, the material details of everyday life and broader geopolitical and socioeconomic structures is being explored.⁹⁶

⁹³ Rosi Braidotti, “The Politics of Life itself and New Ways of Dying,” *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, 2010, p. 203.

⁹⁴ Sarah Ellenzweig, and John H. Zammito, “Introduction: New Materialism: Looking Forward, Looking Back,” 4.

⁹⁵ Braidotti, “The Politics of Life itself and New Ways of Dying,” 209.

⁹⁶ “Introducing the New Materialisms,” 6-7.

Tendencies within new materialism can be summed up as a new ontology, bioethics and biopolitics, and critical materialism.⁹⁷ Although these tendencies are extremely connected and cannot be strictly separated, the concern in this study is related to a posthumanist orientation that is explicitly presented in *MaddAddam* trilogy as well as vital materialism that shares the biopolitical concerns of life and death. Vital materialism shares the argument that contemporary politics as well as capitalism is biopolitical,⁹⁸ life is at the center of politics, but it disagrees with the idea of life belongs to humans only. This argument is based on the assumption that Foucault's biopolitical is anthropocentric such that Foucault prioritizes human beings, his notion of life, as well as subjectivity, belongs to humans. Vital materialism tries to overcome this narrow conception of life and extends it to the nonhumans and things as well, and this is where vital materialism is bound to the posthumanist ontology. So for vital materialism, what is biopolitical in contemporary politics should be "post-anthropocentric". For this dimension, vital materialists turn to Deleuzian vitalism. Deleuze is not considered as vital materialist, but he claims that "everything I've written is vitalistic, at least I hope it is."⁹⁹ Deleuze's vitalism incorporates organic and nonorganic, human and inhuman/nonhuman. In Deleuzian philosophy, "the world is a living world, a vital world."¹⁰⁰ The vital world is composed of assemblages, connects the human and the nonhuman, organic and inorganic. This is a rhizomatic thought, "any point of rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be."¹⁰¹ Rhizome establishes relationships and links, and forms assemblages; rhizome is composed of multiplicities and differences. Rhizome is formed through directions, it does not

⁹⁷ Coole and Frost, "Introducing the New Materialisms," 7-36.

⁹⁸ Rosi Braidotti, "Posthuman Affirmative Politics," in *Resisting Biopolitics*, p. 46.

⁹⁹ *Negotiations*, (Columbia University Press, 1995), 143.

¹⁰⁰ Todd May, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*, p. 117

¹⁰¹ Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. Brian Massumi (University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 7.

have a beginning or an ending, it is in the middle and it is non-hierarchical.¹⁰² Rhizome “is alliance, uniquely alliance...proceeding from the middle, coming and going rather than starting and finishing.”¹⁰³ In rhizomic thought, there are movements of territorialization, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization. Each of these movements marked by becomings.

Becoming is a significant philosophical concept for Deleuze and Guattari. Becoming is about alliances and about difference and multiplicity.¹⁰⁴ “Becoming is the unfolding of difference.”¹⁰⁵ Becoming, like rhizome, forms alliances; it has no subject other than itself, it is not about imitating and produces “nothing other than itself.”¹⁰⁶ Deleuze and Guattari first explore what is mean to becoming-animal; “animals are packs, and that packs form, develop, and are transformed by contagion.” Each pack is formed through multiplicity of animals and in turn these are transformed by contagion. At the same time, in each pack, there is this “anomalous,” or “the outsider,” which is neither an “exceptional individual” nor a species; anomalous constitutes the borderline. The anomalous has several functions; it defines a border for each multiplicity and it is a prerequisite for forming alliances that is necessary to becoming. Becoming is political and “becomings are minoritarian; all becoming is a becoming-minoritarian,”¹⁰⁷ and thus political is minoritarian, it is “an active micropolitics.”¹⁰⁸ They put minoritarian in opposition to the majority. According to Deleuze and Guattari, what constitutes majority is not their quantity. Majority “implies a state of domination,”¹⁰⁹ it defines and determines

¹⁰² Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 21-21.

¹⁰³ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 25.

¹⁰⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 239.

¹⁰⁵ Todd May, “When is a Deleuzian Becoming?”, *Continental Philosophy Review* (2003):143

¹⁰⁶ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 238.

¹⁰⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p. 291

¹⁰⁸ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p. 291

the standard. Minority, on the other hand, is the “subversion of the domination of the majority...from within.”¹¹⁰

Becoming is creativity, it is experimental; becoming is political, and “politics is an experiment.”¹¹¹ Becoming is “affirmation of being, it is the affirmation of difference itself,”¹¹² and this affirmation of difference makes this becoming post anthropocentric. Becoming is not a term that refers only to humans; it refers to all the things that “evolve, mutate, and reconnect,”¹¹³ and this is mechanistic thinking. Deleuze and Guattari have a crucial contribution in mapping how to resist this biopolitical machine. Becoming-animal and also becoming-woman are their terms for resistance. They claim psychoanalysis “killed becoming-animal” by perceiving it as a representative of certain drives whereas, in reality, becoming-animal represents nothing and an effect in itself.¹¹⁴ So becoming-animal for Deleuze and Guattari can be considered as a “political action that enables the resistance to biopolitical power.”¹¹⁵

As it is said above, for vital materialists, Foucault's biopolitics is considered as anthropocentric and appealing to the concept of becoming aims at the repudiation of anthropocentrism. For Foucault, human lives and bodies are objects of knowledges and through biopower, these lives and bodies of individuals are controlled as well as regulated. It is Foucault who insists on the relation between the body, life, and their knowledges, and “his insistence on the productivity of power relations serve as positive references in new materialism.”¹¹⁶ But new materialists

¹⁰⁹ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p. 291

¹¹⁰ Todd May, “When is a Deleuzian Becoming?”, p. 148

¹¹¹ Todd May, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*, p. 133

¹¹² Todd May, “When is a Deleuzian Becoming?”, p. 148

¹¹³ Todd May, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*, p. 124

¹¹⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p. 259

¹¹⁵ Stephen E. Wilmer, and Audronė Žukauskaitė, “Introduction,” *Resisting Biopolitics*, p. 10

¹¹⁶ Thomas Lemke, “New Materialisms: Foucault and the ‘Government of Things’,” p. 4

assert that this productivity of power relations is only concerned with human beings. Lemke develops a counter-argument based on the Foucauldian concept of governmentality. If biopower is understood in terms of the regulation of the physical and biological existence of human beings, then the vital materialists are right in their claim of the anthropocentrism of Foucault's analysis. However, in his later works, Foucault extends his analysis of biopower through the concept of governmentality, which will be discussed in detail in the next section. The concept of governmentality refers not only government of people but also government of things as well as government of the milieu. Foucault defines milieu as "a set of natural givens - rivers, marches, hills - and a set of artificial givens - an agglomeration of individuals, of houses, etcetera. The milieu is a certain number of combined, overall effects bearing on all who live in it."¹¹⁷ The extension of the concept of biopolitics to governmentality repudiates the claim of the new materialist regarding Foucault's anthropocentrism. Lemke argues that Foucault's concept of governmentality refers not only government of human beings but also government of the things. In fact, it is through the art of government that distinction between the human and the thing is made. It is the art of government that determines the subject or the object, or human and inhuman.¹¹⁸ This distinction, Lemke maintains, "is itself an instrument and effect of the art of government."¹¹⁹ For Foucault nature (human nature or non-human nature) is not predetermined or given, it is not taken for granted. Lemke argues, "in the perspective of a government of things, neither nature nor life is a self-evident and stable entity or property...life is not given but depends on conditions of existence within and beyond life processes."¹²⁰ So the shift in the analysis of biopower to governmentality, which implies not only government of individuals but also government of things, opens a new reading for the Foucauldian biopower, which is

¹¹⁷ *Security, Territory, Population*, 21.

¹¹⁸ Thomas Lemke, "New Materialisms: Foucault and the 'Government of Things,'" 10.

¹¹⁹ Thomas Lemke, "New Materialisms: Foucault and the 'Government of Things,'" p. 10

¹²⁰ "Rethinking Biopolitics: The New Materialism and the Political Economy of Life," in *Resisting Biopolitics*, 66.

not anthropocentric and supports vital materialism approach to biopower. As Lemke claims “a posthumanist approach implicit but not developed in Foucault's work.”¹²¹

To conclude this section, new materialism's approach to biopower is developed in line with scientific and technological developments. Through the developments in life sciences, material phenomena are perceived to be “open, complex systems with porous boundaries,”¹²² and new ways of thinking about life, about human, and also about matter emerge. With these new ways of thinking, the concept of biopolitics is also extended. Biopolitics is about the regulation of life but with new scientific developments, what constitutes life and the living have been altered. The political agency, once attributed to human beings, is now understood as an “impersonal kind.”¹²³ This impersonal kind of agency has been explored and experimented with through Deleuze and Guattari's concept of becoming. In the contemporary world, where the boundaries have blurred between real and the artificial, where new inventions and innovations have challenged the concept of natural, and where the interconnectedness of the human and other species have utmost importance for a sustainable future, new materialism provides a new postanthropocentric ground to discuss the present and explore the future. *MaddAddam* trilogy projects the contemporary world, in which boundaries are blurring, new knowledges about life and living beings are produced, and non-human agencies are emerging. Trilogy demonstrates the urge to re-think the relationship between human and inhuman, the interconnectedness of humans with their environment and other species in the light of the scientific and technological developments. Thus, a new materialist approach is added for the analysis of trilogy.

¹²¹ “New Materialisms: Foucault and the ‘Government of Things’,” 8.

¹²² Coole and Frost, “Introducing the New Materialisms,” 15.

¹²³ Jane Bennett. “A Vitalist Stopover on the Way to a New Materialism,” *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, 55.

4.2. Governmentality

Diverse interpretations of biopower embody the importance of the analysis of biopower for understanding contemporary politics. Every power relations are constituted through “a form of truth discourse... strategies for intervention...and classification.”¹²⁴ In this line of argument, biopower “requires a systematic knowledge of “life and of “living beings””¹²⁵ as well as the strategies and techniques of power that “mobilize...generate and disseminate forms of knowledge”¹²⁶ and the modes of subjectivation. This section deals with the strategies and techniques of power that “mobilize...generate...disseminate knowledge” that can be called governmentality.

As it is stated above, power is only exercised on the free subjects, in this sense, power is “action upon action, on existing actions or on those which may arise in the present or the future.”¹²⁷ Action is the precondition of power and government means “to structure the possible field of action of others.”¹²⁸ This structuration presupposes freedom. The relation between the governmentality and pastoral power is briefly given in the previous section. Pastoral power and governmentality take human conduct as their objects. Pastoral power dispersed in religious institutions whereas governmentality dispersed in political institutions.

When the history of the idea of government is analyzed, Foucault claims, before the term gained political meaning in the sixteenth century, government had a semantic meaning; it “refers to the control one may exercise over oneself and others...refers to an intercourse...one never governs a state....those whom one governs are people, individual or groups.”¹²⁹ In the sixteenth century, government

¹²⁴ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 307.

¹²⁵ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 119.

¹²⁶ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 119.

¹²⁷ Foucault. “Subject and Power,” 788.

¹²⁸ Foucault. “Subject and Power,” 789.

was identified with politics and monarchical activities; government was exercised over the territory. When liberalism is formed, and the idea of society is discovered, the administrative monarch is replaced with a new art of government, which is liberalism. Foucault argues that this new art of government took its full shape in the eighteenth century. From then on, government has started from the society; in other words, “person and activities were to be governed through society, that is to say, through acting upon them in relation to a social norm, and constituting their experiences and evaluations in a social form.”¹³⁰ According to Foucault the idea of society is “one of the greatest discoveries of political thought,” after its discovery government, “not only has to deal with a territory, with a domain, and with its subjects, but that it has also deal with a complex and independent reality that has its laws and mechanisms of reaction, its regulations as well as its possibilities of disturbance.”¹³¹

In the mid-eighteenth century, the society is discovered and considered as a “kind of natural collectivity of living beings.”¹³² This natural collectivity is assumed to have its own laws and mechanisms through which individuals should be governed. These laws and mechanisms constitute the basis of liberal governmentality. After the eighteenth century; liberal governmentality is formed and it is composed of “population as its target, political economy as its major form of knowledge, and apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument.”¹³³ The general idea of the liberal form of government is the impossibility of the total administration by a sovereign. Sovereign cannot and should not have the power to control all actions and the economy is the sphere that sovereign power cannot

¹²⁹ *Security, Territory, Population*, p. 122

¹³⁰ Nikolas Rose, “Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies,” *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and the Rationalities of Government* 2013, p. 40.

¹³¹ Foucault, “Space, Knowledge, and Power,” *The Foucault Reader*. p. 242.

¹³² Nikolas Rose, Pat O’Malley, and Mariana Valverde. “Governmentality.” *Annu. Rev. Law Soc. Sci.* 2, 2006, p. 84.

¹³³ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, p. 108.

control and decide on. Governmentality's characteristics of political economy steps in here; “economics...begins to demonstrate not only the pointlessness but also the impossibility of a sovereign point of view over the totality of the state he has to govern.”¹³⁴ So the liberal form of government tries to solve the dilemma between the “non-totalizable multiplicity of economic subject of interest and the totalizing unity of the juridical sovereign”¹³⁵ by governing homo-economicus and his society.

In a liberal form of government, society is considered as natural, with its laws and its dynamics, and government is sustained and maintained according to these laws and through freedom. To govern is to utilize the freedom of the subjects, their freedom to act for realizing their own objectives.¹³⁶ Freedom is both condition and the precondition of the power as well as government.¹³⁷ However, freedom also presupposes the mechanisms of security. There is no contradiction between freedom and security; “freedom is something that could be calculated and arranged,”¹³⁸ and these calculations and arrangements are provided by security mechanisms. Security means here the “protection of the collective interest against the individual interests.”¹³⁹ So the elements of new governmentality are “the society, economy, population, security, and freedom.”¹⁴⁰

Governing through society does not mean the extension of the state to society. The state is not the first actor in governmentality; the idea of government opposes the reduction of power to the state's actions. Foucault argues that state “is only an episode in government, it is not government that is an instrument of the

¹³⁴ Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics*, p. 282.

¹³⁵ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 282.

¹³⁶ Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), 4.

¹³⁷ Foucault, “Subject and Power,” 789.

¹³⁸ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 67.

¹³⁹ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 65.

¹⁴⁰ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 354.

state.”¹⁴¹ Governing through society means inventions of new forms and techniques that govern society through society. The state does not lose its importance, rather it is governmentalized; it becomes a center “that could program - shape, guide, channel, direct, control - events and persons distant from it.”¹⁴² The liberal art of government and governmentalization of the state have led to the rise of expertise. Experts have the “know-how” in specific issues, they have the knowledge of specific subjects; through this liberal art of government, they are installed in the authority to govern the society. Rose and Miller discuss the double alliance that experts enter into with the political authorities and with the individuals.

They would ally themselves with political authorities, focusing upon their problems and problematizing new issues... they would seek to form alliances with individuals themselves, translating their daily worries and decisions over investment into a language claiming the power of truth, and offering to teach them the techniques by which they might manage better, earn more, bring up healthier or happier children and much more besides.¹⁴³

So, experts have become an important instrument for the government of society. They have the knowledge of specific areas thus they provide the legitimacy of the government as well as contribute to the national health by way of merging individual interests to the collective interests.

The spread of welfarism throughout Europe created a much stronger bond between the expertise and the governmentality. Rose and Miller argue that the most important innovation that welfarism comes up with is its attempt to “link the fiscal, calculative, and bureaucratic capacities of the apparatuses of the state to the government of social life.”¹⁴⁴ Welfarism maintains and even strengthens the bond between the individual and the social, the citizen, and society. Individuals (citizens) are social citizens, they have a responsibility towards their society, and they have expectations that would be realized in and with the society.¹⁴⁵ So, what is aimed at

¹⁴¹ *Security, Territory, Population*, 248.

¹⁴² Rose, “Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies,” in *Foucault and Political Reason*, 40.

¹⁴³ “Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government,” *British Journal of Sociology*, (1992), 188.

¹⁴⁴ “Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government,” 192.

welfarism is increasing national growth and well-being “through the promotion of social responsibility and the mutuality of risk.”¹⁴⁶ Social insurance and social work constitute two poles that connect individuals to society. Insurance provides a kind of social solidarity whereas social work “as a means of civilization under tutelage.”¹⁴⁷ Welfare services are provided to all citizens in the name of solidarity. The subjects of the welfare, a subject of need who should “be embraced within, and governed through, a nexus of collective solidarities and dependencies.”¹⁴⁸ In this type of governmentality, the relation between expertise and politics is “substantive”, everything is turned into a “machinery and objective of political government.”¹⁴⁹

Welfarism governs through society but governing through society is not the sole technique of government. In advanced liberal societies, the techniques of government have been altered. In these societies, the possibility “to govern without governing society”¹⁵⁰ opens up. Through governmentality, a different reading of the transition to neoliberal policies can be made. It can be argued that “it is a mistake to see neoliberalism as simply a negative political response to the welfarism or corporatism of previous decades”¹⁵¹ Rather than defining it “as a retreat from the governmental intervention,” it might be described as “re-inscription of the techniques and forms of expertise required for the exercise of government.”¹⁵² This creates new kinds of relationships between the individual and the social, citizenship,

¹⁴⁵ Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 77.

¹⁴⁶ Rose and Miller, “Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government,” 192.

¹⁴⁷ Rose, “Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies,” 58.

¹⁴⁸ Rose, “Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies,” 40.

¹⁴⁹ Rose, “Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies,” 54.

¹⁵⁰ Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, p. 88

¹⁵¹ Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, Nikolas Rose, “Introduction,” *Foucault and Political Reason*, 11.

¹⁵² Barry, Osborne, Rose. “Introduction,” *Foucault and Political Reason*, 14.

and society. Before going into details in governmentality in neo-liberal or advanced liberal societies, what is meant by neoliberalism should be discussed briefly.

In the second chapter, a brief discussion on the characteristics of neo-liberalism is made. However, in that discussion, the characteristics of neo-liberal policies rather than neo-liberal rationality are given. To comprehend governmentality in its full scope, neoliberal rationality should be examined. The rise of neo-liberalism is generally associated with the Mont Pelerin Society, established in 1947. Contrary to this argument, Foucault, Dardot, and Laval claim that the birth of neo-liberalism can be dated earlier. Dardot and Laval claim “The Walter Lippman Colloquium” held in 1938 was the “founding moment of neoliberalism.”¹⁵³ The Mont Pelerin Society is a result or an extension of this Colloquium. The Colloquium was of utmost importance and the participants such as Fredrich Hayek, Ludwig Von Mises, Alexander Rustow are among the ones who shape liberal thought. The aim of the Colloquium, in a sense, is to create new liberal rationality; the future of liberalism was the main subject in the Colloquium and renewed ideas about liberalism were presented, which were mostly contrary to classical liberalism. Several shifts can be observed in this Colloquium, which shape the neoliberal rationality. The most important shift might be the abandonment of laissez-faire liberalism. Laissez-faire is based on the natural order of the market. Market and competitive capitalism were considered as “a product of nature” and any intervention to this natural order would damage the balance of the market. In the Colloquium this idea is refuted by Lippmann's thesis, arguing, “liberalism was not identical with laissez-faire”¹⁵⁴ and “competitive capitalism was not a product of nature, but a machine that demanded constant supervision and regulation.”¹⁵⁵ So, intervention to the market is necessary to create and maintain competitive capitalism.

Another shift can be observed in the object of economic analysis. Neoliberals argue classical economists analyzed only the object of the economic process, such

¹⁵³ *The New Way of the World*, 49.

¹⁵⁴ Dardot and Laval, *The New Way of the World*, 52.

¹⁵⁵ Dardot and Laval, *The New Way of the World*, 63.

as the process of capital, investment, and production. However, for them, economics is an activity. Rather than an analysis of the economic process, they offer “an analysis of the internal rationality, the strategic programming of individual's activity.”¹⁵⁶ For such an analysis, they analyze the labor since they think that the analysis of labor is lacking in the economic analysis. They analyze the labor in economic terms; “labor comprises a capital, that is to say, it as an ability...and on the other side it is an income, a wage.” So the worker has a capital inseparable from him, a capital that in return he earns a wage. This capital involves the “ability to work, skill, the ability to do something cannot be separated from the person who is skilled and who can do this particular thing.”¹⁵⁷ The argument on economics as an activity thus changes the conception of labor. Labor or worker begins to be perceived as a capital, possessed a human capital and this leads to another shift in the idea of homo-economicus. In classical liberalism, homo-economicus is the man of exchange, who acts on the principle of utility. In neo-liberalism homo-economicus is “an entrepreneur, an entrepreneur of himself...being for himself his own capital, being for himself his own producer, being for himself the source of his earnings.”¹⁵⁸ So the framework of neoliberal rationality is revealed; neoliberal rationality, as Dardot and Laval posit “is the generalization of competition as a behavioral norm and of the enterprise as a model of subjectivation.”¹⁵⁹ The characteristics of this new conceptualization of homo-economicus will be discussed in detail in the last chapter. In this section, it should be clarified that liberalism, especially neoliberalism is “a way of doing things,”¹⁶⁰ it is the “form of our existence - the way in which we are led to conduct ourselves, to relate to others and to ourselves.”¹⁶¹ So defining it as simply an ideology or economic policy would be an

¹⁵⁶ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 223.

¹⁵⁷ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 224.

¹⁵⁸ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 226.

¹⁵⁹ *The New Way of the World*, 4.

¹⁶⁰ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 318.

oversimplification of its terrain and effects as well. It is global rationality that puts competition and enterprise at its center. Freedom is a prerequisite in increasing competition and transforming subjects into an entrepreneur of himself/herself.

Advanced liberal or neoliberal societies govern “through the regulated and accountable choices of autonomous agents...and to govern through intensifying and acting upon their allegiance to particular “communities”.”¹⁶² A new type of organization emerged through neo-liberal rationality. Capitalism, first, damaged the communal familial ties and invented the social and then replaced the communal ties with the social tie. With social ties, a consumption system has been established and, in this system, social ties are rendered unnecessary. What is needed in this consumption system is not society but individual responsibility.¹⁶³ In neoliberal societies, governing through society is replaced by governing “at a distance.”¹⁶⁴ The new relations between individuals and politics are formed. In this type of societies governing through freedom can be observed as well. The welfare subject, who is in need and who is bound to the society through her expectations, is now set free; in neoliberal societies the subjects are autonomous, they make their choices according to their needs and they try to enhance their life qualities.¹⁶⁵ What is observed in these societies is not a rupture from the previous techniques of government; governmentality refers to a continuum, it involves not only political government but also government of the self, which can be characterized as ‘technologies of the self.’¹⁶⁶ Now the technologies of the self is organized not around the social but

¹⁶¹ Dardot and Laval, *The New Way of the World*, 4.

¹⁶² Rose, “Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies,” p. 61

¹⁶³ Rose and Miller, “Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government,” 198.

¹⁶⁴ Rose, “Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies,” 57.

¹⁶⁵ Rose and Miller, “Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government,” 200.

¹⁶⁶ Thomas Lemke, “‘The Birth of Bio-politics’: Michel Foucault’s Lecture at the Collège de France on Neo-liberal Governmentality,” *Economy and society* 30.2 (2001): 201.

around the individual; the individual in neoliberal societies is a “responsible and moral individual and an economic-rational actor.”¹⁶⁷

Experts in neoliberal societies are relocated to a market system that is governed by competition and organized around consumer demand.¹⁶⁸ It is the individual who seeks for and reaches the knowledge of the experts in neoliberal societies; citizenship is “active and individualistic rather than passive and dependent.”¹⁶⁹ In these societies, the relation between the individual citizen and the social has been altered. The role and the place of the social have diminished for determination as well as realization of individuals' aspirations. Social citizenship is replaced by being member of communities.¹⁷⁰ Individuals are rendered responsible in the areas of “for social risks such as illness, unemployment, poverty, and so forth, and for life in society, into the domain for which the individual is responsible and transforming it into a problem of “self-care”¹⁷¹ The risk in welfare societies is shared collectively whereas in neoliberal societies the risk management becomes personal responsibility. Freedom and free will have pivotal roles in this new regime. Freedom means “autonomy and enterprise” and requires responsible individuals who are “not just taking risks, but assessing and managing risks, calculating about their potential implications for one's form of life in the future, and taking active steps to secure—and ensure—against them.”¹⁷² The national obligations such as public health and economic growth are bound to individuals' choices and her “activity as consumer.”¹⁷³

¹⁶⁷ Thomas Lemke, “Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique,” *Rethinking Marxism* 14.3. (2002): 59.

¹⁶⁸ Rose, “Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies,” 41.

¹⁶⁹ Peter Miller, and Nikolas Rose, “Governing Economic Life,” *Economy and society* 19.1 (1990): 24.

¹⁷⁰ Rose, “Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies,” 54.

¹⁷¹ Thomas Lemke, “Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique,” 59.

¹⁷² Nikolas Rose, and Filippa Lentzos, “Making Us Resilient: Responsible Citizens for Uncertain Times,” in *Competing Responsibilities: The Politics and Ethics of Contemporary Life*, ed. Susanna Trnka, and Catherine Trundle (Duke University Press, 2017), 31.

The techniques of neoliberal governmentality support and enhance individuals because strengthening individuals are perceived as a more effective form of government than pursuing welfare policies. Government refers to a perspective more than a theory or a concept.¹⁷⁴ It is about to find out an “economic government”, and it is an analysis of “governmental action to find out whether it is necessary and useful or superfluous or even harmful.”¹⁷⁵ Government is an exercise of power and power is “foremost about guidance...governing the forms of self-government, structuring and shaping the field of possible action of subjects.”¹⁷⁶ When perceived this way, the shift to neoliberal policies cannot be considered a paradigm shift or an epochal shift, rather, it can be considered as a new technique, which seems more effective than the previous ones. If neoliberal policies such as privatization, corporatization, and individualization and their consequences such as consumption, commodification, and growing risks are perceived as effects of techniques of governmentality rather than inevitable results of contemporary capitalism, then, the possibility to reverse the effects of these techniques emerges. If government is about shaping the conduct of individuals, then, it is possible to be governed differently. Foucault claims the permanent question of the critique “would be how not to be governed like that, by that, in the name of those principles, with such and such objective in mind and by means of such procedures, not like that, not for that, not by them.”¹⁷⁷ And as the government also refers to “conduct of conduct,” it is possible to conduct oneself differently. Foucault claims, “word for resistance is counter conduct;”¹⁷⁸ and counter conduct refers to a “sense of struggle against the

¹⁷³ Peter Miller, and Nikolas Rose, “Governing Economic Life,” 25.

¹⁷⁴ Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 21.

¹⁷⁵ Thomas Lemke, “The Risks of Security: Liberalism, Biopolitics, and Fear,” in *The Government of life: Foucault, Biopolitics, and Neoliberalism*, 62.

¹⁷⁶ Lemke. “Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique,” 52.

¹⁷⁷ Foucault, “What is Critique?,” in *The Politics of Truth*, 28.

¹⁷⁸ *Security, Territory, Population*, 197.

process implemented for conducting others.”¹⁷⁹ Resistance is the subject of the last chapter, in this chapter the aim is to make an analysis of power relations and techniques of governmentality because they open up the way for resisting power relations. For such an analysis theory should be seen as practices and should be treated as a “box of tool” as Deleuze emphasizes.¹⁸⁰ The perspective of governmentality would not refute the liquid and reflexive modernity theses. Rather, it complements them through a rigorous analysis of neoliberal rationality. Many arguments of liquid modernity and risk society thesis and the society they portray are overlapped with the arguments posed through neoliberal governmentality. What is lacking in these modernity theories is the analysis of the rationality and power mechanisms. Rather than a focus on neoliberal rationality, these modernity theses put forward the consequences of this rationality. So, this chapter is an attempt to make an analysis of power and biopower together with neoliberal rationality, the techniques of government in order to reveal the historical correlation of the specific techniques and power relations. Through this way, the possible ways out as well as flights of escapes from the ongoing power relations can be detected.

4.3. Power in *The Handmaid’s Tale*

Early twentieth-century dystopias are generally about totalitarian regimes, which rule either through fascist/communist tendencies or through science and technology. However, after the 1960s, this tendency has shifted towards more technology-oriented fictions in which “growing threats of the loss of humanity, or identity, and of free will and then the possibility of our real extinction” become the central concern.¹⁸¹ Although written in 1985, *HT* portrays a dystopic future that reserves both totalitarian fear and the fear of loss of identity, and it is not a technology-oriented dystopia. Totalitarian regimes are the product of modernity and

¹⁷⁹ *Security, Territory, Population*, 201.

¹⁸⁰ Gilles Deleuze, and Michel Foucault, “Intellectuals and Power,” *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. Donald F. Boucard, trans. Donald F. Boucard and Sherry Simon (Cornell University Press, 1996), 208.

¹⁸¹ Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History*, 271.

the religious foundation of the Gileadean regime seems incompatible with the warning quality of dystopias since it seems not possible to rule through religious means in contemporary politics. Anti-secularism seems in opposition to the dystopian tradition, but it should be emphasized again that most of the dystopias produce some kind of a higher authority to be followed, a secular religion. This could be rationality, science, or technology. The return to religion as a source of authority may be considered as one option among others.

The power presented in *HT* will be evaluated under three sections; the first part is devoted to the analysis of the relation between power and truth based on the argument that “there can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourse of truth.”¹⁸² This section covers the Gileadean regime and the post-Gileadean era since the details of the regime of the truth in pre-Giledean times are not given in detail. Thus, the analysis of some of the approaches above may not be suited for the first section. The first section can be considered as the analysis of the regime of truth in Gilead and post-Gilead. Truth and knowledge are necessary elements in government of individuals; thus, the first section is crucial in forming a background about the relationship of truth, knowledge, and power. The second section is devoted to an analysis of the power of pre-Gilead, and the last one devoted to power within Gilead. Although the exact date of the novel is not known, the emphasis on Offred's mother's involvement in the feminist movement gives the reader the clue that during the 1960s and 70s Offred was a child, and the novel is set around the 1990s and 2000s when Offred was thirty-three years old. Before the Gileadean regime is established, the USA is projected as a free, democratic state. The academic panel on Gilead given at the end of the book takes place at 2195 so Gilead may last two centuries long. The collapse of Gilead, however, does not bring an ideal future and this will be discussed in later sections.

4.3.1. Power and Truth in *The Handmaid's Tale*

As discussed in the previous chapter, positivist science seeks universal and objective truth. When science has the claim over truth, it has the power over

¹⁸² Foucault, “Two Lectures,” 93.

“functioning of society, and admittedly indirect and obscure relation to the satisfaction of general needs.”¹⁸³ Power and truth are connected; power produces truth. “Where there is power, where power is necessary, where one wishes to show effectively that this is where the power lies, there must be truth.”¹⁸⁴ There can be no truth without a relation of power and no power without “a manifestation of truth.”¹⁸⁵ All power depends on some kinds of truth and government of men depends on know-how, on “knowledge of the order of things and the conduct of individuals.”¹⁸⁶ Governmentality, from this perspective, means individuals' subjugation in social practice “through mechanisms of power that adhere to a truth.”¹⁸⁷ So every power mechanisms produce their own truth through which individuals are governed and integrated in social practices. This form of truth gives government “a kind of ethical basis for its actions.”¹⁸⁸

For Atwood, truth is an important element in writing. She emphasizes the role of the writer as an eyewitness and her protagonists always try to reveal the truth, not the objective truth that science seeks for and depends on, but their subjective truth and through this revelation, they, somehow, possess power. The dystopian narrative sets a perfect example of the strong relationship between power and truth. In general, what is observed in dystopias is that the regime requires the production of truth; dystopian present (or future) is formed around a discourse of truth that would refute and invalidate the past regime and construct and support the new one. The truth is constantly produced by the regime in a way to strengthen the regime's power and control over individuals. The regime of truth in dystopias is generally

¹⁸³ Horkheimer, *Critical Theory*, 216.

¹⁸⁴ Michel Foucault, *On the Government of the Living: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1979-1980*, ed. Arnold I. Davidson, trans. Graham Burchell (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 7.

¹⁸⁵ Foucault, *On the Government of the Living*, 4.

¹⁸⁶ Foucault, *On the Government of the Living*, 4-5.

¹⁸⁷ Foucault, “What is Critique,” 32.

¹⁸⁸ Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 27.

transmitted through the use of propaganda, through the media and education. Individuals are compelled to believe in the regime; they are made to think that the regime is for their own good and the rules and the norms are the best possible option for them. These are done mostly through rewritten history, erasure of memory, manipulation of language, and truth. Tom Moylan claims in dystopias “control over the means of language, over representation and interpellation, is a crucial weapon and strategy.”¹⁸⁹ Control over the language and representation constitute the very structure of truth. Dystopias, which project totalitarian regimes, mostly play with the truth as well as history and language for their effective uses in the regime's protection. For instance, in *1984*, Orwell presents a Minister of Truth, which reappropriate the old newspaper with the Party's current propaganda. The main goal of the Minister of Truth is rewriting history in line with the present. Orwell focuses mainly on memory, language, and also objective truth. In *1984*, we are reminded, “this 'truth' might actually be mutable if enough effort was devoted to the task.”¹⁹⁰ The truth is a crucial part of setting dystopian fiction. In correlation with the function of the truth in dystopias, dystopian writers also concern about the truth and its role in society. For example, according to Orwell, the function of writing and writers “is to tell the truth, not to sell dreams.”¹⁹¹ In parallel with Orwell, Atwood claims that writing is a form of “truth-telling.”¹⁹² Atwood and Orwell share similar ideas about the function of writing and the writers, its function of truth-telling but they also recognize the intimate relationship between the truth and power and how truth can be produced by the power, for its own sake, on very slippery ground.

Before the Gileadean regime is established, the USA projected as a free, advanced liberal society. The details of this free and democratic past in relation to its truth regime are not given. Thus, it is more appropriate to leave the discussion of the relation between the power and truth and relation between power and knowledge

¹⁸⁹ *Scraps of the Untainted Sky*, 149.

¹⁹⁰ Claeys, *Dystopia A Natural History*, 413.

¹⁹¹ Claeys, *Dystopia A Natural History*, 431.

¹⁹² Atwood, *Second Words*, 348.

in advanced liberal societies to the next section, the section on *MaddAddam* trilogy since trilogy contains more about the regime of truth and government of individuals. In *The Handmaid's Tale*, the truth regime in Gilead is given in detail as well as the truth regime after its collapse. These will be focal points for this section. Foucault argues that there are five important characteristics of the political economy of truth

'Truth' is centred on the form of scientific discourse and the institutions which produce it; it is subject to constant economic and political incitement...; it is the object, under diverse forms, of immense diffusion and consumption...; it is produced and transmitted under the control, dominant if not exclusive, of a few great political and economic apparatuses...; lastly, it is the issue of a whole political debate and social confrontation...¹⁹³

Truth is a kind of scientific discourse. The production of truth is motivated by the economy and politics. It is as necessary as economic production for the political power; truth is produced to be consumed; it is controlled by and transmitted by the political and economic apparatuses and the claim to truth or the legitimacy over truth constitutes struggles. Truth is neither neutral nor has an objective stance. It is produced for specific purposes; and in the production of truth or knowledge, many knowledges are subjugated, they are made disqualified.¹⁹⁴ Truth is produced and transmitted in order for the functioning of the system and this constitutes the very core of the power relations. Each modality of power produces its own discourses of truth and internalization of this discourse on truth consolidates power relations. These characteristics of truth make individuals governable in certain ways; through the forms of truth, individuals know themselves in certain ways and conduct their behavior "in the name of certain objectives."¹⁹⁵ Although in advanced liberal societies, the regime of truth is organized around freedom and liberties, in totalitarian regimes, the truth is more directly dictated by the regime itself. In totalitarian regimes there are no sovereign individuals who know themselves through the regime of truth and conduct their behavior accordingly; there is sovereign power (maybe an individual or a collective unit, or a state) that makes individuals know themselves in a certain way and makes them conduct their

¹⁹³ "Truth and Power," in *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge*, 131.

¹⁹⁴ Foucault, "Two Lectures.", 82.

¹⁹⁵ Rabinow and Rose, "Biopower Today," 302.

behavior in the “name of certain objectives.” Governing at a distance principle, which is peculiar to advanced industrial societies, cannot be observed in totalitarian regimes; in such regimes, governing is more direct.

Atwood, in the introduction of *The Handmaid’s Tale*, states that Gilead is based on “seventeenth-century Puritan roots that have always lain beneath the modern-day America thought we knew.”¹⁹⁶ The regime of truth is organized around this religion. When the sources of truth are rooted in Christianity, government of individuals would be based on the Church’s teachings by pastorate. Pastoral power “is only concerned with individual souls insofar as this direction of souls also involves a permanent intervention in everyday conduct, in the management of lives, as well as in goods, wealth, and things.”¹⁹⁷ In Gilead, the role of the pastorate is given to the Aunts but Aunts do not govern all people, they only govern the Handmaid’s, and the rest, especially men are guided and governed according to the Bible. Women, except the Aunts, do not have access to the books; they do not have access to Bible as well; so, they are governed by their husbands or by the heads of the Household (Commanders). In Gilead, the Handmaids are considered as sinners (since they either had an unlawful marriage or they are homosexuals or had an abortion). As the Handmaids are composed of sinners, they need purification of their soul and guidance for their actions. Red Centre is the place where Handmaids are re-educated, their souls are purified, and learn their duties towards themselves as well as towards their society. Their duty is to bear children and this duty is legitimized based on the old story of Rachel and Leah (this is the original name of Red Centre, Rachel and Leah Re-Education Centre).

Biblical texts are the sources of education in Red Centre but they are appropriated “to institute and enforce harsh political control, to shape a political reality for its citizens.”¹⁹⁸ In the Red Centre, the first education that Handmaids’ are given is to renounce their identities, forget their pasts, their names, their relatives as

¹⁹⁶ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, x.

¹⁹⁷ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 154.

¹⁹⁸ Karen Stein, “Margaret Atwood’s Modest Proposal: The Handmaid’s Tale,” *Canadian Literature*, (1996): 61.

well as their past lives. They are also educated in a way that weakens and degrades their relationship with each other so that “the modes of domination and control of physical force political power, conflicting individual interests, and intrapsychic control are internalized by those who are subjected to the regime.”¹⁹⁹ In the Red Center, the Handmaids’ are given speeches about how terrible the past was, how there was no protection for women, how “freedom to” causes many disturbances in society especially for women, and how “freedom from” is for the benefit of the women and especially for the Handmaids and should not be underrated.²⁰⁰ So the truth about the past is rewritten; The Handmaids are brainwashed and Offred says, “it has taken so little time to change our minds, about things like that.”²⁰¹ For Handmaids, the education and manipulation begin at the Red Center but outside the Red Center, the propaganda of the regime continues. In Gilead, many books as well as magazines are forbidden. The newspapers are censored and the news on TV is controlled. The prohibition of books ensures the erasure of the memory of the past collectively and individually. “It is authoritarian, hegemonic discourse shapes the narrative about the past and collective memory to the point that individual memory has been erased.”²⁰² The news is controlled and manipulated by the regime, the sources of the news, and the reliability of the news is ambiguous.

Truth regime in Gilead derives from religious sources and spread and maintained through all kinds of means as well as institutions exist in Gilead. Though, religion or religious texts are reappropriated in accordance with the regime's need. This regime is different than the free societies; in free societies, there are varieties sources of the regime of truth for different aspects of lives; different for health, for education, as well as for wealth. And in free societies, these different aspects of lives are governed by competition or rather through a political economy of life. In such societies the truth regime does not demand total obedience or

¹⁹⁹ Peter G. Stillman, and S. Anne Johnson, “Identity, Complicity, and Resistance in *The Handmaid’s Tale*,” 75.

²⁰⁰ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 34.

²⁰¹ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 38.

²⁰² Raffaela Baccolini, “The Persistence of Hope in Dystopian Science Fiction,” 520.

submission, it requires freedom for the subjects, to be the object as well as the subject of the government whereas in totalitarian regimes, obedience and submission are demanded. In Gilead, it is known that there is no total obedience, as there are resistances both as individual acts as well as collective movements. In pure obedience, there would be no resistances, and when there is pure obedience, there are no power relations.²⁰³ Nevertheless, there are no varieties in the regime of truth. Only the past experiences can be sources of a regime of truth for an individual and these experiences are repressed, erased, or reshaped. People, especially women, in Gilead possess little freedom to enjoy and before the law, they only possess “freedom from.”²⁰⁴ Their rights and freedoms are replaced with duties and obligations. As will be discussed in the next chapter, the power regime in Gilead is based more on sovereign power and disciplinary power whereas the regime legitimizes itself on the basis of biopower. Each has different regimes of truths but what is observed in everyday experiences of people as well as within the institutions, the regime of truth is constructed around the sovereign's will, in more juridical terms and also through a regime of normalization.

The academic panel on Gilead, given at the end of the book, reveals another regime of truth and thus another power relation. This academic panel is discussed in the second chapter in relation to the clash of modernism and postmodernism. Piexito, the keynote speaker, is projected as a man of science and he searches for the objective truth in Offred's tapes, but what he finds is just subjective insights. Pieixoto claims to analyze the text scientifically, thus he tries to be neutral and not “passing moral judgments upon”²⁰⁵ culturally specific issues. He tries to be neutral but also he legitimizes the regime in a sense by saying that “Gileadean society was under a good deal of pressure, demographic and otherwise, and was subject to factors from which we ourselves are happily more free.”²⁰⁶ He perceives these

²⁰³ Foucault, “Subject and Power,” 794.

²⁰⁴ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 34.

²⁰⁵ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 314.

²⁰⁶ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 314.

pressures as a legitimization for a repressive and totalitarian regime. He claims that before Gilead is established, in the USA there is serial polygamy and in Gilead, it is replaced with “simultaneous polygamy.” For the sake of objectivity, he misses an important aspect of the lives before Gilead, freedom. He defines “organized, state rape” as “simultaneous polygamy.” He bases his argument on “the sociobiological theory of natural polygamy,”²⁰⁷ which is a justification of the regime's systemic rape for him. He also asserts that Gilead is patriarchal in form whereas matriarchal in content. The role given to Aunts, the education of the Handmaids' as well as their power of control and surveillance within the system, is considered as matriarchy whereas none of the women in Gilead, including Aunts, can be in a leading political position. There is strong patriarchy and even Aunts do not have privileges like an ordinary man, except for reading.

From the point of view of Piexito, Offred's tapes are subjective and constitute “subjugated knowledges,” which are disqualified knowledges due to lack of “scientific qualities.” Piexito is reluctant to put any value or any credibility to these tapes. In modern times, science has the claim over truth, and scientific truth claims to be neutral, to be objective. Piexito's analysis of Gilead, his arguments, his deductions claim to be neutral and objective, whereas, in the pursuit of objectivity, Piexito rewrites the history of Gilead. He mostly rejects the subjective insights that tapes offer, rather he proposes “objective arguments” that mostly clash with the tapes. He uses his power over truth. He claims at the end that “the past is a great darkness, and filled with echoes...we cannot always decipher them precisely in the clearer light of our own day.”²⁰⁸ If there is “no shadow unless there is also light”²⁰⁹ then, there is no light unless there is also shadow.²¹⁰ And Atwood shows that this shadow is the shadow of neutrality and claims to objective truth. Truth cannot be produced without the power mechanisms that support it.

²⁰⁷ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 320.

²⁰⁸ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 324.

²⁰⁹ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 115.

²¹⁰ David Ketterer, “Margaret Atwood's ‘The Handmaid's Tale’: A Contextual Dystopia,” *Science Fiction Studies* (1989): 214.

4.3.2. Power Structure Before Gileadean Regime

In the second chapter, the modernity portrayed in *HT* is discussed in relation to theories of modernity, especially with those that have a critical approach to modernity because dystopias are critical by nature. A critical perspective for the organization of society is structured and maintained starting with Weber's analysis of modernity in relation to purposive rationality or instrumental rationality. And then an analysis of totalitarianism that is regarded as intrinsic to modernity is made. Now the aim is to fulfill this analysis with a question of power strategies that lead to totalitarian regimes. The theories of modernity that discussed in the previous chapter, in general, lack a strong analysis of power, so the aim is to complement them with an analysis of power, especially with an analysis of biopower based on the argument that the modern form of power is biopower. So, the general argument in this section revolves around the power mechanisms that make totalitarianism possible and even intrinsic to modernity and their portrayal in *The Handmaid's Tale*.

The Handmaid's Tale is unique in several ways within the dystopian genre. Some of its special characteristics are given above such as the gender of the protagonist, religious orientation of the regime, and the limited role given to science and technology. Another crucial characteristic should be given to start an analysis of power relations. In dystopias, power relations and excessive uses of power are explicitly portrayed. In general, the rules and the norms of the regime in the dystopias are accepted and internalized by the inhabitants; they do not question the norms, norms are treated as a natural sequence of things. However, at some point, the protagonist acknowledges the flaws of the regime. And the reader is given the changing perception and the journey of the protagonist. “Dystopian narratives with their account of what happens to a specific character offer a readerly pleasure that lies in the process of following the protagonist as she or he finally comes to see the society for what it is and then acts against it.”²¹¹ What is distinctive about *HT* and its protagonist, Offred, is that nobody truly internalizes the rules of the regime exactly. The commitment to the regime is ambiguous; nobody knows or decides who is the true believer and who is not. Not only do the Commanders and Wives

²¹¹ Raffaella Baccolini, and Tom Moylan, “Critical Dystopia and Possibilities,” in *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*, ed. Rafaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan (Routledge, 2003), 243.

openly break the rules of the regime but also the rules are broken by the regime itself with the establishment of clubs like Jezebel's. Beauchamp argues that a significant feature of the dystopian tradition is the struggle, "in which the rebellious protagonist confronts the apologist for the evil regime."²¹² He maintains that there is no such "agon" in the *HT* and according to him *HT* loses the most important dystopian quality.

The struggle is indeed a crucial feature for the dystopian genre; it reflects the wrongdoings as well as the perception of better ways of doing things. Contrary to what Beauchamp claims, there is a struggle in *HT*, but this struggle does not start with the totalitarian takeover. The dystopian future (Gileadean regime) is built upon the past experiences, and the free past and the unfree, repressive present are not separate. The distinctiveness of *HT* within the dystopian genre derives from the fact that neither the past nor the present are glorified, and the struggle is not only towards the totalitarian regime but the regime that makes this totalitarianism possible. As without the struggle against the so-called free, democratic past that ends up with totalitarianism, another form of repressive power may be formed in the future (this fear is explicitly reflected in the Historical Note part). So, the struggle given in *HT* does not start with an enlightened protagonist that began to realize the flaws of the regime as most of the dystopia does; rather, it starts with the critical engagement to the historical formation of the present and the historical formation of the present can be traced through an analysis of power. The present task is in line with the previous chapter with a difference; rather than the analysis of society as a whole, it will be an analysis of power that structures society.

A brief introduction on the relation between capitalism and power mechanism is made at the beginning of this chapter. Foucault claims the necessity of disciplinary mechanisms in achieving and maintaining the success of capitalism. Foucault is not the first one that proposes this argument; in *The Protestant Ethic*, Weber offers a strong relation between capitalism and discipline. According to Weber, the development of capitalism is part of the process of rationalism.²¹³

²¹² Beauchamp, "The Politics of The Handmaid's Tale," 21.

²¹³ *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (Routledge, 2005), 37.

Capitalism requires disciplining of individuals as much as it requires an investment of capital. It requires “rational utilization of capital in a permanent enterprise and the rational capitalistic organization of labor.”²¹⁴ Disciplining of individuals necessitates a general rationalization in human conduct and Weber claims that this becomes possible through Protestantism, which can be defined as “a systemic rational ordering of the moral life as a whole.”²¹⁵ However, this systemic rational ordering has resulted in instrumental rationality; which derives from “the Puritan obsession with calculation, impersonal rules and self-discipline.”²¹⁶ Instrumental or economic rationality is crucial in spreading capitalism within the economic sphere in the modern era; capitalism or more generally economic sphere also “educates and selects the economic subjects which it needs through a process of economic survival of the fittest.”²¹⁷ This is where an analysis of the power mechanism becomes necessary through which the formation of such economic subjects can be understood.

As it is stated above, capitalism necessitates the circulation of money as well as labor, which is possible through freedom. Liberalism produces freedom but each freedom comes with its own control mechanisms; liberalism creates “forms of coercion and obligations relying on threats...”²¹⁸ These threats are about the danger that individuals are exposed and will be exposed in the future. The exercise of freedom requires the calculation of the risks and dangers that will shadow the exercise of freedom, which eventually leads to the formation of control mechanisms. Thus “control is no longer just the necessary counterweight to freedom...it becomes its mainspring.”²¹⁹ Control and freedom are creating one another and cannot be

²¹⁴ *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 22-23.

²¹⁵ *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 79.

²¹⁶ Alexander, the Dark Side of Modernity, 36.

²¹⁷ Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 20.

²¹⁸ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 46.

²¹⁹ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 66-67.

considered in their singularity. Liberalism is an art of government through which control and freedom are organized. Liberalism is “the management of freedom,”²²⁰ and by managing freedom, liberalism also sets certain boundaries and limits to the exercise of freedom. So, a seeming contradiction emerges at the heart of liberalism; “relationship between the production of freedom and that which is the production of freedom risks limiting and destroying it.”²²¹ It is a problematic relation between freedom and control mechanisms; control mechanisms ought to protect freedom while destroying it.

These control mechanisms are crucial in understanding totalitarianism. Without the control of certain liberties and established security mechanisms, the totalitarian rule is not possible. Freedom comes with the security apparatus; this security apparatus is an essential element in governing individuals as well as their milieu. Governmentality is the management of the population; it is the management of the contingency. The aim of governmentality or the security mechanism “will try to plan a milieu in terms of events or series of events or possible elements, of series that will have to be regulated within a multivalent and transformable framework.”²²² Through providing freedoms, security mechanisms become “the regulator of a milieu, which involved not so much establishing limits and frontiers, or fixing locations, as, above all and essentially, making possible, guaranteeing, and ensuring circulations; the circulation of people, merchandise, and air, etcetera,”²²³ and freedoms as means of ensuring this circulation are the condition of governing well.²²⁴ Security may be seemed as a juridical concept as such that it is provided as well as protected through the laws. However, it is not a juridical concept according to Foucault. Security presupposes a social life; “It relies on statistical facts, risk

²²⁰ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 64.

²²¹ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 64.

²²² Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 28.

²²³ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 29.

²²⁴ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 353.

calculations, social routines, and so forth.”²²⁵ So security is the management of social life rather than being strictly a juridical concept.

In *HT*, the past is illustrated as an advanced industrial society. In advanced liberal societies, governing through society is replaced by governing through “the regulated choices of individual citizens.”²²⁶ Neoliberal rationality makes individuals self-responsible in calculating and managing risks; it creates neoliberal subjects. Individuals are made responsible for their actions and choices; they've lost the connection between the citizen and society. Now the society is composed of self-responsible individuals and if there is any, their “self-governing community.”²²⁷ So what matters now is not the society but individuals themselves, their choices, their close communities. Offred portrays an example of a neoliberal subject, and the detail of this kind of subjectivation will be discussed in the last chapter. Here, the crucial thing to emphasize is the connection between the neoliberal subject and the road to totalitarianism. Offred is an individual living in an advanced industrial society and adopts neoliberal rationality. She is concerned with herself, her family, and her close friends. Atwood demonstrates no other bond that Offred has. Offred's mother and her close friend Moira are demonstrated as part of the community; part of feminist and queer communities. Rose argues that in advanced liberal societies, community becomes the new way of governing people, he claims “politics was to be returned to citizens not just in the form of individual morality but also in terms of community responsibility.”²²⁸ For him, the community is a powerful political force. So, in *HT*, Atwood gives two aspects of advanced industrial societies; self-governing individuals without any collective bonds and communal responsibility. However, it should be emphasized that self-governing individuals and community is not “antithetical,” it is still the self-governing individuals who compose

²²⁵ Lemke, “The Risks of Security: Liberalism, Biopolitics, and Fear,” 67.

²²⁶ Rose, “Governing ‘Advanced’ Liberal Democracies,” 41.

²²⁷ Rose, “Governing ‘Advanced’ Liberal Democracies,” 56.

²²⁸ Nikolas Rose, and Filippa Lentzos. “Making Us Resilient: Responsible Citizens for Uncertain Times,” 33.

communities.²²⁹ Offred's responsibility towards herself and her inner circle ends up with not-taking responsibility at all. And, communal responsibility of Moira and Offred's mother is not strong enough to destroy the patriarchy as well as inequality and not strong enough to prevent the totalitarian take-over. The positive force of community that Rose puts great importance on cannot be found in *HT*. What is found is individualization as a result of neoliberal rationality. Nevertheless, the positive implications of belonging to a community, to be part of something, to be courageous to defend the rights and freedoms can be found in Offred's appraisal of her friend. Offred perceives her passivity and generally does not give positive power to passivity. Moira has always been an activist, when they have met in Jezebel, Offred says "I hear in her voice is indifference, a lack of volition... But how can I expect her to go on, with my idea of her courage, live it through, act it out, when I myself do no? I don't want her to be like me. Give in, go along, save her skin."²³⁰ The bare survival is, at last, what Moira chooses and Offred expects much more from Moira, much more from what Offred does all the time because survival is what Offred chooses. And in the previous chapter on modernity, it is argued, "in contemporary dreams, the image of progress seems to have moved from the discourse of shared improvement to that of individual survival."²³¹ Governing through an individual's responsibility has led to such a conclusion; the individual perceives herself and her life as the only thing that matters, that needs improvement, and in worse cases, only her life requires a struggle for survival.

HT focuses more on the totalitarian regime, whereas the details of the roots of the totalitarian regime, the free past is barely given. In *HT* the choices of individuals are represented as the main reasons that lead totalitarian take-over. The choices of individuals are considered as "too much choice" by the totalitarian regime, which would eventually lead to totalitarian take-over whereas the protagonist considers the choices they have made, is mostly about ignoring. Offred tells, "we lived, as usual, by ignoring. Ignoring isn't the same as ignorance, you have

²²⁹ Mitchell Dean, *Governing Societies: Political Perspectives on Domestic and International Rule*, 90.

²³⁰ Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale*, 261.

²³¹ Bauman, *Liquid times*, 103.

to work at it.”²³² To ignore things, she claims, one has to work on it since one has to make a lot of choices to ignore things, to look the other ways, to interpret things as “isolated incidents.”²³³ To consider one's life and one's experiences as isolated is the result of advanced industrial societies. The techniques of governmentality are not implicit in *HT*. A more comprehensive discussion on these techniques will be analyzed in the section on *MaddAddam* trilogy.

4.3.3. The Power Regime in Gilead

In Gilead, it is the bare survival of the population that is at stake; the maintenance of the biological existence provides with the sole legitimacy of the regime. The maintenance of the population depends on procreation, and it is trying to be achieved through the control of sexual relations, or more accurately through the control of female sexuality. So, the control of women's sexuality constitutes the very basis of the order of the regime. Sexuality becomes the main concern for the regime; it is controlled by the regime on the basis of the maintenance of the population. Sexuality is important as it is at the intersection between the disciplinary power and biopower; “sexuality functions not only as a tool of normalization but also as a tool of population management.”²³⁴ In Gilead private sexual relations and sexuality do not exist, the norms on sexuality “are turned into performance and spectacle.”²³⁵ Sexuality is only for reproduction and reproduction is distributed according to the hierarchical order. Commanders who do not have children are given Handmaids and Commanders high in rank in the hierarchy are able to pick among the Handmaids.²³⁶ Procreation is also a savior for the Handmaids. Life, with all its dimensions, is at the center of politics.

²³² *The Handmaid's Tale*, 66.

²³³ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 73.

²³⁴ Todd May and Ladelle McWhorter, “Who's Being Disciplined Now? Operations of Power in a Neoliberal World,” 247-248.

²³⁵ Pamela Cooper, “Sexual Surveillance and Medical Authority in Two Versions of The Handmaid's Tale,” *Journal of Popular Culture* 28.4 (1995): 56

The Gileadean regime is structured around different Households. The head of these households are the Commanders and Commanders are at the top of the hierarchy, they are the rulers. Gilead is portrayed as one giant family, formed around different households and established in order to provide with living in harmony.²³⁷ The illustration of Gilead as a family is critical; organization around family belongs to the ancient era and in the ancient times, family belongs to the private realm, “where the household head ruled with uncontested, despotic powers.”²³⁸ The private realm is the realm of inequalities and through this inequality, it is distinguished from the public, which “knew only ‘equals.’”²³⁹ A strict hierarchy exists in the family as well as in the regime. Portraying the people living in Gilead as a family means there would be no politics, there would be no equality because equality belongs only to the public realm.²⁴⁰

The totalitarian rule in Gilead legitimizes itself on the basis of the decreasing birth rates and the Gileadean regime has to provide maintenance of an increase in the population through controlling women’s body and especially the body of the fertile women; so biopower is explicitly at work in Gilead. However, in Gilead, the productive side of biopower is less visible. An analysis of the power structure in Gilead requires an analysis of sovereign power. Foucauldian approach to biopower attributes a limited role to the sovereign in contemporary life, sovereign power is limited to the juridical structure. However, in Gilead sovereign power is beyond the limits of the juridical sphere. So, it is necessary to complement the analysis with a different perspective of sovereignty. Sovereign power is explicit in totalitarian regimes. But this sovereign is not the sovereign that Foucault defines. There, in a sense, emerges an “evolution of sovereign power.”²⁴¹ In contemporary politics,

²³⁶ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 316.

²³⁷ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 171.

²³⁸ Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 27.

²³⁹ Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 32.

²⁴⁰ Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 32.

especially in repressive regimes, there exists a “paradox of the relations of power...conjunction of sovereignty, discipline, and government, of a politics of life and a politics over life itself.”²⁴² Bargu defines this power as biosovereignty that connects sovereignty, discipline, and security not in their “pure and distinct form” but “independently constituted and operative.”²⁴³ In *HT*, a combination of mechanisms of sovereign power, discipline, and biopower exist and their existence brings forth something new and something that cannot be defined in their pure form. The combination of these forms of power creates total warfare, which is waged “on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity.”²⁴⁴ The war within Gilead is waged on the behalf of the existence of the population; it is not waged “in the name of a sovereign who must be defended.” As the motivation behind the war is the guarantee of a life of a species, one can find modern racism in here through which biopower legitimizes its killing. As Foucault states “the death of the other, the death of the bad race, of the inferior race (or the degenerate, or the abnormal) is something that will make life in general healthier: healthier and purer.”²⁴⁵ The guarantee of the maximization of life requires the killing of the inferior ones as well as the useless ones.

Gileadean regime presents a great example of the intersection and the existence of all modalities of power simultaneously. Sovereign power can be observed in the juridical exercises of the regime such as punishments, rituals, and ceremonies as well as in the determination of the value of life and termination of life. Disciplinary power can be seen in the re-education of the Handmaid's and within their daily routines and the logic of biopower constitutes the fundamental

²⁴¹ Bargu, *Starve and Immolate: The Politics of Human Weapons*, 45.

²⁴² Bargu, *Starve and Immolate*, 50.

²⁴³ Bargu, *Starve and Immolate*, 51.

²⁴⁴ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Vol.1, 137.

²⁴⁵ Society must be defended, 255.

basis of the regime. As it is stated earlier three modalities of power; sovereign power, disciplinary power, and biopower do not exclude each other; they are not sequential in the sense that the emergence of one does not lead to the disappearance of the other. All these three still exist in contemporary societies with their different techniques. However totalitarian regimes mobilize all three modalities of power in their extremes, so all these modalities of power and their functioning are more visible and pervasive than in modern or contemporary democracies.

As opposed to modern democracies, in totalitarian regimes, biopower is more effective in mobilizing its power over life rather than the power of life; the destructive side is more visible and effective than the productive side. Conduct of conduct is limited due to the lack of freedom. In a totalitarian regime, sovereign power is visible, but this sovereignty is different from monarchical sovereignty. This is where biopower and sovereign power enter into a zone of contact. In such regimes, “sovereignty becomes more biopolitical: it expanded its control over different facets of life, while at the same time, it builds its legitimacy on its ability to protect life and enhance its well-being.”²⁴⁶ In such regimes there is a state of exception; the rights and freedoms are suspended; terror and fear control the society and also, there is always an ongoing war or a constant threat of war and the sovereign is there to decide between the friend and enemy.²⁴⁷ In Gilead war “seems to be going on in many places”²⁴⁸ and the enemy is always changing as Offred says; “there wasn't even an enemy you could put your finger on.”²⁴⁹ So the totalitarian character of the Gilead makes the sovereign power as important as the other modalities of power as opposed to the contemporary democracies. In a totalitarian regime, the power of the sovereign is excessive, and Gilead is no exception.

For totalitarianism, an analysis of the sovereign power is necessary and Agamben makes an analysis of biopower based on sovereignty. Agamben defines

²⁴⁶ Banu Bargu, *Starve and Immolate*, 298.

²⁴⁷ Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, trans. George Schwab (University of Chicago Press, 2007), 26.

²⁴⁸ *The Handmaids' Tale*, 92.

²⁴⁹ *The Handmaids' Tale*, 183.

the sovereign's original activity as "the production of a biopolitical body."²⁵⁰ This biopolitical body is produced through the politicization of bare life, which originally is "at the margins of political order."²⁵¹ In other words, the bare life or natural lives of humans is excluded from the political order but at the same time, it is captured within it. For Agamben it is through sovereign decision an individual life can be killed; this is an idea that is shared with Foucault. However, for Foucault in contemporary politics sovereign's right "to take life" is replaced by "make live and let die," whereas for Agamben, it is still taking life or killing is central to power. It is through sovereign that a life's value is decided. He asserts "the fundamental biopolitical structure of modernity" is "the decision on the value (or nonvalue) of life as such."²⁵² In *HT*, the value of the lives of the women is determined through their biological qualities as well as their position in the hierarchy. The Handmaids are valuable because of their "reproductive capability."²⁵³ In Gilead, fertile women are regarded as a "national resource."²⁵⁴ They are necessary for the "biological existence of the population." Handmaids' fertility is within the production apparatus; they cannot be wasted; they are too valuable to be wasted.²⁵⁵ The reason why Handmaids are alive, or they are not categorized as Unwomen and sent to Colonies or they are not in Jezebel is because they are fertile. The fertility of women makes the lives of the women valuable, and more importantly, makes them alive. If they do not function their biological destiny or disobey the rules of Gilead, they are no longer valuable. "The new rulers equate the value of something and someone solely with validity, usefulness, functionality, economic profit."²⁵⁶ People who are

²⁵⁰ *Homo Sacer*, 6.

²⁵¹ *Homo Sacer*, 9.

²⁵² *Homo Sacer*, 139.

²⁵³ Gina Wisker, *The Handmaid's Tale*, 12.

²⁵⁴ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 75.

²⁵⁵ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 17.

not useful, and disobedient are not valuable, and thus in constant danger of being killed. These killings are sovereign decisions but there are biopolitical concerns.

In totalitarian regimes, sovereignty is not dispersed among individuals; it still belongs to the sovereign. It is not the sovereign individual subjects that make the decisions for themselves, it is still the sovereign makes those choices on behalf of the individuals, it is the sovereign who decides the value of human life and in totalitarian regimes, there is no value for human life. Thus, the negative side of biopolitics, the politics of death, can be characterized as one of the crucial features of totalitarian regimes, and thanatopolitics is a predominant form of politics in Gilead. Fostering life is still the idea behind the politics in Gilead but those who cannot help to foster life, such as the Unwomen, dissidents, and even the Unbabies are sent to death. They are useless for the regime so that they are expendable. The Handmaids' lives are valuable not as an end of themselves but as a means to reproduce babies for the Commanders and their Wives. Handmaids are useless if they don't create new life and they are sent to Colonies, where "you've got three years maximum"²⁵⁷; where they are left to die. In Gilead, both biopolitics and thanatopolitics can be observed; the main idea behind the establishment of the regime is claimed to be creating new lives but the regime kills many people for the sake of the maintenance of the population. So "the deadly regime paradoxically aims at creating new life."²⁵⁸ Thanatopolitics cannot be separated from biopolitics; biopolitics requires "to manage the health of the body politic inescapably requires the control and elimination of foreign bodies... Other things being equal, healthy individuals were more desirable than those who were unhealthy."²⁵⁹ Thanatopolitics is at work where fostering life is in danger, for the people who are unhealthy and useless and who pose threat to the regime. In totalitarian regimes, the combination of sovereign power and biopower turns politics into the politics of death, "in which

²⁵⁶ Hilde Staels, "Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*: Resistance Through Narrating," in *The Handmaid's Tale*, ed. J. Brooks Bouson (Salem Press, 2010), 230.

²⁵⁷ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 260.

²⁵⁸ Hilde Staels, "Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*: Resistance Through Narrating," 230.

²⁵⁹ Nikolas Rose, "The Politics of Life itself", *Theory, Culture & Society* (2001): 2-5.

life permeated the mechanisms of death and the age-old sword of the state were exercised and justified in the name of protection of life.”²⁶⁰

The forms of executions implemented in Gilead are the most vivid examples of the sovereign power in juridical terms. In Gilead, the killing is mostly made through public executions. Men, who rank at the bottom of the hierarchy, who are not Commanders or Eyes are disposable and replaceable. Actually, everybody is replaceable but some of them are more replaceable. As it is stated earlier, men who are valuable for the order of Gilead, who design the regime and who help to maintain it, are the only ones that are productive for Gilead. Those who are political and against the regime, those who practice abortion in pre-Gilead, in short, those who cannot be integrated into the system and made productive, can be killed easily or sent to the exile, to the Colonies. The ones who endanger the regimes actively, namely the rebels and political activists, professionals such as doctors are killed, whereas those who do not pose immediate hazards but not conform to the norms of the Gilead are sent to the Colonies.

There is little information on imprisonment in Gilead, the Colonies might be considered as prisons of the Gilead; punishments described are mostly public executions. Public execution has always been an important part of capital punishment in periods when crimes have been regarded as a crime against the whole society and the social contract. It is still used in some countries but generally, it has begun to disappear since the nineteenth century. Public execution is not only judicial but also political since it is the manifestation of the sovereign power.²⁶¹ It does not only serve to secure justice for the society but also it is the reinforcement of the sovereign power, its public appearance. There is an excess of violence in public executions and these excesses display that the sovereign is more powerful than the convicted. The logic of the public execution and the material presence of the sovereign power in these executions derive from the idea that “the crime attacks the sovereign: it attacks him personally, since the law represents the will of the sovereign; it attacks him physically since the force of the law is the force of the

²⁶⁰ Bargu, *Starve and Immolate*, 154.

²⁶¹ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 47.

prince.”²⁶² But it has another dimension. Sovereignty exists as a result of a “certain radical will...that will is bound up with fear, and sovereignty is never shaped from above... Sovereignty is always shaped from below, and by those who are afraid.”²⁶³ Sovereign derives its power from the people; its power is based on the will of the people. It is the idea of the social contract. And who he commits a crime, he commits against the people and the sovereign since the sovereign is the representation of the will of the people and as well as the maker and the implementer of the law. In Gilead, public executions serve the same purpose. First of all, the crimes are no more individual crimes and they are crimes against society. This idea produces a holistic idea of society; no separation between individuals and society. The identified crimes such as operation on birth control techniques, adultery, the murder of a Handmaid, or political opposition are considered as against the maintenance of social unity. Public executions are made both to create 'terror' and fear, and also, they reveal the power of the sovereign. The exposures of the dead bodies hanging on the Wall create an environment of fear and terror.

Public executions manifest the visible form of sovereign power but there is another dimension hidden in these public practices; the disciplinary power can be also discerned from these executions. In the case of the sovereign power, power as well as the punishment is negative. It is the power to ban or to eliminate whereas disciplinary power is a productive power; it produces norms, and subjectivities. Discipline, for Foucault, is the art of distribution;

Discipline proceeds from distribution of individual in space...Discipline is an art of rank, a technique for the transformation of arrangements. It individualizes bodies by location that does not give them a fixed position, but distributes them and circulates them in a network of relations.²⁶⁴

Public executions are conducted in order to eliminate the criminal, who is the enemy of the sovereign and also the public. The convicts are treated as “war criminals.”²⁶⁵

²⁶² *Discipline and Punish*, 47.

²⁶³ Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 96.

²⁶⁴ *Discipline and Punish*, 141-146.

²⁶⁵ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 42.

Execution is the act of the sovereign but when the arrangement of the rituals is examined, disciplinary power can be observed. Although the details of the Men's Salvaging are not given, the places of women in Salvaging are organized in a certain manner; they are not random; there is a standard for that; each woman has her own place according to their rank. Even if it is the sovereign power through which executions are made, the arrangements are done under the disciplinary power because it is the disciplinary power that makes and transforms the arrangements.

The whole regime is organized by the techniques of disciplinary power. Society is divided into ranks; there is a patriarchal hierarchy; not only there is a strict distribution of roles between males and females, but also the positions within the same sex are also definite and transition from one position to another, especially among the women, is not possible. Disciplinary power requires an obedient subject, “the individual subjected to habits, rules, orders, an authority that is exercised continually around him and upon him, and which he must allow to function automatically in him.”²⁶⁶ Disciplinary power necessitates subjugated individuals; and in Gilead, these subjugated individuals are women. It is not to say that men are not subjugated; they are because norms are applied to the whole society. However, the system works through constant control and surveillance, and men mostly do these; men are the designers and the executioners of the system, who create the norms and ensure the normalization. So, women's subjugation is more explicitly given, and it is among one of the main themes of the book. This is why the novel is, by many critics and several times, elaborated through feminism.

Discipline “requires enclosure, the specification of a place heterogenous to all others and closed in upon itself...its aim was to...set up useful communications, to interrupt others...the elements are interchangeable.”²⁶⁷ The Red Centre is where the disciplinary techniques are used for the handmaids. The Red Centre is established for the correction of the body and the soul of the Handmaids, which are the foremost purposes of disciplinary power. After the religious takeover, Handmaids to be are brought into Red Centre for re-education. In the Red Center,

²⁶⁶ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 128.

²⁶⁷ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 141-145.

they are taught to “renounce their previous identities, to know their place and their duties, to understand that they have no real rights but will be protected up to a point if they conform.”²⁶⁸ This is the place where they learn the norms of the new regime and where they are corrected according to the new norms, where they are made “docile”; in short, handmaids are taught to be handmaids. Red Center is designed like a prison or a hospital. It is a closed arena without any partition. Only Aunts and Handmaids are allowed to be there, Guardians are not allowed to enter unless they are needed. There are no personal spaces or personal communication between handmaids. The use of their original name is not allowed, though they exchange their names through whispering; they all wear the same red dresses that reduce the differences among them and erase their identities. There have many daily routines; daily education, daily gatherings, and daily exercises. The meal times are routinized, they have meditation hours, and everything is organized with a timetable. It is through their education and through these daily routines they are made Handmaids. The aim of the Red Centre is disciplining and making the handmaids so that they become useful. Aunts have an important position in Gilead although they are women and rank low at the hierarchy. Aunts are the controller of the Handmaids, they “run their education centers with cattle prods, torture technique, and brainwashing slogans.”²⁶⁹ Although men produce norms, Aunts make them happen. Aunts also have roles outside the Red Centre; they are responsible for the Handmaids in everywhere.

Disciplinary power produces “normalizing judgment,” about creating an artificial order and making it work through “natural and observable processes.”²⁷⁰ It is an artificial order because it is programmed and produced, and it is the norms that are produced in this process, which eventually produces subjectivities that are obedient to the norms. The main reference point of produced norms in *HT* is Old Testament so disciplinary power works slightly different. Rather than creating an artificial order, it sets itself upon an order that is already created but it arranges that

²⁶⁸ *The Handmaid's Tale*, xi.

²⁶⁹ Rigney, *Margaret Atwood*, 118.

²⁷⁰ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 179.

order for its own benefit. For instance, although the legitimacy of the norms and the regime is based on the Old Testament, the Old Testament is inaccessible to half of the population in Gilead. Women are not allowed to read and write except the Aunts, and they are allowed because they are the transmitters of the norms. It is the men who have access to the Old Testament. Norms are based on the Old Testament, but the optimal model is still constructed by the logic of disciplinary power. The scripts read in the public rituals, in the ceremonies are chosen according to the regime's need and this generates the optimal model. In Gilead, the logic of the disciplinary power, like in every society, creating individuals that are useful and obedient to the system. Foucault thinks that disciplinary mechanism was necessary for the industrial capitalism,²⁷¹ in case of Gilead disciplinary mechanism is necessary for reproduction; infertility is the fundamental threat to the maintenance of existence. So disciplinary power aims at the subjugation of women in such a way that it creates a position as Handmaids', causes deprivation of the rights of the women, and makes the whole population believe that this is the last and only resort. Gilead "recognizes divine power but relies heavily on human control,"²⁷² and resorting to divine power is just a technique of disciplinary power.

The power represented in the Gileadean regime is a complex one. It represents a politics of death as well as a politics of life; it illustrates a power over life as well as a power of life. The three different power mechanisms that Foucault offers (sovereign power, disciplinary power, and biopower) exist simultaneously and are mobilized in their extremes. Neither exists in their pure form, in the form that Foucault first emphasizes. Power structure demonstrated for the Gileadean regime is a combination of thanatopolitics and biopolitics, the politics of death, and the politics of life. The concept of biosovereignty can be useful for manifesting their co-existence as well as their changing forms since biosovereignty refers to an "unstable, contingent and changing intersection between sovereignty, discipline, and security."²⁷³ Sovereign decisions over life, over the value of life, biopolitical

²⁷¹ *Society Must Be Defended*, 36.

²⁷² Lucy M. Freibert, "Control and Creativity: The Politics of Risk in Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*," in *Critical Essays on Margaret Atwood*, ed. Judith McCombs (GK Hall, 1988), 281.

concerns regarding the maintenance of a healthy population as well as disciplinary mechanisms that produce norms and generate normalization are all existed in totalitarian regimes as in Gilead.

4.4. The Power Mechanisms in *MaddAddam* Trilogy

Utopias and dystopias are embedded in the present society and *MaddAddam* trilogy reflects the concerns of the twenty-first centuries. In *The Handmaid's Tale*, the concern was about too much government on the level of the state and too little responsibility on the level of the individual. Environmental problems as well as the consequences of advanced industrial societies are also mentioned in the book but without elaborative illustrations, the focus was more on the totalitarian regime. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, these problems are given in detail and there are other concerns, the concerns that are much more complex. The trilogy can be evaluated through a post-humanist approach, an ecological approach, and also through an analysis of bioeconomy or specifically biocapitalism. However, these books reflect the consequences of advanced industrial societies. In *HT*, totalitarianism is projected as the result of advanced capitalism and in trilogy the annihilation of the most of the human race is portrayed as the result of the advanced capitalism. Different than *HT*, in the trilogy freedom of individuals is still on the table and individuals are governed by freedom. Governing through freedom is a technique of governmentality in free societies and governmentality is a technique of biopolitics. Biopolitics, here, does not only refer to the “basic biological features of human species”²⁷⁴ but refers to the interactions between human and non-human, between the natural and artificial, and the physical and the moral.²⁷⁵ Biopolitics refers to the government of living beings as well as the government of things. In a sense, it refers to the government of vital processes. This vitality is not attributed only to human beings; vitalism is life itself

²⁷³ Banu Bargu, *Starve and Immolate*, 52.

²⁷⁴ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 2.

²⁷⁵ Lemke, “Rethinking Biopolitics: The New Materialism and the Political Economy of Life,” 66.

and “encompasses both organisms and “non-organic life.”²⁷⁶ In this perspective “world...is a vital world,”²⁷⁷ and biopolitics refers to the government of the vital world in general. This extended version of biopolitics ensures the possibility of combining different perspectives.

In the second chapter, *MaddAddam* trilogy is analyzed through the lenses of the theories of modernity. It is analyzed through two levels of inquiries; on the macro level, global developments, and structural changes as well as their consequences are elaborated; on the micro-level, individuals’ positions vis-a-vis these changes are explored. As it is discussed at the beginning of this chapter, these theories lack specific analysis of power relations and in this chapter, the aim is to complete this lack. It is claimed that power in contemporary societies is biopower and analysis of biopower requires three elements; “knowledge of vital processes, power relations that take humans as living beings as their objects, and modes of subjectification.”²⁷⁸ The modes of subjectification will be analyzed in the last chapter in relation to resistance. In this section “the knowledge of vital processes” and power mechanisms will be analyzed in relation to *MaddAddam* trilogy and through this analysis, the missing part within *The Handmaid’s Tale* section will also be completed.

4.4.1. “The Knowledge of Vital Processes” in *MaddAddam* Trilogy

It is argued throughout the chapter that power depends on the production of truth as well as knowledge. In the analysis of *the Handmaid’s Tale*, the focus was on the production of truth rather than knowledge. In this section, the focus will be on the production of knowledge, which eventually leads to the production of truth. The reason for this is that in free societies, there are many sources of knowledge, there are experts that have specific knowledges. Sovereignty is dispersed. However,

²⁷⁶ John Protevi, “Deleuze and Life,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*, ed, Daniel W. Smith and Henry Somers-Hall (Cambridge University Press, 2012), 246.

²⁷⁷ May, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*, 116.

²⁷⁸ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower today,” 322.

in totalitarian regimes, the regime produces its own truth and governs the society in accordance with it. Truth is produced by the regime itself without a dispersion of sovereignty. Thus, in totalitarian regime, one cannot speak of a "delegation of sovereignty" which results with the different sources of knowledge and truth as opposed to free societies.

Atwood, both in *The Handmaid's Tale* and in the trilogy, brings forward the oppositional ideas. She exposes the clash between modernity and postmodernity, monism and dualism, scientific rationality, and philosophical thinking, and by doing so, she encourages the reader to comprehend what we have experienced through all dimensions. In the trilogy, one can observe the political, socio-economic as well as ethical concerns of the twenty-first century. Throughout the books, clashing ideas about human/animal/nonhuman, material/spiritual, real/artificial are projected. Atwood presents these ideas as if she is neutral towards all these, without creating a character who is 'pure evil' or 'pure good'. She projects the good and the bad together. The word that she made up for her novels, ustopia, represents her perception. Ustopia is a combination of utopia and dystopia; she made up this word because "each contains a latent version of the other,"²⁷⁹ in every utopia a dystopia is embedded and vice-versa. So the protagonists of her novels or the characters in her novels are like ustopias in this sense, they reserve both good and bad. It is not to claim that her writings are neutral; rather it is to assert that she projects both sides without dictating which is good or which is bad. She proposes possible developments giving birth to possible moral dilemmas, and she projects much oppositional thinking together. The developments she demonstrates derive from a new perspective about living beings, things, and their vitality. The knowledge of living beings and things has been fundamental in shaping people's lives as well as in shaping contemporary politics. New knowledges give birth to new governmental techniques and new ethical dilemmas. In the trilogy, Atwood demonstrates these dilemmas deriving from knowledges regarding vital processes of living beings and things.

With modernity, life becomes the chief object and subject of power and there have been certain transformations about the concept of life itself. Life is also at the

²⁷⁹ *In Other Worlds*, 66.

center in *MaddAddam* trilogy, but this is not the life of human beings; rather it is life on earth in general. Life has no stable definition; there have been alterations in the meaning, definition, and also the conceptualization of life. So life is not “a self-evident and stable entity or property...is not given but depends on conditions of existence within and beyond life processes.”²⁸⁰ The most crucial factors that affect and alter the concept of life are developments in scientific knowledges. These developments have mostly occurred in natural or life sciences (biology, medicine, biomedicine, biotechnology) but they have altered the conception of the life in social sciences as well. The most fundamental link between the natural sciences and the social sciences is their focus on the living beings and things, their classification as well as their categorization. This section analyses the projections of the living beings and things as well as the knowledges that produce, shape, and alter these in *MaddAddam* trilogy.

Although in modernity the concept of life has been revitalized, altered, and become subject of scientific as well as political classification and categorization, the concept itself is not modern. The concept of the good life and how to achieve this good life has been a fundamental topic in antiquity. The differences between antiquity and modernity in discussions about life derive from binary distinctions between natural/artificial, organic/inorganic, human/nonhuman. Such distinctions belong to the modern period, in the antiquity, Lemke argues, continuity between natural and artificial is assumed.²⁸¹ Such distinctions between natural and artificial, organic, and inorganic were not known until the eighteenth century, more specifically until the emergence of modern biology in the eighteenth century. With modern biology, life is given a separate identity as “an independent working principle that described the emergence, preservation, and development of natural bodies.”²⁸² From then on biology tries to discover the hidden laws behind these natural bodies. Body, in this sense, is at the juncture of the natural and social sciences. As Foucault strongly posits “it is always the body that is at issue - the body

²⁸⁰ Lemke, “New Materialisms: Foucault and the ‘Government of Things’,” 13.

²⁸¹ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 62.

²⁸² Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 62.

and its forces, their utility and docility, their distribution and their submission.”²⁸³ From this perspective, the concept of biopower adopts an approach that takes “social regulation of bodies and their actions”²⁸⁴ into account, and such regulation requires knowledge of the individual and collective bodies, which is generally acquired through natural sciences. And the knowledges of the body, as well as the knowledges of life, are historically specific knowledges and their regulation necessitates a specific form of power, which is biopower.

The logic of vitality is at the heart of contemporary biopolitics.²⁸⁵ This means the biological life of human beings and their vital capacities are shaped, manipulated, controlled, and regulated. Biopolitics intends to “transform certain vital tendencies or fundamental biological traits of individuals or the human race with the intent of using them to strengthen economico-political forces.”²⁸⁶ It intends to increase human capital in a sense, to transform human capital through the logic of competition. Vitality has gained new meanings through the discoveries of natural sciences. Life is started to be understood at the molecular level and this new type of knowledge has made it possible to intervene, transform, and regulate molecular entities. These interventions are beyond the limits of “normativity of a natural vital order.”²⁸⁷ So what is natural is interpreted differently or lost its importance because it is open to intervention. The intervention in the natural processes becomes natural itself. Biopolitics is “the political economy of life,”²⁸⁸ and through the new knowledges about vitality, it becomes possible to optimize this political economy of life as well as to increase its competitiveness. Now it is not health or sickness are

²⁸³ *Discipline and Punish*, 27.

²⁸⁴ Elizabeth Grosz, Kathryn Yusoff, and Nigel Clark, “An Interview with Elizabeth Grosz: Geopower, Inhumanism and the Biopolitical,” *Theory, Culture & Society* (2017): 134.

²⁸⁵ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 316.

²⁸⁶ Frédéric Gros, “Is There a Biopolitical Subject? Foucault and the Birth of Biopolitics,” 271.

²⁸⁷ Rose, *The Politics of Life itself*, 5.

²⁸⁸ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 60.

just being regulated; rather, “the best possible future for those who are subjects”²⁸⁹ are aimed at. All vital processes of the body and mind of the individual are open to be shaped, altered, and optimized. Now, medicine is not about curing illness or revealing hidden pathologies but to intervene in order to “optimize the life chances of individuals.”²⁹⁰ Biopolitics is concerned with the optimization of life in general. Due to the contemporary developments in medicine, biotechnology, and biology, optimization of life, thus biopolitics, has gained new meanings. All capacities, capabilities, and all vital processes through the molecularization of science and technologies, are open to be intervened and changed. *MaddAddam* trilogy demonstrates this shift in the knowledge of the vital processes.

New materialism in general aims at providing an affirmative worldview as well as a politics that would overcome “transcendental humanism,”²⁹¹ and offers “a new understanding of ontology, epistemology, ethics, and politics.”²⁹² This new understanding of ontology or epistemology cannot simply be understood as the knowledge of nature or things and ethics cannot be considered as concerning relations between human beings. New materialism proposes a new approach for examining our experiences with the world, with ourselves, and with others. It is a relational and non-foundationalist approach, but it is also “non-relativist.”²⁹³ This approach stipulates two powerful arguments for orienting our behaviors and our society towards a more sustainable future. The first one is overcoming anthropocentrism and the second one is recognizing the vitality of the matter. These two arguments are inter-connected without recognizing the vitality of the matter anthropocentrism cannot be overcome and vice-versa. These arguments play pivotal roles in *MaddAddam* trilogy and these arguments also occur as the utopian impulse

²⁸⁹ Rose, *The Politics of Life itself*, 6.

²⁹⁰ Rose, *The Politics of Life itself*, 19.

²⁹¹ Iris Van der Tuin, and Rick Dolphijn, “The Transversality of New Materialism,” 167.

²⁹² Lemke, “New Materialisms: Foucault and the ‘Government of Things’,” 4.

²⁹³ Iris Van der Tuin, and Rick Dolphijn, “The Transversality of New Materialism,” 167.

in the trilogy. The advocates of these arguments are God's Gardeners and Atwood claims God's Gardeners are embedded utopia in these dystopian novels.²⁹⁴ God's Gardeners imagine a future, which is post-anthropocentric and ecologically sustainable. So, the new materialist approach is crucial in analyzing *MaddAddam* trilogy.

The first argument of new materialism is both natural sciences and cultural theory base their theories on humanism.²⁹⁵ This humanism has resulted in the privileging human beings in terms of their potential as well as their agency and thus vitality is attributed to human beings only. However, new developments in natural sciences reveal that vitality is inherent in the matter. This presents the second argument, the vitality of the matter. The matter is used to be defined and characterized as "discrete entities and closed systems"²⁹⁶ whereas new developments in physics prove the opposite. Material phenomena started to be conceptualized as "open, complex systems with porous boundaries."²⁹⁷ The matter is continuously on the move, it is not a dynamic state, it is not being, but it is becoming.²⁹⁸ This conceptualization of matter has tremendous effects on social sciences. The idea that matter is a process and becoming rather than a static being means that everything becomes something else. Through this conceptualization of the matter, the concept of representation has been damaged. Since everything is in a process of becoming, then "each object is more than itself, contains within itself the material potential to be otherwise."²⁹⁹ So that representation becomes problematic because, in every representation, there is a missing part that is not

²⁹⁴ Atwood, *In Other Worlds*, 93.

²⁹⁵ Iris Van der Tuin, and Rick Dolphijn, "The Transversality of New Materialism," 156.

²⁹⁶ Diana Coole, and Samantha Frost, "Introducing the New Materialisms," 15.

²⁹⁷ Coole, and Frost, "Introducing the New Materialisms," 15.

²⁹⁸ Coole, and Frost, "Introducing the New Materialisms," 13.

²⁹⁹ Elizabeth Grosz, "Bergson, Deleuze and the Becoming of Unbecoming," *Parallax* 11.2 (2005): 10.

represented. This is a fundamental transformation for the knowledge of things as well as living beings.

The projections of this new knowledge of the social sciences can be found in Deleuze and Guattari. New materialists, thus, base their arguments on the concept of becoming that Deleuze and Guattari propose. Becoming is an ontological concept for Deleuze and Guattari, it is the “very principle of matter itself.”³⁰⁰ Although their critique of capitalism and psychoanalysis cannot be considered as a political project or more accurately, their “schizoanalysis” is not a political program for the future,³⁰¹ becoming can be considered as lying at the heart of their understanding of political; for them, everything can be political but becoming is itself a “political affair.”³⁰² Becoming is a creative activity and “creativity is to experiment”³⁰³ and an experiment is an affirmative act in itself, it does not consider the results of the experimentation; it explores the alternatives.³⁰⁴ The concept of becoming will be analyzed in detail throughout the next chapter in relation to subjectivity and resistance. What is significant here is that these discussions on life as vitality and vitality of the matter provide with new substance for the political theory, new knowledges for the government of the things, and living beings.

This new conceptualization of matter as dynamic, as a process and becoming opens the way for the discussion about the role of human beings as the sole agency. In conventional political theory, it is the rational human beings that have the capacity to act. Human beings are subjects. New materialism repudiates this argument by attributing the capacity to act, to shape, and to manipulate to the matter. The matter is not a passive thing, nor it is a commodity to be consumed. The body is a matter and the works of Foucault demonstrate how the body “in its materiality

³⁰⁰ Grosz, “Bergson, Deleuze and the Becoming of Unbecoming,” 10.

³⁰¹ Paul Patton, “Deleuze’s Political Philosophy,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*, 207.

³⁰² Gilles Deleuze, and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 292.

³⁰³ Todd May, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*, 66.

³⁰⁴ May, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*, 66.

is affected and modified by power relations.”³⁰⁵ What is missing in Foucault, new materialists claim, is the vitality of the matter. According to this perspective, the body is not just regulated by forms of power, it has the power to regulate; it is not a “stable spatial map of normalized functions and instead emerges as a highly mobile field of strategic differences.”³⁰⁶ It is through the new knowledges of living beings that this characteristic of the body is known, the vitality of the body and matter is discovered. Jane Bennet advocates the vitality of the things by arguing for a thing-power that “not only to impede or block the will and designs of humans but also to act as quasi agents or forces with trajectories, propensities, or tendencies of their own.”³⁰⁷ From food to clothes, every “thing” has a power and nothing is passive, nothing is given or pre-determined. Matter forms assemblages, connections, and networks.³⁰⁸ Even the things that we assume we have made have power on our making. Bennet gives an example of culture. It is assumed that culture is our own making but Bennet claims it is not; culture “infused as it is by biological, geological, and climatic forces...These impinge on us as much as we impinge on them.”³⁰⁹ So all the things, from matter to human beings form interactions and a web of relations. They form assemblages and have an impact on these assemblages; they have the capacity to act, to change, and to shape these networks. The conventional political theory disregards these capacities of the things and in this sense, cultivates “the self-destructive character of human actions that are reckless with regard to the other nodes of the web.”³¹⁰ In other words, the conventional political theory encourages anthropocentrism by giving agency to human beings and disregarding matter’s

³⁰⁵ Thomas Lemke, “New Materialisms: Foucault and the ‘Government of Things’,” 4.

³⁰⁶ Donna Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (Routledge, 1991), 211.

³⁰⁷ *Vibrant matter: A Political Ecology of Things* (Duke University Press, 2010), viii.

³⁰⁸ Bennett, “The Force of Things: Steps Toward an Ecology of Matter,” 354.

³⁰⁹ *Vibrant matter*, 115.

³¹⁰ Bennett, “The Force of Things: Steps Toward an Ecology of Matter,” 354.

vitality and this has destructive effects, which are perfectly exemplified in the trilogy.

In the trilogy, there are many trend topics regarding developments in biomedicine and biotechnology that demonstrate the knowledge of things and living beings. Hybrid animals are created for defense (wolvogs), as an after-hours hobby, in biolabs many animals are created just for fun, but then destroyed because “they are too dangerous.”³¹¹ Biomedicine is highly developed, human neocortex, human organs growing in animals (pigoons, which is produced for growing organs). What is observed in the trilogy is a sort of reflection of Harraway's manifesto. She claims, “modern medicine is also full of cyborgs, of couplings between organism and machine.”³¹² Trilogy perfectly illustrates this coupling between organism and machine through genetically produced animals, animals that grow human organs, humans that carry animal parts inside their brains. So the boundaries between humans and animals have been exceeded, if not destroyed. Every surgical operation is possible as well as gene-spliced. Human hairs are growing in animals, fingerprints, voiceprints, and iris can be changed. Real food is replaced by artificial foods, especially in poorer settlements. Thus, the boundary between real and artificial has also been crossed in many areas.

The knowledge of the living things and beings and know-how process disseminate from natural sciences. So the roles of scientists are fundamental in spreading as well as using these knowledges. Humanism is one of the most important features of the natural sciences and new materialists argue that humanism has encouraged as well as contributed to the “juggernaut of capitalism, technoscience, and political domination,”³¹³ and helped to generate a global world crisis. In the trilogy, this global crisis is carried one step further and presented as a dystopia. There are two kinds of scientists presented in the trilogy and this split reflects the scientists' position with regard to the global world crisis. The first group

³¹¹ *Oryx and Crake*, 57.

³¹² “A manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s,” *Australian Feminist Studies* (1987): 2.

³¹³ Ellenzweig Sarah, and H. Zammito John, “Introduction: New Materialism: Looking Forward, Looking Back,” 1.

of scientists works for the companies either willingly or without noticing how they damage the world and living beings in it. This group contributes to the profit of the companies by doing their research and implements companies' projects without questioning the project itself; these scientists contribute to the damage done to the earth and the living beings. The other group of scientists belongs to a community, God's Gardeners. God's Gardeners split later, and another group emerges, MaddAddamites. Most of the Gardeners are sincere believers; they are vegetarian, they are environmentalist, they waste nothing and consume nothing more than what they need. They do not hold any property and they live in left buildings. They believe in the dangers of technological developments. Although this group is composed mainly of scientists, they warn their community towards reckless scientific and technological development. Gardeners believe that humankind will be annihilated soon and it would be due to their own doings, because of their disrespect to the earth, to the other living beings as well as the things. So Atwood, again, exemplifies the two kinds of scientists, two opposite poles together.

On the one pole, some scientists encourage privileging human beings, contribute anthropocentrism, and attribute a passive, inert role to the matter. These scientists contribute to the further exploitation and acceleration of consumer culture. Their researches pave the way for further accumulation of capital and exploitation of human beings as well as raw material sources. Jimmy's father is an example of this kind of scientist. Jimmy's father work in a lab that transplants human stem cells and DNA into pigs; these pigs, pigoons are created just for the transplantation. The researches have made it possible for a pigoon to grow five to six organs at a time.³¹⁴ The project necessitates a serious investment and thus pigoons are created in a way that "rather than being destroyed, it could keep on living and grow more organs" because "that would be less wasteful."³¹⁵ And the company tries to relieve the public by emphasizing that "none of the defunct pigoons ended up as bacon and sausages: no one would want to eat an animal whose cells might be identical with at least some of their own."³¹⁶ This project is a demonstration of anthropocentrism from the

³¹⁴ *Oryx and Crake*, 26.

³¹⁵ *Oryx and Crake*, 26.

beginning of the project till the end. The new species are created for human beings, humans use them as storages for organs, and it is told that they would not be served as a meal because it shares cells and DNA with humans. However, in the following sentences, it is told that bacon and ham sandwiches turn up often on the staff cafe menu at that time.³¹⁷ So human gene-spliced animals are turned up as meals for humans. From the beginning of their creation until their consumption, anthropocentrism has been there.

In the trilogy, the boundaries between humans and animals have begun to be blurred. Human hairs grow in animals, human neocortex tissues and human organs grow in animals. Thus, human and animal distinction becomes harder to sustain. These mixtures of humans and animals create awareness, but this awareness derives not from animal rights but the attempt to avoidance of cannibalism in a sense. “It would be hard to slaughter and eat an animal with human hair; especially human hair that so closely resembles, in its sheen and stylability, the shampoo ads of yore.”³¹⁸ This is also an example of anthropocentrism, privileging human beings, and their right to live instead of a recognition of animals' rights. It is not just anthropocentrism but also cannibalism in a sense; so Atwood demonstrates a “quasi-cannibal culture that disregards both human and animal genetic material.”³¹⁹ Pigoons are not the only species that are created for the service of human beings. Other species are created for control and surveillance. For instance, wolvogs are created for defense by CorpSeCorps, they look like dogs, but they are more violent than dogs. They provide additional security for CorpSeCorps. Another example is cyborg bees. The Corps develops a hybrid bee, these bees are captured when they are in larval form, then they are put mechanical systems, and they are bee cyborgs - spies at the hand of the Corps.³²⁰ Harraway states that cyborg stipulates a “revolution

³¹⁶ *Oryx and Crake*, 27.

³¹⁷ *Oryx and Crake*, 27.

³¹⁸ *MaddAddam*, 256.

³¹⁹ Sławomir Kuźnicki, *Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Fiction: Fire is Being Eaten*, 78.

of social relations” in the household as well as it breaches the boundaries between nature and culture through reworked on them, so “one can no longer be the resource for appropriation or incorporation by the other.”³²¹ In the trilogy, this is not the case. The boundary between nature and culture is crossed but this crossing boundary is not an affirmative step; it is for further domination and exploitation; it is like creating further means for total domination and control. In the trilogy “science and its inventions interact with the culture of consumerism, without which the totalitarian rules probably would not be possible.”³²² So scientific and technological inventions such as bee cyborgs, wolvogs, and pigoons are meant to maintain and strengthen the current capitalist system. These inventions pave the way for further exploitation of nature and things as well as the domination of living species. Moreover, for Haraway cyborgs are “illegitimate offspring of militarism and patriarchal capitalism”³²³ and she expects unfaithfulness of cyborgs to their origin. In the trilogy, cyborgs are still “offspring of militarism and patriarchal capitalism,” thus they serve to dominate rather than emancipate. Although the knowledge of living beings and things increases to such a level that many inventions can be made for the betterment of living conditions not just for human beings but also for the entire world, these inventions have destructive effects rather than productive effects for the future of the earth. These have created further means for man's mastery over nature and strengthen anthropocentrism rather than weaken it.

On the other pole, some scientists run away from the Companies or who still work for them without adapting the rationalities of the companies. These people are represented either being a member of God's Gardeners or MaddAddamites or activists against this destructive capitalist system. These scientists have different rationale from the corporate-ruled world. They respect the earth, nature, all the living creatures, and all the things produced in the world. Their vision can be

³²⁰ *The Year of the Flood*, 329.

³²¹ “A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s,” 3.

³²² Sławomir Kuźnicki, *Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Fiction: Fire is Being Eaten*, 85.

³²³ “A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s,” 4.

summarized as “an ecologically-based critique of bioengineering and short-sighted instrumental logic central to Flood's corporate compounds, and as a resistance to imperial rule affected by their secret police.”³²⁴ God's Gardeners are an inclusive group in the sense that they accept all those who are in need or who are not believers. They have ethical guidelines on how one should live, treat others, and the world. God's Gardeners also presents a resistance movement; thus, they will be analyzed in detail in the next chapter. What is crucial here is their approach to life, living beings, and things that resemble new materialists. They try to overcome anthropocentrism by respecting living species and things. They accept that all living things have equal right to live, thus they do not eat meat of any kind, they are vegetarian. They believe in nature's own circle. They do not believe in killing people; thus, they stand as a non-violent group. The leader of the God's Gardeners, Adam One, in a speech to his community says that “whenever we are tempted to become puffed up and to see ourselves superior to all other Animals, we should reflect on our own brutal history.”³²⁵ All living beings have an equal share in being on earth and to earth, they show only respect. In parallel with new materialism, they advocate an environmentalist perspective. The real danger for Gardeners is the system that human beings built, and the end of the world would come because of the wrongdoings of human beings.

God's Gardeners sustain an organic life without using technological devices and by planting their own vegetables. They do not hold property they consider ownership as wrong.³²⁶ They do not oppose science altogether; rather they oppose the misuse of scientific and technological developments, their use for exploitation. For instance, there are many extinct species and the leader of the God Gardeners have “a dream of restoring all the lost Species via their preserved DNA codes, once a more ethical and technically proficient future had replaced the depressing present.”³²⁷ God's Gardeners try to use the knowledge of living beings for a

³²⁴ Miles Weaver, “Writing from the Margin: Victim Positions in Atwood's *The Year of the Flood*,” in *Margaret Atwood's Apocalypses*, 60.

³²⁵ *The Year of the Flood*, 372.

³²⁶ *The Year of the Flood*, 95.

sustainable future rather than for exploitation. They want to use it for repairing what has been damaged by human beings. They are not worried about the inventions; they are worried about the use of them. As Atwood strongly emphasizes “It is not a question of our inventions - all human inventions are merely tools - but of what we might be done with them.”³²⁸ These inventions portrayed in the trilogy provide the basis for further domination and exploitation; contribute to man's mastery over nature. God's Gardeners, on the other hand, want to use these inventions for the betterment of earth and living conditions for all the species.

Another resemblance between new materialist and God's Gardeners can be found in their attempt to attribute vitality and actancy to the matter. For Gardeners, nothing should be waste, nothing should be used recklessly; “There was no such thing as garbage, trash, or dirt, only matter that hadn't been put a proper use.”³²⁹ They are against a materialistic worldview, in which “man was the measure of all things.”³³⁰ They also believe that “we're what we eat.”³³¹ Thus they avoid eating meat or animal products. Recognition of the foods' effect on the body is giving an actancy to the food, giving vitality to the matter. Jane Bennet analyzes approaches of Nietzsche and Thoreau to diet and food, and she argues that for them “consumption is a two-way street, an encounter between bodies human and nonhuman.”³³² This perception gives an actancy to the food. The food is not just a passive, edible object; it has an effect on the people, there is a complex relation between the eater and the eaten. Bennet argues, if we recognize the food's active role in our body, then we can rethink our eating habits and “reorient our own

³²⁷ *The Year of the Flood*, 295.

³²⁸ *Curious Pursuits*, 323.

³²⁹ *The Year of the Flood*, 83.

³³⁰ *The Year of the Flood*, 48.

³³¹ *The Year of the Flood*, 481.

³³² *Vibrant matter*, 47.

experience of eating.”³³³ God's Gardeners seem to follow this perception about food and the matter in general. They are not just environmentalists, but they are also new materialists. They do not just live on earth and respect to earth, they “live as earth...are more alert to the capacities and limitations...of various materials that they are.”³³⁴

To conclude this section, Atwood bases trilogy on the scientific and technological developments. These developments and our attitudes towards these developments have the power to shape and guide our lives. The new knowledges about the vital process such as molecularization of sciences and living beings have altered our conception of life and living beings. Now all the vital processes of living beings are open to change the vital processes are not considered as destiny but as opportunity.³³⁵ Optimization of life of individuals is the key objective of biopolitics and through the developments of science and technology, new opportunities and techniques have emerged to achieve this objective. Now, each part of the body of living beings can be optimized for the best possible form. The scientists have the ability as well as the power to shape, manipulate, and organize the order of things so they have significant roles in the configuration of the society. They produce the know-how necessary for the government of the living beings and things. Trilogy proposes two poles of scientists can be identified. On the one pole, there are reckless scientists, who help the exploitation of resources as well as living species. On the other pole, some scientists try to use science for a sustainable, ecological future. In the trilogy, new species are created for the service of human beings. These are living beings and it does not matter whether “they occur in nature” or “created by the hands of man.” As Crake puts it very clearly “after it happens...the process is no longer important.”³³⁶ Although they are living beings they are mostly treated as objects to be consumed and exploited.

³³³ *Vibrant matter*, 51.

³³⁴ *Vibrant matter*, 111.

³³⁵ Rose, *The Politics of Life Itself*, 51.

³³⁶ *Oryx and Crake*, 235.

The developments in natural sciences reveal that vitality is inherent in living beings and matter, and recognition of this vitality is a fundamental step towards a better future. The future is constructed through imagining it and utopias and dystopias are fundamental instruments in imagining the future. Utopias and dystopias explore the possibilities of better or worse futures. Trilogy presents the reader with a dystopia, a worse possibility. However, a utopia embedded in this dystopia as Atwood emphasizes and this utopia is the God's Gardeners, their approach to life, and their ethical guidelines. For God's Gardeners, life does not belong only to people, life as vitalism attributed to the many living species. It belongs to both the "natural beings" and artificial productions. For them, there are no such binary divisions and strict classifications that modern philosophical and scientific thinking have built. This is the utopia that Atwood proposes, and this utopia has found echoes in political theory, in the discussions of a new materialism approach to biopower. New materialism aims at a sustainable future. The way towards this future is overcoming anthropocentrism and creating a post-anthropocentric future. The first step towards this future is the recognition of the rights of all living beings. The second step is the recognition of the vitality that is intrinsic to materiality and giving materiality an active role. This new knowledge of things provides new know-how about living beings and things and the government of men and things depend on know-how, on knowledge, "on knowledge of the order of things and the conduct of individuals."³³⁷ So, this new know-how provides new techniques of the government of living beings and things and the next section will be an analysis of these techniques of government.

4.4.2. Power Structure in *MaddAddam* Trilogy

In the second chapter, the main subjects within *MaddAddam* trilogy such as the loss of the functions of the nation-state, privatization of welfare services, commodification, consumer culture, and individualization as well as the global environmental problems are analyzed in relation to the postmodern theory, liquid modernity and risk society theses. These are analyzed in the lights of specific

³³⁷ Foucault, *On the Government of the Living*, 4-5.

transformation that societies have undergone mostly due to the transition to neoliberal policies. Flexibilization, privatization, and deregulation that neoliberal policies sustain have drastic effects both on the macro level and at the micro-level and in the second chapter these are given. In this section, these subjects will be analyzed through an emphasis on power mechanisms with an emphasis on biopower and its technique, governmentality. However, it should be stressed that in contemporary politics, “zones of contact”³³⁸ between biopower and sovereign power is observed. Thus, an analysis of sovereign power will be added when necessary. In the previous section, the knowledges of the vital processes necessary for power mechanisms and government of things and living beings are given in relation to their representations in *MaddAddam* trilogy. In this section, how these knowledges are made operable and turn individuals into governable subjects will be given.

The second chapter focuses on two levels of inquiries; macro-level transformations and their effects on the individual. In this section, a micro-level analysis or more accurately an analysis of micro-power will be made in accordance with Foucault's perspective on micro-power. Foucault emphasizes that there is no break between micro-power and macro-power. When an analysis of the government and the state is made, an analysis of micro-power is there.³³⁹ He argues the analysis of micro-power is “a point of view” and the notion of governmentality, “the analysis of ways of conducting the conduct” of people can be equally valid in dealing with “economic policy...or the management of a whole social body.”³⁴⁰ So it can be stated that the changes and transformations occur at the macro-level can be analyzed by the micro-powers, through the procedures of governmentality. Through this way, the relations of power are de-institutionalized and de-functionalized and the ways how power relations “are formed, connect up with each other, develop and multiply”³⁴¹ can be revealed. De-institutionalization of power relations through a

³³⁸ Mitchell Dean, *Governing Societies*, 157.

³³⁹ *Security, Territory, Population*, 358.

³⁴⁰ *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 186.

³⁴¹ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 119 dipnot a
236

focus on governmentality would also reveal the points of lines of flight of resistances and opens the possibility of being governed differently,³⁴² which seems impossible in advanced capitalist societies.

As it is stated above, biopower as a concept refers to the intervention to the vital powers of human beings by different authorities with an objective of the “optimization of life itself.”³⁴³ In advanced liberal societies, a retreat of the state is observed in achieving this objective. *MaddAddam* trilogy illustrates this retreat. In the second chapter, this retreat is analyzed in relation to the liquid and reflexive modernity theses and their emphasis on global changes and neoliberal transformation. Here, the retreat of the state will be approached as a new technique of government, a neoliberal technique of government. As it is discussed above, with a liberal mentality, it becomes explicit that a state cannot govern only by itself. On the one hand, there is a “non-totalizable multiplicity of economic subjects of interests” and on the other hand, “totalizing unity of the juridical sovereign.”³⁴⁴ The state needs other power relations to govern the society otherwise society cannot be governed.³⁴⁵ The idea of “ungovernability of society” Dean argues, “is accompanied by the idea of dethroning of the idea of the state.”³⁴⁶ Dethroning of the idea of the state, in return, opens up “plural and heterogeneous” analyses of the power relations through which society as well as individuals become governable. Through this analysis, the state loses its significance as a political actor and its functions dispersed around other institutions, families, and individuals. This is called governmentality.³⁴⁷ In the trilogy, a further step is taken and the state disappears altogether. State loses all its functions; it is a non-existent actor in power

³⁴² Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 194.

³⁴³ Rose, *The Politics of Life Itself*, 82.

³⁴⁴ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 282.

³⁴⁵ Foucault, “Truth and Power,” 122.

³⁴⁶ Governing Societies, 46.

³⁴⁷ Dean, *Governing Societies*, 47.

relations. The functions of the state and its institutions are transferred to Compounds; education services, health services as well as security services are controlled and regulated by Compounds. Compounds control not only welfare services but also scientific researches and the market.

In advanced liberal societies, “degovernmentalization of the state” can be observed. The state is degovernmentalized and the functions of the state in governing society are dispersed around other institutions, experts as well as around “the realm of science and commercial interests.”³⁴⁸ In the trilogy, the commercial interests govern society. In all crucial domains of social life, there is a compound. Even the realm of science is regulated and controlled by the market, or for the profit of the market. The state's intervention, thus, is not observed. Rather, the exercise of government is handed over to the expertise, in the case of the trilogy, this expertise belongs to the compounds and derives from their researches in scientific areas. By setting the novel in a future where corporations and science control society, Atwood presents her perception of the danger for the future. This is a danger of a market-regulated society in which all decisions in every sphere of lives are made for the market and by the market. This danger resembles Lemke's argument. He claims that

State will, in the name of “deregulation,” retreat from the domains it once occupied in society and hand over decisions pertaining to the value of life and determinations of when it begins and ends to the realm of science and commercial interests, as well as to the deliberations of ethics committees, expert commissions, and citizen panels.³⁴⁹

Decisions over the value of life and life-related issues are sovereign decisions. Agamben strongly posits, “in modern biopolitics, the sovereign is who decides on the value or nonvalue of life as such.”³⁵⁰ However, in contemporary societies, the decision over value or nonvalue of life as well as the decision over life, which is worth living, are dispersed around different institutions and authorities. For instance, medical authorities decide when life begins, or it ends. Psychiatry as well as marketing and advertisement determine the life that is worth living. So in contemporary societies, the concept of life generates a “the zone of indistinction” or

³⁴⁸ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 62.

³⁴⁹ *Biopolitics*, 61.

³⁵⁰ *Homo Sacer*, 142.

“zone of contact” among sovereign power, biopower, and governmentality. Biopower attempts at fostering life but the decision over whose life should be fostered is made through sovereign power and in trilogy both sovereign power and biopower can be observed.

According to Foucault, sovereign right is “the right to take life or let live” whereas biopower is the “power to “make” live and “let” die.”³⁵¹ In contemporary politics, it is biopower, the power to make live is on the operation. Rabinow and Rose make a differentiation between “letting die” and “making die.” They argue contemporary biopolitics operates through the logic of “letting die” and “letting die is not making die.”³⁵² Although Rabinow and Rose claim the opposite, contemporary politics operate on both levels: in the trilogy both “letting die” and “making die” can be observed. Moreover, in some situations, it is hard to determine “whether we are letting die or exercising a right of death.”³⁵³ So, again, in contemporary life - “biopolitical, the sovereign, the governmental, begin to enter into the zone of indistinction.”³⁵⁴

The life and the body are shattered in the trilogy; they are comprised of the molecules, which can be “identified, isolated, manipulated, mobilized, recombined in new practices of intervention.”³⁵⁵ The life and the body are scrutinized and intervened at micro-levels. Each part has a value; each part has its own demand and supply. Each part has its own market. The body and life are not considered as a closed system; they are open systems. As life and body become open systems, each part of their constituents can be optimized and be better. The companies in the trilogy are based their policy on the “betterment of humankind,”³⁵⁶ through

³⁵¹ *Society Must Be Defended*, 241.

³⁵² “Biopower Today,” 316.

³⁵³ Dean, *Governing Societies*, 93.

³⁵⁴ Dean, *Governing Societies*, 96.

³⁵⁵ Rose, *The Politics of Life Itself*, 5-6.

³⁵⁶ MaddAddam, 283.

interventions in cells, in DNA's, and tissues. Nothing is sacred in nature and in the nature of human beings; everything is open to be altered and optimized through new technologies based on knowledge of vital processes. The most powerful companies in the *MaddAddam* trilogy are the companies that specialized in the area of the body. What is commercialized in these companies are perfection and immortality, and the new knowledges in natural science make selling these dreams of perfection and immortality possible. Gene-splices, every aesthetic surgery, skin-color change, DNA infusion are possible. Biocorps are selling the dream of perfection even before a certain life has begun. Ordering DNA for unborn babies is common in the society portrayed; “They were customizing their kids, ordering up the DNA like pizza toppings.”³⁵⁷ Natural births still exist but if “nothing natural happened”³⁵⁸ there is always an option to try something else, and of course something better with more money and more research. Biocorps focus on the enhancement of life as well as the prevention of illness from the start. Both enhancement of life and the prevention of illness is an element of biopolitics. Enhanced life is more productive whereas “illness isn't productive” Crake says, “it generates no commodities and therefore no money.”³⁵⁹ However, like everything else, there are two sides regarding life. On the one hand, these compounds try to optimize life and its effectiveness; on the other hand, they decide whose life can be fostered and whose lives are disposable and the decision regarding life is a sovereign decision.

In the trilogy, the sovereign decision over life belongs to the compounds. Compounds determine who will live and who can be killed “without the commission of homicide.”³⁶⁰ There are many examples given in the trilogy about the killing of the compounds. For instance, CorpSeCorps is the official security force, started as in charge of the security of Compounds but then becomes a social security force. All kinds of legal and illegal activities are controlled and surveilled by CorpSeCorps

³⁵⁷ *MaddAddam*, 57.

³⁵⁸ *Oryx and Crake*, 293.

³⁵⁹ *Oryx and Crake*, 246.

³⁶⁰ Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, 142.

as well as all kinds of killings. CorpSeCorps, in expelling illegals and criminals, chooses the method of “shoot, shove, and shut up.”³⁶¹ People are murdered by CorpSeCorps and they have vanished as if they've never existed and these killings are not judged. Not only criminals in Pleeblanders, but also scientists in the Compounds are killed. Those scientists who do something that Compounds do not like are murdered. It is called “Corpicide.”³⁶² Glen's father (Crake's father) is among the scientists who are killed by the compounds. He found out about the unethical and dangerous researches of the compounds and he threatens that he would spread this knowledge to the public. Then, he was killed.³⁶³ These are deliberate choices of the sovereign right to “take life” or as Rose and Rabinow call it “make die.” There are also examples of Dean's argument about ambiguity between “letting die and making die.” Drug companies test their drugs on people, especially on the people who cannot afford to be treated otherwise. They use people as “guinea pigs.”³⁶⁴ Most of the time, individuals choose these treatments. They willingly accept and use the vitamins and pills that Compounds produce. But they do not aware of the fact that these drugs are in the testing phase. In the end, some people die. This is an example of the situations that one cannot determine the power that operates; whether the sovereign's right to kill or letting die principle of biopower. Treatments seem like fostering life; they are about the prevention of illness as well as enhancement and optimization of health and life, so it is about biopower. However, the drug-testing phase makes the situation complicated. It might be sovereign's right to kill because only poor people join these drug testing phase and their lives might be determined as non-valuable and these people can be characterized as “homo sacer.” At the same time, it might be about biopower's principle of “letting die.” It is not easy to determine which modality of power operates here. But from the previous example, it can be noted that sovereign power does not disappear in contemporary

³⁶¹ *The Year of the Flood*, 37.

³⁶² *The Year of the Flood*, 291.

³⁶³ *The Year of the Flood*, 298.

³⁶⁴ *The Year of the Flood*, 125.

societies. One can speak of "delegation of sovereignty"³⁶⁵ rather than its disappearance and in the trilogy, the sovereign decision over life is delegated onto the Compounds.

One way of delegation of power into other institutions is governmentality. The art of government draws the boundaries between the object and the subject, between the human and non-human, and by doing so it provides a justification of "humans' instrumental appropriation of material resources."³⁶⁶ *MaddAddam* trilogy reflects the binary divisions between natural and culture, real and artificial as well as it portrays the attempts and inventions to repudiate such divisions. On the one hand many species, "natural" species extinct, on the other hand, many new hybrid species are produced such as pigoons, wolvogs, rakunks. On the one hand, what is "natural" is lost on the other hand artificial has taken the place of the natural. In other words, what is considered as artificial a time ago is recognized as natural right now. So, in *MaddAddam* trilogy, the two poles regarding such divisions are given. However, it is significant to emphasize that the distinction between what is real and what is artificial, what is human or nonhuman, is itself instrumental and it is an effect of the art of government.³⁶⁷ As it is projected in *MaddAddam* trilogy, the boundaries between human and nonhuman, organic and inorganic, are becoming harder to be drawn due to the new scientific inventions and developments and this is directly related to the emergence of a new kind of knowledge of the living beings and the knowledge of things through which life is interpreted differently.

The scientific researches demonstrated in the trilogy are generally about the vital processes of living things. The knowledge of the vital processes is a prerequisite for the government of things and living beings. And in advanced liberal societies, these knowledges about vital processes disseminate from the experts. As it is discussed in the previous section, contemporary inventions and discoveries in the area of medicine, biology, and biotechnology have altered the perceptions about what is natural or unnatural, what is human or non-human. These knowledges are

³⁶⁵ Dean, *Governing Societies*, 93.

³⁶⁶ Coole, and Frost, "Introducing the New Materialisms," 22.

³⁶⁷ Lemke, "New Materialisms: Foucault and the 'Government of Things,'" 9.

necessary to classify what is a subject and what is an object, and this classification and categorization is the fundamental objective of the art of government. The art of government determines the subjects and objects, “establishes and enacts the boundaries between socially relevant and politically recognized existence and ‘pure matter’, something that does not possess legal-moral protection and is ‘reduced’ to ‘things’.”³⁶⁸ This objective of governmentality has the utmost importance in *MaddAddam* trilogy. The matter, which is reduced to the status of things, is open to be exploited; the material world, nature, and the artifacts are categorized as the “raw material for technological progress, economic production, or social construction.”³⁶⁹ In the trilogy, this exploitation is explicitly demonstrated and constitutes one of the fundamental bases and/or sources of dystopia. *MaddAddam* trilogy demonstrates an “ecological collapse,”³⁷⁰ and the reasons for this ecological collapse are the actions of human beings. Ecological collapse derives from human beings' perceptions about themselves, their environment, and their material world. This perception is produced, shaped, and manipulated by biopolitics. Life, in its all aspects, is “subject to judgments of value.”³⁷¹ The value of something or someone, the very categorization of things and living beings are produced by knowledge of vital processes and regulated by the art of government.

Governmentality refers to a continuum in pursuing the most effective techniques and forms of government of human beings and their milieu. There are different techniques of governmentality and alteration in these techniques does not imply an epochal shift. The main objective of the government is the mechanisms of security, the security of the economic processes, and the security of the population through state interventions.³⁷² Liquid modernity and reflexive modernity theses

³⁶⁸ Lemke, ‘New Materialisms: Foucault and the ‘Government of Things’,’ 9.

³⁶⁹ Lemke, ‘Rethinking Biopolitics: The New Materialism and the Political Economy of Life,’ 62.

³⁷⁰ Chris Berg, “Goddamn You All to Hell!: The Revealing Politics of Dystopian Movies,” 40.

³⁷¹ Rose, *The Politics of Life Itself*, 58.

³⁷² Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 353.

emphasize the increasing risk, uncertainty, and contingency in contemporary life. According to these theories, especially for risk society theory, responsibilities shifted in dealing with social risks such as poverty and unemployment, now it is the individual who has the responsibility to overcome and cope with these risks. And the consequences of the modernization process, which was unknown or unprecedented, now become apparent and create global risks. And there are no global authorities to solve the problems of global risks such as climate change and environmental problems. So there is an increase in insecurity, uncertainty, and contingency about our life and our future, and contemporary society is characterized as a risk society. From the perspective of governmentality, the risk is a concept that refers to “a way of ordering reality...a way of representing events so they might be made governable in particular ways.”³⁷³ Modernity is always about ordering, it is about “boundary demarcations, standard forms and distinctions.”³⁷⁴ Modernity is about managing contingencies, uncertainties and insecurities. As Foucault emphasizes, “in modernity, there is no ontological certainty and no center of ordinance which creates the feeling of insecurity which biopower attempts to ward off but actually proliferates by failing to vanquish uncertainty.”³⁷⁵ Beck focuses on the incalculable risks that are the consequences of industrialization process and also a globalization of these risks. But to identify risk is to make it “intelligible as specific representations that render reality in such a form as to make it amenable to types of action and intervention.”³⁷⁶ So society, in a sense, is always risk society and what is transformed in this society is the type of management of risk as well as shifting the responsibilities. It is through neoliberal rationality risk is individualized. Although Beck identifies this risk society with the domination of nature, Dardot and Laval claim it is due to the “generalized norm of competition,” the risk is

³⁷³ Mitchell Dean, “Risk, Calculable and Incalculable,” *Soziale Welt* (1998): 25

³⁷⁴ Beck and Lau, “Second Modernity as a Research Agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the ‘Meta-Change’ of Modern Society,” 534.

³⁷⁵ *Society Must Be Defended*, 256.

³⁷⁶ Dean, “Risk, Calculable and Incalculable,” 26.

individualized and risk society is generalized.³⁷⁷ Individualization of risk, Dean argues, derives from the new type of governmentality in which risk management or risk minimization depends on the choices of individuals, families, and communities.³⁷⁸ To do such choices, experts give individuals the necessary knowledges.

The role of expertise is significant in disseminating the knowledge necessary for an individual's self-government. Expertise provides information for an individual's self-actualization, the way to wealth, to health, to happiness; through expertise "self-regulatory techniques can be installed into citizen that will align their personal choices with the ends of government."³⁷⁹ Individuals in advanced liberal societies assume a new role and a new relation to themselves and the world; they are not only objects and but also the subject of the government. They are adjusted to the economic process as free, autonomous, private actors, and "private enterprise was to become vital locale for the government of the economic life of the nation."³⁸⁰ These subjects are evaluated in the second chapter with reference to the modernity theories. What is conceptualized as individualization by theories of liquid modernity and reflexive modernity is a technique of liberal art of government from the perspective of governmentality. "Individualization is a way of exercising power."³⁸¹ The individual is an effect of power and as Foucault states "power passes through the individual that it has constituted."³⁸² Liberal governmentality aims at regulating the life of the individuals through freedom and freedom is a kind of "well-regulated and "responsibilized" liberty."³⁸³ Freedom is a practice, and an essential element of

³⁷⁷ *The New Way of the World*, 276 footnote 54

³⁷⁸ Dean, "Risk, Calculable and Incalculable," 34.

³⁷⁹ Rose and Miller, "Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government," 189.

³⁸⁰ Rose and Miller, "Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government," 187.

³⁸¹ Peter Miller and Nikolas Rose, *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life* (Polity, 2008), 5.

³⁸² *Society Must Be Defended*, 30.

governmentality. Foucault asserts, “a condition of governing well is that freedom, or certain forms of freedom, are really respected.”³⁸⁴ In liberal and neoliberal societies, the freedom to choose is asserted as an obligation,³⁸⁵ and this obligation is accompanied with an obligation to fulfill one’s dreams.³⁸⁶ These obligations are fulfilled through two technologies in advanced liberal or neoliberal societies; the first one is technologies of consumption and the second one is psychological technologies.

Technologies of consumption concern with the “relations between persons and products” and technologies of psychology concerns with the “care of the soul.”³⁸⁷ For the liquid modernity thesis, the consumer is a passive being and consumption is a “lonely activity.”³⁸⁸ However, consumption is something more than that; it is not just a passive and lonely activity. The consumer is also a producer, “produces his own satisfaction.”³⁸⁹ Thus consumption is “an enterprise activity,” consumer uses his or her own capital “at his disposal, will produce something that will be his own satisfaction.”³⁹⁰ There is a “subjective meaning of consumption.”³⁹¹ Consumers are defined as “active agents in their own consumption patterns.”³⁹² Individuals’ desires,

³⁸³ Barry, Osborne, and Rose, “Introduction,” 8.

³⁸⁴ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 353.

³⁸⁵ Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 86.

³⁸⁶ Rose, “Governing ‘Advanced Liberal Democracies,’ ” 57.

³⁸⁷ Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 77.

³⁸⁸ Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 165.

³⁸⁹ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 226.

³⁹⁰ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 226.

³⁹¹ Miller and Rose, *Governing the Present*, 130.

³⁹² Miller and Rose, *Governing the Present*, 140.

wishes, and pleasures are discovered first, and then these desires and their lifestyles are reflected into the commodity and through this way, the commodity becomes more than itself; it gains meaning and value.³⁹³ Psychological technologies play an important role in mobilizing consumers as a subject. They form the necessary connection between individuals' desires, hopes as well as their anxieties with particular products. Through these two technologies, individuals are incorporated into the social whole, with a new identity as autonomous individuals who fulfill their desires and dreams and strengthen their capacities and potentials to make their dreams come true. In other words, in contemporary politics, "individual is no longer governed against her own desires; instead, she is governed in the mere fact of multiplication of her desires in the sphere of the free market."³⁹⁴ She is governed through being a producer of her satisfaction, through appealing her human capital and her entrepreneurship.

Trilogy offers substantial examples for consumer culture and these examples are analyzed in the second chapter, so they will not be mentioned again in this section. Consumer culture has drastic effects on individuals and their relationship with themselves, with others, and with the world. However, the characterization of consumerism with passivity and as a lonely activity is to overlook its productive capacities. By reading consumerism as a new technology of government, by understanding how consumption becomes the key mobilizing force, a more productive reading of consumption can be made. From the perspective of governmentality studies, individuals are not passive in the process of consumption and consumption appeals individual as an entrepreneur and make individuals' lives meaningful. Consumed products define and describe the person, her wishes, and her desires. This can be read, as Rose and Miller do, as a "political economy of subjectification" which refers to "a life that is personally pleasurable and socially acceptable."³⁹⁵ With neoliberal rationality, such life is made through making

³⁹³ Miller and Rose, *Governing the Present*, 120.

³⁹⁴ Daniele Lorenzini, "Governmentality, Subjectivity, and the Neoliberal Form of Life," *Journal for Cultural Research* (2018): 158-159.

³⁹⁵ *Governing the Present*, 141.

individuals as an entrepreneur of themselves. Being an entrepreneur herself, individuals maximize their own capital so that they can produce their own satisfaction. The characteristics of neoliberal subjects will be discussed in the next chapter. Here, it should be stressed that consumption is not an isolated activity of isolated individuals, it is a mechanism through which individuals are made entrepreneurs, who can fulfill their dreams and wishes, who produce their own satisfaction.

To conclude this section, loss of nation-state, privatization, individualization, and consumption are different but interconnected technologies of neoliberal rationality and governmentality. In this process, authorities are dispersed among institutions, families, expertise, and market. Individuals are made responsible subjects and they are governed through freedom and choice. One way of exercising freedom is to construct oneself, to care for oneself. It is through technologies of psychology such as therapeutics, the knowledge of the care of the selves, an ethical regime of the self, is dispersed among individual subjects and it is through different technologies including consumption technology individuals create identities and lifestyles for themselves. Dean considers this as “cultural governance or governance through the ethical culture,” and by the culture, he refers to “the cultivation of the capacities of the individual.”³⁹⁶ So contemporary lives of individuals are governed through freedom with an objective to foster the capacities of individuals and to increase their competitiveness. In this process, individuals are made autonomous responsible subjects; they are governed by freedom and choice. In this governance, the key is to make individuals entrepreneurs of themselves through two technologies (consumption and psychological technologies). These technologies integrate individuals into neoliberal rationality by creating and maintaining the identity and a life that is worth living. Without conceiving these technologies, individualization and consumerism can only be understood in their negative effect and perceived as inevitable consequences of advanced capitalism. However, there is always a “different form of conduct” as well as an urge to “be conducted differently...towards other objectives.”³⁹⁷ In every form of government

³⁹⁶ *Governing Societies*, 61.

as well as in individualization and consumerism, there is an ethics of the self. Foucault interprets ethics as “the elaboration of a form of relation to self that enables an individual to fashion himself into a subject of ethical conduct.”³⁹⁸ This relation to self has a “transformative potential,” which “provide at least an outline of a possible form of resistance to biopower.”³⁹⁹ So it is crucial to highlight, again, that every form of government can be altered through an analysis of the dynamics that generates that kind of government. In the trilogy, there is an emphasis on both advanced liberal governmentality and its counter-conducts and these counter-conducts will be analyzed in the following chapter.

4.5. Concluding Remarks

In this chapter power mechanisms in *HT* and *MaddAddam* trilogy are analyzed. Power is an important dimension in utopian and dystopian fiction and it is argued that modern and contemporary form of power is biopower; this power is the power of life as well as the power over life. Biopower can narrowly be defined as the integration of life processes into political calculations. In this chapter an analysis of power and biopower is made. Dystopias generally focus on the consequences of power. The fear presented in *HT* is the centralization of power and its consequences of the collective and individual lives of individuals. In the *MaddAddam* trilogy the fear derives from the power of “self-interested corporations of global capitalism.”⁴⁰⁰

In the second chapter, *HT* and *MaddAddam* trilogy are analyzed through modernity theses. These sociological narratives evaluate the transformation and epochal shifts in explaining the present. In this chapter, the aim was to look for the underlying mechanisms that constitute the present as such, and to do this, the power

³⁹⁷ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 194.

³⁹⁸ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: The Use of Pleasure*. Vol. 2, trans. Robert Hurley (Vintage, 1990), 251.

³⁹⁹ Catherine Mills, *Biopolitics* (Routledge, 2018), 30.

⁴⁰⁰ Mark Bosco, “The Apocalyptic Imagination in Oryx and Crake,” 161.

structures in these novels are analyzed. It was argued that the contemporary form of power is biopower. Three approaches to biopower, Foucauldian approach, political theology approach, and new materialist approach to biopower are taken as the starting points for evaluation of these dystopias. It is argued that the Foucauldian approach to biopower attributes a limited role to the sovereign power for contemporary life. However, in exceptional states, in totalitarian regimes as well as in decisions over the value of life, sovereign power can be observed, thus the political theology approach, which put great importance on the sovereign, is included in the study and this analysis of sovereign power is crucial in *HT*. Moreover, a post-humanist reading is necessary for *MaddAddam* trilogy. Thus, new materialist approach to biopower, which gives actancy to the matter and non-human beings, is included in the study.

Throughout the chapter, it is argued that power necessitates knowledge and truth for government. Each power mechanisms produce its truth and knowledge. In *HT*, the focus is more on the production of truth rather than production of knowledge that generates the truth. The analysis of *The Handmaid's Tale* suggests there is a strong relationship among sovereign power, disciplinary power and biopower in totalitarian regimes. The Regime legitimizes itself on the biopolitical concerns; the production and maintenance of a healthy generation. However, to do that, sovereign's right to kill is constantly practised in case of emergence of a threat to the regime's survival. Biopolitics has two dimensions; on the one hand, it is the politics of life and on the other, it is the politics of death. It can be argued that, in war-like situations, in oppressive regimes as well as in totalitarian regimes, the politics of death is more visible than the politics of life. However, deaths are legitimized and justified on the basis of the politics of life. The threats to the survival of the society are eliminated for the sake of the rest of the society. The determination of who poses threat to the society is sovereign decision. The determination of the value of the life is also sovereign decision and in repressive regimes these sovereign decisions are more visible than in free societies. In free societies, these sovereign decisions are dispersed into other institutions such as medical experts, juridical authorities, support groups, and etc. And trilogy exemplifies these dispersion or delegation of sovereignty into other institutions or authorities.

In the trilogy, the society depicted is highly developed in terms of the knowledge about vital processes as well as knowledge about things and living beings. These knowledges have altered the conception of life. This knowledge transforms the conception of life, matter, and nature. It blurs the strict categorizations that modernity has built such as the human/nonhuman-animal and natural/artificial. This new knowledge also refutes the oppositional way of thinking belongs to modernity. With these newly emerged knowledges, Atwood depicts communities that overcome anthropocentrism and recognize the vitality of living species as well as earth. Also, with the advanced scientific and technological developments, as portayed in the trilogy, life becomes to be understood in its molecular level; every part of the body (human or animal) is open to be intervened in order to have the best possible form of it. This is the point where rationality behind the biopower is revealed. Biopower is the "political economy of life" and it is through neoliberal rationality this political economy is achieved. In parallel with neoliberal rationality, biopower aims at the optimization of life chances and capabilities, achievement of the best possible version of us.

With these knowledges, the government is also altered. The loss of the power of the nation-state, privatization, individualization, and consumerism, as well as growing global risks, are the main concerns of the liquid modernity and reflexive modernity theses. In the second chapter, the examples and demonstrations of these subjects in *HT* and *MaddAddam* trilogy are given and evaluated in relation to these modernity theses. Liquid modernity and reflexive modernity focus on the neoliberal transformation and their effects on global and individual lives. These theories have totalizing tendencies and they propose grand narratives. In this chapter, rather than a totalizing narrative, an analysis of "micro-physics of power" is made to understand the underlying mechanisms of this new form of government. In this view, liberalism is understood as an art of government, and in advanced liberal societies, authorities and responsibilities are dispersed around individuals, families, communities, and diverse institutions. This form of government is not marked by an epochal shift but with a continuum. So, in this chapter, rather than focusing on evaluating the characteristics of given societies in *HT* and *MaddAddam* trilogy, the mechanisms and technologies that make societies as such are given. Power and government are inseparable. "The exercise of power consists in guiding the possibility of conduct

and putting in order the possible outcome, it is a question of government, government designated the way in which the conduct of individuals might be directed.”⁴⁰¹ And in order to be governed differently, one has to know the dynamics and technologies of government.

Utopias and dystopias open up new windows. They pose critique because a better way of being seems possible. Booker states “critiques of the existing system would be pointless unless a better system appeared conceivable.”⁴⁰² The critique will have the power to unfold our possibilities as well as our limitations. It is “the idea we have of our knowledge and its limits.”⁴⁰³ Critique has a transformative power and utopian and dystopian fictions derive their power from these transformative capacities. However, as long as the current system is perceived as inevitable, then transformation cannot occur. Through an analysis of biopower and governmentality, the order of things, their seeming fixedness, and inevitability can be overthrown. If one knows the mechanisms and technologies that govern her, then she has the capacity to be governed differently, “by other leaders... toward other objectives.”⁴⁰⁴ So the next chapter will be on governed differently.

⁴⁰¹ Foucault, “Subject and Power,” 789.

⁴⁰² *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature*, 15.

⁴⁰³ Foucault, “What is Critique,” 35.

⁴⁰⁴ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 194.

CHAPTER 5

RESISTANCE IN *THE HANDMAID'S TALE* AND *MADDADDAM* TRILOGY

As discussed in the first chapter, Atwood's dystopias are not dead-end in the sense that they portray dystopic societies in which better alternatives are also displayed. However, it should be emphasized, again, dystopias are more about warnings. The authors of dystopias do not have to propose better scenarios or alternatives. Rather, what they mostly do is to project the fear.¹ In some dystopias, hope for a better alternative can be projected but this is not necessarily the aim of dystopia. This is a highly debated issue among dystopian scholars but in this study, the arguments of Claeys regarding dystopia are adopted. He argues

Every dystopia aims at warning readers about the consequences of particular courses of action or particular ideas. Whether this is accomplished most successfully by including a component of hope, by offering an exit strategy or utopian escape within the text, or by frightening readers into taking the subject more seriously depends on the author.²

Atwood's position regarding dystopia is given in the first chapter. She considers utopia and dystopia as containing one another and she includes "a component of hope" in her dystopias. Atwood projects her fears but she also gives the reader a "little utopia" in both *The Handmaid's Tale* and for *MaddAddam* trilogy. She argues for *The Handmaid's Tale*, utopia is in the past (our present) and in the future society in which Gilead has ceased to exist.³ For *MaddAddam* trilogy, God's Gardener is

¹ Claeys, "Moylan and Dystopia," *Utopian Studies* 31.1 (2020): 197.

² Claeys, "Moylan and Dystopia," 202.

³ Atwood, *In Other Worlds*, 90.

demonstrated as utopia within dystopia.⁴ These embedded utopias within dystopia have a close correlation to what can be termed as resistance, they propose resistance to the current system.

Baccolini, while discussing the return to dystopia in present times, refers to dystopia as “one of the preferred forms of resistance.”⁵ She refers to critical dystopias specifically but in this study, a distinction between critical and traditional dystopia is not made based on the argument that all dystopias are inherently critical. Critique is a constituent element for dystopias; it is necessary for the assessment of the present. This critique that dystopia offers, however, is not for finding the ideal alternatives or ideal solutions to the current problems. This critique is an “enlightenment sense of critique.”⁶ It is the critique that Foucault, following Kant, encourages. It is about knowing that “we have of our knowledge and its limits.”⁷ Foucault proposes a general characterization of critique, it is “the art of not being governed quite so much.”⁸ Utopias are about power and authority; they aim at showing “the way people may be governed other than by the state.”⁹ Dystopias, on the other hand, can be considered as an attempt to reveal the dynamics of bad government while do not necessarily show the ways for good government. Nevertheless, both utopia and dystopia originate from an enlightenment sense of critique and at the core of critique, there lays, the relationship between truth, knowledge, power, and subject. As it is discussed in the previous chapter, the analysis of biopower necessitates an analysis of the relationship between truth/knowledge, power mechanisms, and modes of subjectification or as Foucault phrases “subjectivation.” In the previous chapter, the relationships between truth,

⁴ Atwood, *In Other Worlds*, 93.

⁵ “Dystopia Matters: on the Use of Dystopia and Utopia,” 3.

⁶ Levitas, *Utopia as Method*, 111.

⁷ Foucault, “What is Critique,” 35.

⁸ Foucault, “What is Critique,” 28.

⁹ Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, 298.

knowledge, and power as well as governmentality through which “individuals are subjugated in the reality of a social practice”¹⁰ are evaluated. In this chapter, first the modes of subjectivation that neoliberal governmentality will be given in order to find possible ways to transgress this kind of subjection. Then, the attention will be paid to the concept of “counter-conduct.” Wanting to be conducted differently can be interpreted as “counter-conduct,” and Foucault equates resistance with counter conduct.¹¹ So, in this chapter, first the modes of subjectification or subjectivation in neoliberal or advanced liberal societies will be given, then the concept of counter-conduct and resistance will be evaluated and then the demonstrations of these actions in Atwood’s dystopias will be evaluated. The aim is to reveal the possibilities of being conducted differently as well as experiencing and inventing a “different form of conduct...towards other objectives...through other procedures and methods”¹² in Atwood’s dystopias.

5.1. Modes of Subjectivation in Neoliberal Rationality

As stated earlier, the analysis of biopower requires three levels of inquiries; “knowledge of vital life processes, power relations that take humans as living beings as their object, and the modes of subjectification through which subjects work on themselves qua living beings.”¹³ The previous chapter was an attempt to analyze the “systemic knowledge of “life” and of “living beings”¹⁴ as well as to show how these knowledges are mobilized and generated in a way to govern individuals. In this section, an attempt will be made to reveal the modes of subjectification. It is argued here neoliberal rationality spread globally produces neoliberal subjects who are constituted by the mechanisms of power as “entrepreneurs of” themselves. This

¹⁰ Foucault, “What is Critique,” 32.

¹¹ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 197.

¹² Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 194.

¹³ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 322.

¹⁴ Lemke, *Biopolitics*, 119.

section is an attempt at the analysis of the construction of neoliberal subjects and characteristics of it.

It is argued throughout the study that power mechanisms constitute subjects. However, this is not a top-down process, meaning, the subject is not passively constituted by the power mechanisms. Subjectivation, for Foucault, is a process “by which a subject is constituted, the creative process by which a subjectivity is affirmed not only negatively - but also positively in the world: in brief, a constitutive movement.”¹⁵ So subjectivation or subjectification is the process through which subject is constituted and also constitutes her through the production of truth and knowledge and also through mechanisms of power. For Foucault, the subject has a double meaning “subject to someone else by control and dependence and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to.”¹⁶ So two structures make individuals governable subjects. The first one is the structure of domination and the second one is the techniques of the self. In the first structure, subjection can be observed, subjection “in the sense of subordination.”¹⁷ In the second structure, “becoming a subject”¹⁸ can be observed. Foucault claims that domination is not the sole mechanism in exercising power; in fact, it is not the best nor the most secure mechanism.¹⁹ So he turns the techniques of the self. He insists, “if one wants to analyze the genealogy of the subject...he has to take into account not only techniques of domination but also techniques of the self.”²⁰ He defines techniques of the self as those techniques,

¹⁵ Judith Revel, “The Literary Birth of Biopolitics,” in *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, 2015, 41.

¹⁶ “Subject and Power,” 781.

¹⁷ Judith Butler, “Bodies and Power Revisited,” *Feminism and the Final Foucault* (2004): 187.

¹⁸ Butler, “Bodies and Power Revisited,” 187.

¹⁹ Foucault, "Discussions about Truth and Subjectivity," *About the Beginning of the Hermeneutics of the Self: Lectures of Dartmouth College 1980*, trans. Graham Burchell (The University of Chicago Press, 2016), 115.

²⁰ Foucault, “Subjectivity and Truth,” in *The Politics of Truth*, 181.

which permit individuals to effect, by their own means (or with the help of other people), a certain number of operations on their own bodies, on their own souls, on their own thoughts, on their own conduct, and this in a manner so as to transform themselves, modify themselves, or to attain a certain state of perfection, of happiness, of purity, of supernatural power, and so on.²¹

Techniques of the self are those techniques that make individuals governable subjects, but this government is based on the subject's own conduct. This government is possible through the use of "the self of people, and the self-conduct of people."²² Foucault makes a correlation between the art of existence and the techniques of the self. Art of existence consists of the actions through which subjects transform themselves and make their life into a work of art or as Foucault posits "an oeuvre that carries certain aesthetic values and meets certain stylistic criteria."²³ The techniques of the self makes the constitution of the subject possible, they are what "enables one to constitute oneself as subjects of one's own existence."²⁴ The argument in here is that in contemporary societies subject is constituted through neoliberal rationality. The promoted techniques of the self or the self-conduct of people are appropriated into the neoliberal rationality. To this aim, neoliberal rationality forms an "alignment between political rationalities and the technologies for the regulation of the self,"²⁵ an alignment that becomes possible through governmentality. In neoliberal rationality, the very individuality of the people is targeted; their relationship with themselves, with one another and with the world are constituted on the basis of the neoliberal rationality, which is the "condition of their active freedom."²⁶ The characteristics of neoliberal rationality are dispersedly given throughout previous discussions. The central concerns here are the construction of

²¹ Foucault, "Subjectivity and Truth," 181.

²² Foucault, "Discussions of Truth and Subjectivity," 114.

²³ *The History of Sexuality: The Use of Pleasure*, 10-11.

²⁴ Revel, "The Literary Birth of Biopolitics," 41.

²⁵ Rose and Miller, "Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government," 201.

²⁶ Graham Burchell, "Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self," 10.

neoliberal subject as well as the characteristics of this subject, the entrepreneur subject.

The divergence between classical liberalism and neoliberalism is key in evaluating the neoliberal subject. In neoliberalism, the principle of exchange is replaced by the principle of competition and competition requires systemic interventions “on the market, on the conditions of the market.”²⁷ This marks the abandonment of laissez-faire liberalism. It is previously argued that the homo-economicus of classical liberalism and neoliberalism is not the same. In classical liberalism, homo-economicus is the man of exchange whereas in neoliberalism she is “entrepreneur of the self,” she is who possesses a capital, invests in it, and competes with all her abilities and skills. So, competition is at the heart of neoliberal rationality. But this competition is based on an idea of human capital. Foucault argues the theory of human capital extends the economic analysis into “a previously unexplored domain” and in this way, it gives an “economic interpretation of a whole domain previously thought to be non-economic.”²⁸ Through the theory of human capital, labor is included in the economic analysis. However, this labor is not the same as labor power, in the analysis of labor power, labor is established as an abstract category whereas neoliberals grasp labor in “its specification, its qualitative modulations and the economic effects of these modulations.”²⁹ Neoliberals put labor into economic analysis and analyze the “worker as an economic subject.” This new economic subject has human capital and there are two sources of human capital, “innate elements and other, acquired elements.”³⁰ Innate elements are composed of genes and other hereditary elements. Although innate elements are considered given, modern biology and the developments in genetics makes the category of innate elements questionable. *MaddAddam* trilogy posits a perfect example of the abandonment of the category of innate elements; genes and other hereditary

²⁷ Jason Read, ““A Genealogy of Homo-economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity,” *Foucault studies*, 6 (2009): 27.

²⁸ *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 219.

²⁹ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 222.

³⁰ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 227.

elements are open to be scrutinized and modified so that the human capital can be increased. Acquired elements are mostly related to the educational investments as well as mobility.³¹ Neoliberals argue that innovation is the result of the human capital, “of investments we have made at the level of man himself.”³²

A new way of understanding economics emerges; economics as “the science of the systematic nature of responses to environmental variables,”³³ and economic subject or neoliberal subject is who can respond to these changing variables, who has the capacity of adaptation, the capacity of “adaptation to competition.”³⁴ So competition is the “potentially universal principle of conduct most essential to the capitalist order,”³⁵ and in order to compete in this order, one has to reveal her entrepreneurship dimension. In this understanding, the market is perceived as a “process of discovering and learning.” It is through the market economic subject is formed, educated, and disciplined. So, the market as a learning process paves the way for constructing its own subjects, the neoliberal and entrepreneur subject.³⁶ The entrepreneur is who learns to behave rationally, who learns to calculate his/her own risks and ways to manage these risks. The entrepreneur is who invests in herself, “who tries to effectively manage her natural talents and acquired skills within a space of freedom which seems unlimited.”³⁷ The entrepreneur is who accepts market norms and internalizes market mechanisms. By introducing the theory of human capital, the process of internalization of the market norms and mechanisms is revealed. It is through human capital that neoliberal governmentality is extended

³¹ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 229.

³² Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 231.

³³ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 269.

³⁴ Dardot and Laval, *The New way of the World*, 66.

³⁵ Dardot and Laval, *The New way of the World*, 102.

³⁶ Dardot and Laval, *The New way of the World*, 106.

³⁷ Daniele Lorenzini, “Governmentality, Subjectivity, and the Neoliberal Form of Life,” 161.

beyond the realm of economics and transforms “the market not only into a principle of limitation for the state but also into a mechanism of intelligibility for the whole social field of personal relations.”³⁸ The principle of competition becomes central not only in the market but also in other social relations and the entrepreneur is who endowed with human capital, which can be “accumulated through enlightened choices that are the fruit of responsible calculation of costs and benefits.”³⁹

These neoliberal subjects are responsible for their decisions as well as their consequences. These subjects are exposed to dangers and risks, and “their management being a matter of strictly private decisions.”⁴⁰ These subjects are not just consumers; their consumptions produce their satisfaction. So they are also producers.⁴¹ The whole society is organized as “an enterprise made up of enterprises,”⁴² as made up of individual entrepreneurs. So there emerges a new ethic in neoliberal rationality, a new form of the care of the self; “the individual’s activity in its entirety is conceived as a *process of self-valorization.*”⁴³ The subject is in a constant evaluation of herself and her capital and in search of increasing this capital. The characteristics of neoliberal subjects are also evaluated in the modernity theses evaluated in the second chapter in relation to individualization. Individualization, as stated above, is an effect of governmentality and is a form of subjugation. As it is an effect of power, it can be altered and modified if the rationality behind this individualization is comprehended. What is missing in modernity theses is the analysis of neoliberal rationality, through which competition and rivalry extend beyond the market and captures all personal and social relations. What is lacking is the analysis of human capital through which subjects becomes entrepreneurs.

³⁸ Lorenzini, “Governmentality, Subjectivity, and the Neoliberal Form of Life,” 161.

³⁹ Dardot and Laval, *The New way of the World*, 275.

⁴⁰ Dardot and Laval, *The New way of the World*, 275.

⁴¹ Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 226.

⁴² Dardot and Laval, *The New way of the World*, 255.

⁴³ Dardot and Laval, *The New way of the World*, 266.

Without this analysis of the individuality that neoliberal rationality produces, individualization would be perceived as inevitable results of capitalism, thus other forms of subjectivities, the alternative forms of being cannot be promoted. As Foucault states to form other subjectivities, we have to refute "this kind of individuality,"⁴⁴ and this refusal is possible by a genealogy of the neoliberal subjects, attempted to be done in here.

There are other formulations on the neoliberal subjects, which may be useful in understanding contemporary forms of subjectivities. Foucault speaks about a more general category of the neoliberal subject, the entrepreneur of the self. This entrepreneurship has several dimensions and concrete consequences for people. For instance, Hardt and Negri identify four categories for the contemporary subjectivities. These are, the indebted, the mediatized, the securitized and the represented. They argue, debt becomes the general condition of life; it reduces the quality of life to mere survival and leads to "depotentialization" of subjectivities. Media becomes the main source of information, communication and expression. The mediatized subjectivity is constantly involved in the communication network within the media but this makes her neither passive nor active, she is involved in media through absorption of attention in such a way to decrease the potentiality of her subjectivity. Moreover, the security becomes the one of the most important mechanism of the contemporary societies and the fear is the triggering effect in the organization and maintenance of the security society. People are being watched everyday, in their every action but they, most of the time, cannot argue with these security and surveillance mechanisms because dangers and external threats are increasing. Lastly, although for Hardt and Negri, representation is not a reliable mechanism for democracy, they argue, due to the decline in civil society, the doors of the political participation are closed for the people. The represented is being less and less represented, has no access to the political participation and thus loses potential contribution to politics.⁴⁵ According to them, these "subjective figures

⁴⁴ "Subject and Power," 785.

⁴⁵ *Declaration* (Argo Navis Author Services, 2012), 10-33.

constitute the social terrain on which - and against which - movements of resistance and rebellion must act."⁴⁶

There are different forms of subjectivation in *HT* and *MaddAddam* trilogy. In *HT*, rather than a focus on a neoliberal past, the totalitarian present is set as the center of the dystopia so that neoliberal rationality and the neoliberal subject is not portrayed as much as it is portrayed in the trilogy. However, it can be argued that totalitarian take-over is the result of neoliberal rationality and its mode of subjectivation. The embedded utopia in *HT* is set in the free past and also after the collapse of the Gileadean regime. So, it can be argued that forming subjectivities that are different from neoliberal rationality produces might have prevented the totalitarian take-over. But, again, the focus in *HT* is on the totalitarian regime, so, the resistance would not be centered on the refusal of neoliberal subjection. Though in *MaddAddam* trilogy the resistance would focus on the individuation or individualization that neoliberal rationality generates; it would concentrate on forming different subjectification other than neoliberal subjections.

5.2. Foucauldian Concept of Resistance

As it is stated above, power is and can only be exercised on free subjects and “only insofar as they are free.”⁴⁷ If there is no freedom, then it is not a power relation, it is a pure relation of domination. This freedom entails “the means of escape or possible flight.”⁴⁸ So there is no power relation unless there is resistance. Power and resistance imply one another, they refer to one another, and they feed one another. In every modality of power (sovereign, disciplinary, and biopower), there appear different mechanisms of resistance. This means, to resist sovereign power or disciplinary power, one has to use different techniques and strategies. So, strategies of resistance alter according to the power strategies that it opposes; thus, “resistance

⁴⁶ Declaration, 2012, 9.

⁴⁷ Foucault, “Subject and Power,” 790.

⁴⁸ Foucault, “Subject and Power,” 794.

is in itself an adaptive response to power.”⁴⁹ Foucault argues resistance is not outside of the power relations. He insists “resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power.”⁵⁰ However, this does not mean that there is no escape from power relations. Rather, this means resistances emerge within the power relations. If power “is about making people do things *that they otherwise would not*”⁵¹ then, there is always a possibility to do otherwise. For Foucault, “there are no good subjects of resistance”⁵² as well as a “normative criteria”⁵³ of resistance. Resistance, like power, is plural, multidimensional, and mobile.⁵⁴

A brief comment should be added in here. Different conceptualization of power and biopower results with different conceptualization of resistance as well. If power is understood as purely in juridical terms, then the resistance should have been conceptualized as a juridical category. Foucault does not conceptualize power, resistance or government in juridical terms; in fact, he opposes this conceptualization. However, in political theology perspective of biopower, power is still considered in juridical terms, thus operates inside and outside the law. Thus, Foucault's tripartite relation of freedom, power, and resistance cannot be found, for instance, in Agamben's work. In Agamben's works, the ways out from the thanatopolitics, from the politics of death as well as the ways out from the politics over life is related to law, not related to freedom. For Agamben, a new relation with the law would have shifted the security paradigm of the contemporary societies. This new relation with law should be something like a "destituent power." He claims that since the French Revolution a paradigm of "constituent power" has been maintained, through which a new institutional order is established. However, in the

⁴⁹ Mark Kelly, *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault* (Routledge, 2010), 108.

⁵⁰ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Vol.1, 95.

⁵¹ Mark Kelly, *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault*, 107.

⁵² Colin Gordon, “Afterword,” in *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge*, 257.

⁵³ Gordon, “Afterword,” 257.

⁵⁴ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Vol.1., 96.

age of security, this paradigm cannot be maintained. He proposes and advocates for a shift from "constituent power" to "destituent power." Constituent power erases the law for the creation of it in a new form whereas destituent power "deposes the law once for all" and "can open a really new historical break."⁵⁵ He, in his earlier works, establishes a strong link between the law and the power. He argues,

one day humanity will play with law just as children play with the disused objects, not in order to restore them but to free them from it for good. What is found after the law is not a more proper and original use value that precedes the law, but a new use that is born only after it. And use, which has been contaminated by law, must also be freed from its own value.⁵⁶

So, for Agamben, it is the law, in the first place, that hinders the practice of freedom. Thus, the aim is to get rid off the law first. Although he does not propose the erasure of the law forever, he advocates the deactivation of law. After deactivating the law, the space will be opened for human action and then it can be asked whether there is a possible use of law. A resemblance can be highlighted among Agamben, Hardt and Negri in their emphasis of destituent power. Hardt and Negri also put greater importance to the destituent power; the power "that destroy the despotic effects left in us and our societies through the exhaustion of the old constitutions."⁵⁷ They attribute the destituent power to the today's struggle, the struggle against the debt, the media, the security mechanisms as well as both the representation system and the unrepresentation of the represented. However, for them, the destituent power should be motivated in order to "prepare the basis for a new constituent power."⁵⁸ This constituent power will not be the same as the power that is maintained since French Revolution. An important difference should be pointed among Agamben, Hardt and Negri. Hardt and Negri do not conceptualize power in terms only of law whereas in Agamben, power is interpreted in juridical terms. Hardt and Negri are in parallel with Foucault in their emphasis of the multidimensionality of power. For

⁵⁵ "From the State of Control to a Praxis of Destituent Power," in *Resisting Biopolitics: Philosophical, Political and Performative Strategies*, 28.

⁵⁶ Agamben, *The State of Exception*, 64.

⁵⁷ *Declaration*, 52.

⁵⁸ *Declaration*, 47.

Foucault power cannot be analyzed in terms of juridical terms because it needs other relations than the relations of law. So that resistance will not be built upon the juridical terms, it will be built upon the practice of freedom.

In this study, resistance refers two things; to be conducted differently and to conduct oneself differently. Foucault defines conduct as “the activity of conducting and conduction...but it is equally the way in which one conducts oneself, lets oneself be conducted, is conducted, and finally, in which one behaves as an effect of a form of conduct.”⁵⁹ As it is discussed in the third chapter, the techniques of government can be characterized as “conduct of conduct” which covers not only conduct of individuals but also their milieu; it refers to the “government the self to governing others.”⁶⁰ It is about calculating, managing, and administering individual and collective conducts for the sake of achieving certain objectives. The first meaning of resistance, “wanting to be conducted differently”⁶¹ is a struggle against the techniques of governmentality. The techniques of governmentality subjugate individuals and promote certain types of individuality. Resistance, in this sense, is to develop and promote a “new type of subjectivity through refusal of this kind of individuality.”⁶² Promotion of new types of subjectivity requires breaking the subjugation and in order for “desubjugation of the subject,”⁶³ critique is essential. This refers to the second meaning of the concept of resistance, “to conduct oneself differently.” Critique is necessary for conducting oneself differently. Through critique, the subject questions the government and questions the government’s discourses on truth. In this way, “desubjugation of the subject” will be insured “in the context of what we call, in a word, the politics of truth.”⁶⁴ In “What is

⁵⁹ Foucault, *Security, Terriroty, Population*, 193.

⁶⁰ Lemke, “Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique,” 3.

⁶¹ Foucault, *Security, Terriroty, Population*, 194.

⁶² Foucault, “Subject and Power,” 785.

⁶³ Foucault, “What is Critique?,” 32.

⁶⁴ Foucault, “What is Critique?,” 32.

Enlightenment?” Foucault argues critique is archaeological in its method and genealogical in its target. It is not about finding “universal structures of all knowledge” but rather seeking for the moments of articulation of “what we think.” Critique derives not from “the form of what we are” but reveals the historical moments that make us who we are today. Critique is to “separate out from the contingency that has made us what we are.”⁶⁵ Critique is a practice of freedom, “an experiment with the possibility of going beyond.”⁶⁶

The concept of counter-conduct is both a political and ethical task. The political is not clearly defined by Foucault. For him, there is no definite scope of the political but “everything can be politicized. Politics is no more or less than that which is born with resistance to governmentality, the first uprising, the first confrontation.”⁶⁷ So politics comes with resistance to governmentality. Politics is to resist the individuality that techniques of governmentality promote. Ethics, on the other hand, is a crucial element in Foucault’s later works. He defines ethics as a relation of one with oneself - “how the individual is supposed to constitute himself as a moral subject of his own actions.”⁶⁸ Ethics requires freedom; it is a practice of freedom through which subject constitutes who she is. Thus, ethics is a “creative activity,” it is a “work of art.”⁶⁹ Foucault claims, nowadays art is considered as related only to objects, whereas an individual’s life should be considered as art,⁷⁰ as an art of existence. According to Foucault, the self is not given, and as it is not given, it should be something to work on. The aim of the work on the self, the art of existence, is to refuse what is offered to us and to conduct ourselves differently, to promote “new kinds of subjectivity.” Counter-conduct, to sum up, involves two

⁶⁵ Foucault, “What is Enlightenment?,” 124.

⁶⁶ Foucault, “What is Enlightenment?,” 132.

⁶⁷ Senellart, “Course Context,” *Security, Territory, Population*, 390.

⁶⁸ Foucault, “On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress,” in *The Foucault Reader*, 352

⁶⁹ Foucault, “On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress,” 351.

⁷⁰ Foucault, “On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress,” 350.

levels of activity; the first, the refusal of the governmental mechanisms through which individuals are imposed on a certain kind of conduct, wanting to be conducted differently, and second wanting to conduct oneself differently. Resistance, thus, is an “ethico-political task - centered on the effort by the individual to practice and experiment with different modes of subjectivation.”⁷¹

5.3. Resistance and Counter-Conduct in *The Handmaid's Tale*

As evaluated in the third chapter, the struggle in *HT* does not begin with the totalitarian take-over. It begins with the road that paves the way for totalitarian take-over. Thus, Atwood puts her embedded utopia in the past, before the totalitarian regime took place as well as in the future, in which the Gileadean regime would collapse. Book’s past constitutes our present. So, Atwood considers such a regime could have been prevented before it was established. It can be argued; prevention of totalitarian take-over can only be achieved through a different form of subjectivity, different from the individuality that advanced industrial society, neoliberal rationality, and its power mechanisms promote. The flashbacks throughout the book, Offred’s memories of her past give clue for different types of subjectivity that may have been promoted. However, as little information is given about the past, the subjectivities that may be promoted against the individuality that advanced industrial society promotes will be discussed in detail in *MaddAddam* section. In concluding remarks, the resemblance between advanced industrial society portrayed in *HT* and *MaddAddam* will be made so that the possibility of the promotion of different subjectivities in *HT*’s free past can be discovered as well. Focus, in this section, will be on resistance to totalitarian regime and possibilities of counter-conduct in such conditions. As it is emphasized before, in every power regime, there is a possibility of resistance and to reverse the power relations. As Foucault stresses “it would not be possible for power relations to exist without points of insubordination which are means of escape.”⁷² In this section, the aim is to reveal

⁷¹ Daniele Lorenzini, “From Counter-Conduct to Critical Attitude: Michel Foucault and the Art of not Being Governed quite so much.” *Foucault Studies* (2016): 19.

⁷² Foucault, “Subject and Power,” 794.

the points of insubordination in the totalitarian Gileadean regime. The book covers three different forms of resistance to the regime; one is an organized resistance, includes Mayday and The Underground Femaleroad, the second one comes within the regime itself, and the third and maybe the most important one is the Handmaids' resistances.

There is not much information about Mayday and The Underground Femaleroad. Ofglen, the walking partner of Offred, introduces Mayday. The organization works in secrecy, the password is known only by the members and is not used randomly; it should be used only if it is really necessary because knowing other member poses threat if they are caught.⁷³ The organization helps those in need if they are really in "immediate danger,"⁷⁴ Ofglen says. The other organized resistance is called "The Underground Femaleroad." This is basically a rescue operation team; the members are unknown, but it is known through Moira that religious groups are helping those who are in need to leave the country. The fundamentalist basis of the Gileadean regime gives little freedom for the existence of different religious sects at first and people from these sects and who are against the regime organize the Underground Femaleroad rescue operation. The safe houses are established, and an underground rail station is used for the transportation of the people. The Underground Femaleroad and its station are in contact with each other, and Moira says "if one station gut busted the entire chain backed up until they could make contact with one of the couriers, who could set up an alternate route."⁷⁵ Professor Pieixoto defines Mayday as a quasi-military organization in the "Historical Notes" section, but there is no emphasis on the tendency of violence for Mayday or The Underground Femaleroad. So, these organizations seem like a non-violent organization and perform non-violent resistance.

Resistance is not exterior to power relations. It is no coincidence the two organized resistance groups have a connection with the general power structure in Gilead. Nick is an Eye and works with Mayday in rescuing Offred. The Eyes are the

⁷³ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 212.

⁷⁴ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 283.

⁷⁵ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 258.

gazes of the regime; they are at the heart of the disciplinary power. They know the Commanders, often work for them; they know the dissidents and the political rebels. They have the means to know everything that happens in Gilead. No one risks questioning the authority of the Eyes neither the Commanders nor the Guardians. They are both inside and above the regime in this sense. Nick's using his position in Gilead in rescuing Offred with Mayday Organization may be considered as a resistance to the disciplinary power. Resistance uses and exists within the strategies of power, "it exists all the more by being in the same place as power."⁷⁶ Resistance does not demolish the power relations altogether rather alters them. Resistance is itself a power relation and it varies according to the power it opposes. Resistance to disciplinary power, in the case of the Gilead, comes from the disciplinary mechanism itself. The Eyes are the surveillance mechanism of the regime, which can see everything but cannot be seen in return. Their power derives both from their invisibility and being everywhere. As an Eye, Nick is invisible, but he sees and knows everything; he has the power over the Commanders and their Wives when the regime's security is at stake. By using the power of an Eye, Nick is able to rescue Offred. When the Commander asks for authorization, Nick says "not that we need one sir, but all is in order."⁷⁷ He does not need authorization because he himself is the authority as an Eye and his authority is the regime's authority, which cannot be questioned by anyone.

Nick resists the regime by conducting himself differently, different from a regular Eye. Although Eyes are crucial in sustaining the regime's maintenance and security, they are also subjugated and subordinated by the regime. They should conduct themselves in such a way that they provide and maintain the regime's security. The regime makes the friend and enemy distinction and decides on who poses threat to the regime. As an Eye, Nick should not be part of a resistance movement or should not help anyone who is a threat to the regime. He is the protector of the regime thus an enemy of the resistance movement. Nick, by planning and helping Offred's escape, demonstrates an example of

⁷⁶ Foucault, "Powers and Strategies," 142.

⁷⁷ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 306.

“desubjectivation of the subject.” He, in a sense, transgresses who he is, transgresses the subjectivation of the regime. Nick, in short, transgresses his being subjugated as an Eye. He forms a new subjectivity by refusing to be a regular eye. Refusal is the beginning of “the process of subjectivitation” for Hardt and Negri⁷⁸ and for Foucault, refusal is “the domain of counter-conduct, a sphere of revolt that incites a process of productivity.”⁷⁹

The second organized resistance is a rescue operation, it establishes safe houses and transports Handmaids and other people those who are in need through the Underground Femaleroad. It is known that religious sects are among those who establish these houses and arrange the rescue operations. Moira explains, when the regime first established, different religious sects are given a kind of freedom; “as long as you said you were some sort of a Christian and you were married, for the first time that is, they were still leaving you pretty much alone. They were concentrating first on the others.”⁸⁰ After the takeover, the regime identifies many enemies, many “others,” and Christian sects do not compose the others at first; so in a sense, religious sects of Christianity, in the beginning, are exempt from the control mechanism so that they can be part in the organization of rescue operations. The source of the legitimacy of the regime, Christianity, is also the only source of the relative freedom that religious sects have during the first years of the regime. Again, the power and the resistance are inextricably linked; resistance comes from the very basis of the regime, from Christian sects. Power operates through differentiation, differentiations “which permits one to act upon the actions of others, differentiations determined by the law or by traditions of status and privilege.”⁸¹ In Gilead, differentiation is made according to gender, marital status, religion as well as ideology. Religion has a privileged status in Gilead. At first, the devout Christians are exempted from the harsh policies of the regime, though not exempted from the

⁷⁸ Declaration, 33.

⁷⁹ Arnold I. Davidson, “Introduction,” *Security, Territory, Population*, xxx.

⁸⁰ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 259.

⁸¹ Foucault, “Subject and Power,” 792.

power mechanisms. Nevertheless, the common feature between the regime and the rescue organization, their devotion to Christianity, gives the rescue operation a kind of freedom as well as power to resist.

Besides the organized resistance, the regime itself offers possible flights and escapes. The rules of the regime are broken several times by the Commanders, by the Wives, and by the Guardians. The first example of these is the black markets. When Offred sees Serena Joy and Nick having cigarettes, she thinks that these cigarettes might come from the black market. Although the black market is illegal, the existence of it offers a break from the rules of the Gilead. Having a cigarette means that both Serena Joy and Nick have something to exchange and also the rules are not that strict and can be bendable if someone has something to exchange. Offred considers this as a kind hope. She says, "This gave me hope... There's always a black market, there's always something that can be exchanged."⁸² The existence of a black market exemplifies that the rules are not that strict in Gilead. "For every rule has an exception,"⁸³ and this exception is a possible escape from the regime itself and produces hope.

It is not only the existence of black markets that constitutes the exception in Gilead or it is not only in the black markets through which rules are bent. The Wives and the Commanders are not dedicated or devoted to the rules of the Gilead. After a couple of ceremonies and no pregnancy, Serena Joy suggests that Offred should have sex with Nick. Even if this is illegal and risky for all of the parties, she makes this proposition. In exchange for this, she offers both a picture of Offred's daughter and a cigarette.⁸⁴ So they exchange things; in exchange for Offred's body and her silence, Serena Joy gives a cigarette and a picture of her daughter. Nick also exchanges his sperms; he says, "I get paid."⁸⁵ And not only Serena Joy but also many Wives use other means for the pregnancy of the Handmaids and doctors are

⁸² *The Handmaid's Tale*, 24.

⁸³ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 139.

⁸⁴ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 215-216.

⁸⁵ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 274.

among these means. So from this picture, it seems as long as one possesses something that the other one needs, the rules are bendable. The instrumentalization of the people and their interchangeability make the rules flexible and bendable for those who have power. For Serena Joy, both Offred and Nick are the means to an end, and the realization of the end is more important than the rule itself and makes the exception possible. The regime itself reserves point of resistances through black markets, through the exchange of things, and secret agreements between the Wives, Handmaids, and men.

Jezebel's sets an example for the system's own fracture. Jezebel's is a "club,"⁸⁶ Commander says, and is only for higher officers and trade delegations. The women working in Jezebel's are the ones who "couldn't be assimilated."⁸⁷ Jezebel is an illegal club; in Jezebel's, these high-rank officials can have sex with the women working for Jezebel's, or they can bring their "evening rental." The club is "the backstage site where high party officials flout the regime's puritanical sexual norms."⁸⁸ It is not only a place for Commanders or delegations to have illegal sex; it is also a business club, Commander says. "Good place to meet people. You can hardly do business without it...You can overhear things too; information."⁸⁹ So it serves more than one function; the high-rank officials of the regime use Jezebel's for doing business, gathering information, and for "illegitimate sex." It is known that the news is manipulated in Gilead and gossip has an informational value, and high-rank officials' gossip network seems to be located in Jezebel's. It also fosters trade according to the Commander. However, the chief purpose of Jezebel's is to provide the variety that Men's nature requires but the regime prohibits; "Nature demands variety, for men. It stands to reason, it's part of the procreational strategy. It's Nature plan."⁹⁰ The nature of men demands diversity whereas the nature of the

⁸⁶ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 248.

⁸⁷ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 249.

⁸⁸ Elisabeth Hansot, "Selves, Survival, and Resistance in The Handmaid's Tale," *Utopian studies* (1994): 58.

⁸⁹ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 249.

women necessitates subordination; and the Gileadean regime, with its own cracks and rules, provides the natural fulfillment for both men and women. In the case of high-rank officials, resistance to the power structure in Gilead is different from other kinds of resistance. High-rank officials establish a kind of alternative to their lives in Gilead; an alternative that resembles, at some points, the pre-Gileadean times. The Commander himself says, “It is like walking into the past.”⁹¹ The past is equated with “the clothes, prostitution, drugs”⁹² by the Commander nevertheless he and the others are content with this alternative place as this place offers them “freedom to” that Gilead does not have. Resistance does not have to disrupt power relations; in some cases, it can even support power relations. For the high-rank officials, establishing such an alternative place to their lives in Gilead serves as an enhancement of their loyalty to the patriarchal order of the Gilead. They are enjoying their freedom in Jezebel’s whereas in Gilead, even for the men, freedom is limited. Power and resistance are connected and they can bring change, but this change can promote freedom or limit that freedom. Jezebel’s promotes the freedom of the high-rank officials but their freedom, in turn, consolidates the power of the regime. Change is not always better as opposed to what Offred thinks “change, we were sure, was for the better always.”⁹³ In the case of this illegal club, resistance seems to provide high-rank officials with the freedom that they lack in Gilead, and having this freedom guarantees the support and the commitment of the high-rank officials to the regime.

Handmaids’ resistances provide substantial examples for understanding resistances as subjective experience as well as counter-conduct. The protagonist’s will to write what has happened and is happening to her constitute the very first act of resistance. In Gilead, women are being silenced, deprived of their rights, and confined to their houses through subjugation in various ways. Women are deprived

⁹⁰ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 249.

⁹¹ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 247.

⁹² Fiona Tolan, “Feminist Utopias and Questions of Liberty: Margaret Atwood’s *The Handmaid’s Tale* As Critique of Second Wave Feminism,” 28.

⁹³ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 239.

of language and words, and through taping her records Offred regains her voice and defies the women's position in Gilead. She reclaims her voice, reclaims what is taken from her, and composes her story. She is "able to take risks and to tell stories, may transcend conditioning, establish their identity, joyfully reclaim their bodies, find their voices, and reconstruct the social order."⁹⁴ The decision to record is itself an act of resistance in such repressive conditions. She is made powerless in various ways, but she still has the language and this is all she has to preserve her integrity, to survive, and not be destroyed by the regime. It is through the language she has power; "she fully realizes that the only way to survive is to preserve her language, as it plays a vital part in this process."⁹⁵ Language is access to reality, to power, and the truth. It is through language people can communicate and language has "the power to define and fix... discourse and communication, what counts as right or wrong, true or false, and correct or incorrect, in any given political or social situation."⁹⁶ Recording tapes becomes an instrument for Offred to communicate with the others, to tell her story, and to feel alive. Offred deconstructs the official language of the regime and creates her own language through which she can constitute her own discourse.

Offred creates her versions of past and present through these tapes, she tells her truth, her perspective of truth. The relation between power and truth is already given. Power creates truth and in return truth supports the power relations but there is no one version of the truth. "Each society has its own regime of truth, its general politics of truth."⁹⁷ Offred creates her own truth as opposed to the regime's truth. This is an act of resistance. Offred defies the truth of the Gileadean regime, a regime that makes women powerless. In these records, Offred analyzes her past and her present; she memorizes her past, recreates it, and shares it. One of the crucial

⁹⁴ Lucy M. Freibert, "Control and Creativity: The Politics of Risk in Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*," 285.

⁹⁵ Kuźnicki, *Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Fiction: Fire is Being Eaten*, 36.

⁹⁶ Sherman Tan, "Contemporary Visions of Power and Resistance: On the Relevance of Jurgen Habermas, Michel Foucault and Judith Butler," *Inaugral Annual Ph. B. Conference* (2011): 2

⁹⁷ Foucault, "Truth and Power," 131.

techniques of totalitarian regimes to maintain its power is the erasure of the past or rewriting history, they try to erase the individual identity and create mass instead. The Gileadean regime also uses these techniques, especially for the Handmaids. Their former identity, their names, their families, and their stories are erased and deconstructed for their adaptation to their new position in society. In her tapes, Offred tries to memorize her past, recreate it, and not to forget her identity, and even construct a new one. In most dystopias, memory has a crucial function. “The recovery of history and literacy, together with the recovery of individual and collective memory, becomes an instrument tool of resistance for their protagonists.”⁹⁸ Recording tape is Offred’s way to memorize things and it generates resistance. The protection of her memory and identity become instruments for survival and resistance at the same time. The tapes are Offred’s private space, where she enjoys freedom; freedom of speech, and freedom of thought. The Giledean regime of truth cannot seed into these tapes because these tapes are part of Offred’s consciousness and “the values of the State have never been part of her consciousness.”⁹⁹ Although through re-education, Handmaids’ are made to internalize the norms of the regime, Offred refuses to internalize it. Offred refuses many things that the regime makes her do in her consciousness. Where there is little or no freedom to act, private consciousness can be a reserve for resistance because it cannot be easily controlled. Her control over her consciousness is a private act; but through this control “she refuses to forget the past, she refuses to believe in the absolute authority of Gilead, just as she refuses to give up hope.”¹⁰⁰

Her tapes do not only help her maintain self-integrity but also they provide a “counter-narrative to the social gospel of Gilead.”¹⁰¹ They are historical materials. In “Historical Notes,” Offred’s records are examined by the academics of the future.

⁹⁸ Baccolini, “The Persistence of Hope in Dystopian Science Fiction,” 520.

⁹⁹ Chris Ferns, “The Value/s of Dystopia: The Handmaid’s Tale and the Anti-Utopian Tradition,” *The Dalhousie Review* (1989): 377.

¹⁰⁰ Coral Ann Howells, “The Handmaid’s Tale,” in *The Handmaid’s Tale*, ed. J.B. Bouson, 98.

¹⁰¹ Coral Ann Howells, “Margaret Atwood’s Dystopian Visions: The Handmaid’s Tale and Oryx and Crake,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Margaret Atwood*, 165.

Although Pieixoto does not rely on the Offred's records and their objectivity, her records bear witness to the Gilead, to the history. "In the process of reconstructing herself as an individual, Offred becomes the most important historian of Gilead."¹⁰² Offred becomes a historian by sharing her experiences. Her voice produces an alternative history to Gilead. She defies the constituted knowledges on Gilead through recording the tapes and through providing her experience in it. Piexito does not acknowledge the importance and value of the tapes. Offred's records are disqualified because of its insufficiency to give adequate information regarding the structure of Gilead and information about the Commander. Records are found to be subjective and thus lack scientific quality. Individual perception and experience are disqualified as a source of scientific knowledge. However, Offred's records constitute a sort of "subjugated knowledge." Foucault defines subjugated knowledges as "historical contents that have been buried and disguised in a functionalist coherence or formal systemization."¹⁰³ These knowledges are disqualified because of their inappropriate forms, because of their low level of scientificity. These knowledges are part of the struggle according to Foucault; they are in a struggle with the hierarchy, with the strict scientific rules and forms. The insurrection of these knowledges means an attack on the constituted power/knowledge relation. And Offred's history generates a counter-narrative and a counter-history against the established Gileadean history.

Tapes also offer the possibility of a future. It "is an act of hope: every recorded story implies a future reader."¹⁰⁴ Offred records the tapes not only for herself but also for the future listener, she tells her story for someone else. "But if it's a story, even in my head, I must be telling it to someone. You don't tell a story only to yourself. There's always someone else. Even when there is no one."¹⁰⁵ This implies a hope for the future that maybe everything will change, and someone will

¹⁰² Howells, "The Handmaid's Tale" in *The Handmaid's Tale*, 92.

¹⁰³ "Two Lectures," 81.

¹⁰⁴ *The Handmaid's Tale*, xiv.

¹⁰⁵ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 48.

listen to these tapes. When there is little freedom to act, imagination and hope can be a powerful tool for resistance. Offred's private consciousness and refusal to internalize the norms of the regime makes the imagination of an alternative world possible. She is aware of the fact that the story she is telling is not a happy one, not an active one or a civilized one.¹⁰⁶ However, she believes that there should be more than this; she says, "I believe there can be no light without shadow; or rather, no shadow unless there is also light."¹⁰⁷ Although she does not see the light right now, she believes that there should be light and the idea of light in such a dark society constitutes a form of resistance.

As it is stated previously several times, resistance and counter-conduct vary according to the power it opposes. In *HT*, one can observe the combination of sovereign, disciplinary, and biopower. In totalitarian regimes, these power mechanisms can be felt in their extremity. Gileadean regime legitimizes itself based on the maintenance of the population and for the production of healthy future generations. The two poles of biopower, "anatomo-politics of the human body and regulation of the population" are observed. For achieving a healthy population, the regime adapts disciplinary techniques of power. The training and education in the Red Centre and controls of Handmaids by Aunts aim at making individuals necessary for the maintenance of the population. This training aim at getting "individuals to keep themselves under surveillance, discipline themselves, and train themselves"¹⁰⁸ in their future role as Handmaids. To resist this power requires "avoiding, rearticulating discourses and by destabilizing the institutional control of behavior."¹⁰⁹ In Gilead, women, especially Handmaids, are made speechless and thoughtless; to speak, to write, to give voice to their thought is forbidden. This is the norm. The Aunts are the control mechanisms for the Handmaids' behavior, they

¹⁰⁶ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 279.

¹⁰⁷ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 115.

¹⁰⁸ Mona Lilja, and Stellan Vinthagen, "Sovereign Power, Disciplinary Power and Biopower: Resisting What Power with What Resistance?," *Journal of Political Power* (2014):114.

¹⁰⁹ Lilja and Vinthagen, "Sovereign Power, Disciplinary Power and Biopower: Resisting What Power with What Resistance?," 114.

provide the institutional control of behavior. Offred, by recording her own experience to the tapes, avoids and destabilizes the institutional control of behavior. Recording the tapes also helps her to retreat from her mental world and this is an act of resistance to disciplinary power. She shows “outward compliance while maintaining inner aggression towards the values and norms of discipline...” She creates a “non-society wilderness area or refuge, where a different life is possible.”¹¹⁰ This can be interpreted as a technique of the self, which “enables one to constitute oneself as a subject of one’s own existence.”¹¹¹ So Offred, through these tapes, desubjectivates her subject position as a Handmaid. She resists the subjectivity that Gilead gives to her and transforms herself into something other than a Handmaid. Lilja and Vinthagen, who are scholars of Foucauldian resistance, claim as techniques of the self, diaries are personalized items and “gives another story of who you are...attempts to reconstruct habits and abilities,”¹¹² thus, they promote new kinds of subjectivities.

In Gilead, women’s bodies are subjugated in several ways. Handmaids’ bodies, especially their abilities to procreate are the main reasons for their subjugation. Their bodies determine who they are. Offred says, “I avoid looking down at my body, not so much because it’s shameful or immodest but because I don’t want to see it, I don’t want to look that determines me so completely.”¹¹³ In the past, Offred uses her body accordingly to her wishes and her pleasures. She says “I used to think of my body as an instrument, of pleasures...or an implement for the accomplishment of my will.” But now, she says, “flesh arranges itself differently.”¹¹⁴ Her survival depends on her ability to procreate and for this, she has

¹¹⁰ Lilja and Vinthagen, “Sovereign Power, Disciplinary Power and Biopower: Resisting What Power with What Resistance?,” 115.

¹¹¹ Judith Revel, “The Literary Birth of Biopolitics,” 41.

¹¹² “Sovereign Power, Disciplinary Power and Biopower: Resisting What Power with What Resistance?,” 116.

¹¹³ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 72-73.

¹¹⁴ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 84-85.

to have sex with Commander and then with Nick. To continue living, she says, “I resign my body freely, to the uses of others.”¹¹⁵ When the power takes the body as its object, when the subjugation is within the body, then the body becomes the site of resistance. Foucault stresses “power, after investing itself in the body, finds itself exposed to a counter-attack in that same body.”¹¹⁶ In *The Handmaid’s Tale*, both individual body and body of the species are “invested by power relations.”¹¹⁷

Handmaids’ bodies are an instrument in sustaining procreation. The role of their body is to procreate. This role is determined and shaped by the regime. To use the body other than its determined role can be considered as counter-conduct. For instance, the dress code keeps Handmaids “from seeing but also from being seen.”¹¹⁸ Handmaids should be invisible; they should be modest and “impenetrable.”¹¹⁹ Angels and Guardians are not supposed to look at Handmaids, they should “show respect” because of the services of Handmaids. When two Guardians try to look at Offred, she let them see her whereas it is forbidden. She moves her hip; she knows she is watched and she enjoys the power of her body. She says, “a small defiance of rule, so small as to be undetectable, but such moments are the rewards...such moments are possibilities, tiny peepholes.”¹²⁰ Offred also uses her body for pleasure, which is strictly prohibited in Gilead. The relationship between Nick and Offred is secret and illegal. Although it is started as a one-time job for both of them, it evolves into something other than an obligation. It evolves into something to be remembered, something to hold on to in such a way that Offred does not even want to escape from Gilead. Offred says “with the Commander, I close my eyes, even when I am only kissing him goodnight. I do not want to see him up close. But now,

¹¹⁵ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 298.

¹¹⁶ “Body/Power,” in *Michel Foucault: Power/Knoweldge*, 56.

¹¹⁷ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 24.

¹¹⁸ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 18.

¹¹⁹ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 39.

¹²⁰ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 31.

here, each time, I keep my eyes open... I want to see what can be seen, of him, take him in, memorize him, save him up so I can live on the image, later.”¹²¹ So, Offred uses her body as well as her mental world as sites of resistance. She conducts herself differently, different from a Handmaid. As power is invested in her body, she uses her body to reverse the power relations. A kiss on the lips, a move in the hip, or a forbidden gaze can be considered as counter-conduct in such conditions. In each counter-conduct, Offred feels her power. These are forms of insubordination and “means of escape.”

It is argued that in *HT* different modalities of power exist at the same time. Not only individual bodies are subjugated but also the life of the population, as a whole, is subjugated. The population as a species are arranged and regulated towards the purpose of procreation. The Gileadean regime’s existence is legitimized on the basis of making life, maintenance of the future generations. Foucault argues, when power becomes power over life, death becomes “power’s limit, the moment that escapes it.”¹²² Foucault elsewhere argues death is the moment “when the individual escapes all power...Power no longer recognizes death. Power literally ignores death.”¹²³ When power is the power of life as well as the power over life, suicide can be considered as a “subversive act of resistance.”¹²⁴ The act of suicide proves that the relationship is not pure domination but a power relation. So, the possibility of suicide, in a sense, is “a minimum requirement for a relation of power to exist.”¹²⁵ Through the act of suicide, individuals escape from biopower, from the power aims at making a life.

¹²¹ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 281.

¹²² *The History of Sexuality*, Vol.1, 138.

¹²³ *Society must be defended*, 248.

¹²⁴ Chloë Taylor, “Biopower,” in *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*, ed. Diana Taylor (Acumen Publishing, 2011), 49.

¹²⁵ Chloë Taylor, “Birth of the Suicidal Subject: Nelly Arcan, Michel Foucault, and voluntary death,” *Culture, Theory and Critique* 56.2 (2015): 204.

The protagonist, Offred, is not the first Handmaid in Commander's house. It is known that there are at least more than one Offred before her. She learns this when she finds out a message on the floor, saying "nolite te bastardes carborundorum."¹²⁶ When she discovers this message on the floor, she wonders what has happened to Offred before her, who wrote this message. She asked Marthas in the house but they do not tell. Then later, in one of the meetings with Commander, she learns what the Latin sentence means, "don't let the bastards grind you down." She also learns that Offred before her hanged herself and that is why there was no chandelier in Offred's room.¹²⁷ And then Offred tells Commander maybe she should not come to Commander's office anymore and Commander says "I thought you were enjoying...I wish you would." Then Offred says, "you want my life to be bearable to me," and Commander approves this. Offred discovers that something has changed she has something on Commander. She says, "what I have on him is the possibility of my own death. What I have on him is his guilt. At last."¹²⁸ The possibility of her death reverses the power relation between the Commander and Offred. Offred before her escapes power relation through her suicide. By killing herself she escapes from the submission of the regime, she is no longer subjugated as a Handmaid. And now Offred has this possibility, the possibility that will invoke a sense of guilt for Commander, guilt that may loosen his power and a possibility sets her free from submission of Gileadean regime.

Another demonstration of suicide as resistance to biopower is given through Ofglen, Offred's walking partners. Ofglen is a member of the organized resistance movement in Gilead, of Mayday. One day a new Ofglen comes to walk with Offred and Offred asks her what has happened to the old Ofglen. She says she hanged herself because "she saw the van coming for her. It was better."¹²⁹ Ofglen chooses to end her life because the Eyes were coming for her. She does not want to bear

¹²⁶ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 62.

¹²⁷ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 196-197.

¹²⁸ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 198.

¹²⁹ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 297.

what Eyes plan for her. She does not want to let someone do something to her, on her and she chooses to commit suicide. Suicide can be considered as a practice of freedom in the sense that an individual determines the conditions she can or cannot live, under which circumstances her life cannot be livable. It is also a practice of freedom to determine or choose the details of one's own death. Foucault, in an interview, talks about the right to suicide, "a recognized right for everybody to kill himself when he wishes in decent conditions"¹³⁰ Ofglen, probably, does not hang herself in decent conditions nevertheless she chooses to kill herself to avoid what would be done to her. This is resistance and resistance refers to "a practice of freedom."¹³¹ According to Foucault, freedom is "never to accept anything as definitive, sacrosanct, self-evident or fixed. No reality must dictate to us a definitive and inhuman law."¹³² Even if Ofglen's aftermath seems definite when the van comes, she refuses submission, refuses to accept what seems definite, and hangs herself. She escapes from biopower; in this case, biopower is power over life rather than the power of life. Suicide is resistance against biopower; it is the "removal of its very object,"¹³³ the life of a fertile handmaid, which would ensure healthy future generations.

Suicide can also be considered as resistance to sovereign power. As the right to take life belongs to the sovereign, the suicide can be read as degrading the power of the sovereign and taking his right away from him. The act of murder or killing can also be an example of resistance to sovereign power. In one of the Particicution, a man "convicted of rape" and the "penalty of rape is death."¹³⁴ So he is brought in front of the Handmaids' and the Handmaids are "permitted anything," they can do

¹³⁰ "Social Security," in *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman, trans. Alan Sheridan and Others, (Routledge, 1990) 176.

¹³¹ Judith Revel, "The Literary Birth of Biopolitics," 41.

¹³² "Interview with Foucault," in *About the Beginning of the Hermeneutics of the Self*, 127.

¹³³ Paolo Adorno Francesco, "Power Over Life, Politics of Death: Forms of Resistance to Biopower in Foucault," 109.

¹³⁴ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 290.

everything to this man. Then, Ofglen steps forward and kicks him in the head several times. Offred sees this and tells Ofglen she saw what she has done and asks her why she has done such a thing because the man said “I didn’t...” Then Ofglen tells Offred “he wasn’t a rapist at all, he was a political. He was one of ours. I knocked him out. Put him out of his misery.”¹³⁵ So the right to take life is once again captured by someone other than the sovereign and this act reverses the power relations.

To conclude this section, in Gilead there are different forms of resistance. There are organized resistances, escape plans that the regime offers and Handmaids’ resistances. These prove the point that even in totalitarian regime where control and surveillance mechanisms are high and individuals’ freedom is limited, there are possibilities of resistance and possibilities of counter-conduct. These resistances or counter-conducts are not total, they propose nothing like the grand refusal of the Gileadean regime. Rather they seek to alter power relations. In Gilead, there are “only dispersed and shifting points of resistance or forms of counter conduct.”¹³⁶ The aim in such a counter-conduct is not to get rid of power relations altogether, “but only to modify the network of power relations in such a way as to change the power with which we are at that moment concerned.”¹³⁷ An important point should be clarified before move on to the analysis of *MaddAddam* trilogy. As previously stated, a little utopia embedded in *HT* is in the past and the future when Gilead collapses. The analyses of free past and the future are not made in this section because there is little given about this past as well as the future. Nevertheless, it can be argued that what is explicitly implied in *HT* is the importance of bearing witness and taking responsibility for what we have seen or what we have witnessed because these things can give us the power to prevent or to change the courses of the events before it’s too late. One of the main features of dystopia is a warning; and Atwood in *HT* warns the reader about the consequences of social and political neglect, about the “avoidance of responsibility.”¹³⁸ Not taking things seriously, ignoring the facts

¹³⁵ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 292.

¹³⁶ Carl Death, "Counter-Conducts: A Foucauldian Analytics of Protest," *Social Movement Studies*, 9 (2010): 239.

¹³⁷ Kelly, *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault*, 113.

and neglecting, and not taking responsibility, all pave the way for the Gileadean regime. So, it can be stated that the little utopia embedded in *HT* is about fighting against isolation, alienation, and most importantly individualization. Offred, both in pre-Gilead and in Gilead, is “self-absorbed, focused on her own happiness and survival and unconcerned with women as a group, with society at a large, and even with the quality of her own life.”¹³⁹ In *HT* resistance to such individualization is not given directly but in *MaddAddam* trilogy, this resistance demonstrates the embedded utopia.

The future, which is portrayed a little in the “Historical Notes” section, also contains a utopia. The academic panel on Gileadean studies takes place at the University of Denay, Nunavit. Although Professor Pieixito argues that we cannot fully comprehend the dark past, “we cannot always decipher them precisely in the clearer light of our own day,”¹⁴⁰ Atwood’s message is clear; denial is not an option. Denial that leads to the Gileadean regime and denial after its end have the same consequences. The attitude of Professor Piexieto towards Offred’ tapes prove the continuation of repression within the society; his attitude strengthens the patriarchal order and excessive scientific positivism. Offreds’ tapes are not considered scientific and objective and they are evaluated from a sexist perspective. So even though Gilead may cease to exist, inequalities are still there. Individual salvation/liberation is important, but an individual is not an isolated creature, she is also a social being and this necessitates the concerns for society as well. So, belonging to a community, bearing witness, sharing, and taking responsibilities are the main themes that *HT* suggests for a better society. These subjects also constitute the main themes in *MaddAddam* trilogy and its embedded utopia.

¹³⁸ Rigney, *Margaret Atwood*, 114.

¹³⁹ Stillman, and Johnson, “Identity, Complicity, and Resistance in The Handmaid’s Tale,” 81.

¹⁴⁰ *The Handmaid’s Tale*, 324.

5.4. Resistance in *MaddAddam* Trilogy

In *The Handmaid's Tale*, Atwood projects totalitarian regime as dystopia whereas, in *MaddAddam* trilogy, advanced industrial society is presented as a dystopia. In neoliberal or advanced industrial society, freedom is the key element in governing individuals whereas in totalitarian regime freedom is limited. In Gilead, "freedom to" is defined as a sign of anarchy, and "freedom from" is promoted.¹⁴¹ In the trilogy, anarchy is also displayed together with technocracy.¹⁴² This anarchy is displayed through a free and advanced or neoliberal society in which most of the institutions are given away to private companies, violence rates are high, and social as well as individual security is at minimum. Atwood, in these books, takes the reader a step further and asks, "what if." In the trilogy, the question asked is, "what if we continue down the road we're already on? How slippery is the slope? What are our saving graces? Who's got the will to stop us?"¹⁴³ The answers to these questions provide the reader with clear views for current socio-political conditions and in some cases alternatives to the current systems, current ways of being, and doing things. *MaddAddam* trilogy provides us alternatives, hope for a better future. So, in this section, these alternative ways of being and doing things will be analyzed, the forms of different subjectivities against individualization of neoliberal governmentality will be evaluated, and they will be analyzed through the concept of resistance, counter-conduct as well as the concept of becoming. Analyzing different forms of subjectivities that are promoted in the society that *MaddAddam* trilogy illustrates would also reveal embedded utopia in *HT*. In the trilogy, resistances can be grouped into two; collective resistance and individual resistance.

The spread of neoliberal rationality relies on human capital and its integration into the market economy through the techniques of governmentality. Advanced industrial or neoliberal society governs through individual freedom and

¹⁴¹ *The Handmaid's Tale*, 34.

¹⁴² *In Other Worlds*, 93.

¹⁴³ *Curious Pursuits*, 323.

individual is a “power-effect.”¹⁴⁴ Governing through freedom is maintained and secured through individualization, which is “a way of exercising power.”¹⁴⁵ Foucault strongly posits

“The philosophical problem of our days is not try to liberate individual from the state and from the state’s institutions, but to liberate us both from the state and from the type of individualization which is linked to the state.”¹⁴⁶ Today resistance concerns the questioning of the types of individualization that neoliberal or advanced liberal society produce. With questioning such individualization, through critique, a possibility to be otherwise is opened since “critique’s ultimate concern is self-formation.”¹⁴⁷ So this section focuses on the alternative subjectivities that are portrayed in *MaddAddam* trilogy.

The collective resistance comes from two groups. The first group is God’s Gardeners, which is a group of religious environmentalist and pacifist. Members of God’s Gardeners are mostly scientists; they either work for the Compounds or have worked for them. Among the members, there are also the Pleeblanders and refugees. Adam One, the leader of the group, insists that there is no hierarchy among members on the spiritual level but on the material level, Toby says, there is.¹⁴⁸ They are against materialistic life and property ownership, most of them do not use technology, computers are not allowed, they believe in the need to respect the entire living creature including the earth itself. They believe in catastrophe, the Waterless Flood, which will erase the human race from the earth. The Waterless Flood, according to God’s Gardeners, will be made by the human race itself; it will be a plague, which will only affect human beings and “leave all other Creatures

¹⁴⁴ Mills, *Biopolitics*, 23.

¹⁴⁵ Miller and Rose, *Governing the Present*, 5.

¹⁴⁶ “Subject and Power,” 785.

¹⁴⁷ Kevin Thompson, “Forms of Resistance: Foucault on Tactical Reversal and Self-Formation,” *Continental Philosophy Review* 36.2 (2003): 130.

¹⁴⁸ *The Year of the Flood*, 54-55.

untouched.”¹⁴⁹ God’s Gardeners resist the neoliberal techniques of government by promoting and constructing alternative ways of living as well as different subjectivities. One of the new techniques of government is government through the community. For *MaddAddam* trilogy an observation can be made regarding the rise of communities, specifically the rise of religious communities. The government through community is in alliance with the neoliberal and individualized subject; the community assumes “responsibility for its own health, happiness, wealth and security.”¹⁵⁰ So the rises of communities do not invalidate the process of individualization. In fact, Dean argues “the self-governing individual” and community are not antithetical but complementary.¹⁵¹ Because in these communities there are subjects who are individually belong to the community rather than a communitarian bond between the members. Individual subjects seek their own interests. However, God’s Gardeners establish a different community, a community that does not compose of individualized subjects. These subjects, at least most of them, try to transform themselves into an ethical subject. God’s Gardeners aim at establishing an ethical community and they promote ethical subjectivation; they promote “to become other than what we are.”¹⁵² They encourage different forms of life through a critique of the current ways of being and doing.

The actions of God’s Gardeners present great examples for counter-conduct. They display different forms of conduct. They are not only “conducted differently, by other leaders,” but they also conduct themselves differently. The top members of God’s Gardeners, Adams and Eves, educate the young members. These young members do not attend in any kind of education other than given by Gardeners. Young ones learn the doctrines through oral education since Gardeners are refused to give education in written language, for them “nothing written down could be

¹⁴⁹ *The Year of the Flood*, 509.

¹⁵⁰ Nikolas Rose, “The Death of the Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government,” *International Journal of Human Resource Management* (1996): 335.

¹⁵¹ *Governing Societies*, 90.

¹⁵² Arnold I. Davidson, “Introduction,” *Security, Territory, Population*, xxx.

relied on,”¹⁵³ only memories can be depended on. And also, the paper is considered as sinful “because it was made from the flesh of trees.”¹⁵⁴ Through this education within the community, young ones are given an alternative education, through which they learn the possibility to be an anti-consumer and anti-materialist. A possibility is revealed through this education, the possibility to promote subjectivities that do not conform to the individualization of neoliberal governmentality. In the school, young ones are given practical education, an education that will make them survive and live in a harmony with nature now and especially after Waterless Flood. This education contains “Culinary Art,” “Holistic Healing with Plant Remedies,” “Garden Botanicals,” “Meditation,” “Predator-Prey Relationship and Animal Camouflage.”¹⁵⁵ Through this education, teachers as well as students oppose the individualization of neoliberal governmentality and transform themselves into ethical subjects. They transform their relationship with one another, with others, and with the world. In a corporation-controlled world, where everything has a monetary value and monetary value is “a way to survive,”¹⁵⁶ God’s Gardeners refuse to survive like this. They refuse to join the exploitation and destruction of nature, of environment, and living species. They reinforce respect towards the world and living beings. They know and teach the young ones different ways to live. They refuse to act as if “capitalism is the only game in town,”¹⁵⁷ by memorizing the past, the Saints, the extinct animals. They oppose scientific developments that will impoverish society, will further exploit natural resources, and will result in the extinction of many species. They are also against the creation of new species just for fun after causing the extinction of many. In short, they propose “an ecologically-based critique of the bioengineering and short-sighted instrumental logic central to Flood’s

¹⁵³ *The Year of the Flood*, 9.

¹⁵⁴ *The Year of the Flood*, 73.

¹⁵⁵ *The Year of the Flood*, 74.

¹⁵⁶ Anna Bedford, “Survival in the Post-Apocalypse: Ecofeminism in *MaddAddam*,” 80.

¹⁵⁷ Levitas, “Discourses of Risk and Utopia,” 205.

corporate compounds.”¹⁵⁸ They offer another as well as a better way of living. And this is the embedded utopia for Atwood.

God’s Gardeners’ perception of life is discussed in the previous chapter in relation to new materialism. They want and encourage living in a “more ethical and technically proficient future.”¹⁵⁹ The members of God’s Gardeners are learned to constitute themselves not as individualized subjects. As Kelly claims, “power increases its level of control by constituting more individualized subjects, who are more concerned with themselves than ever.”¹⁶⁰ The members of God’s Gardeners learn to “exercise power over” themselves through doctrines and they learn to resist themselves too. In this way, they resist the power mechanisms. They treat humans and animals alike; according to their view, humans are not superior to animals, but they are in a relation of kinship. They are against the worldview that “animals for the sole pleasure and use of man, and you could therefore exterminate them at whim.”¹⁶¹ They encourage a different type of relationship not only with the animals but also with the whole world. They are against consumerism due to its destructive effect on the relationship between humans and other living beings as well as natural resources. Rather than a hierarchy, in which humans are at the top, they believe in a heterarchy in which all living beings have equal right to be in the world, to live in the world. In short, God’s Gardeners’ resistance can be characterized as the promotion of counter-conduct through self-formation. Counter-conduct is “the struggle in order to claim and obtain other conduct, in order for the individual to be conducted autrement.”¹⁶² Counter-conduct is a political and ethical activity; the aim is to transform “one’s relation to oneself and others; it is the active intervention of individuals and constellations of individuals in the domain of ethical and political

¹⁵⁸ Miles Weaver, “Writing from the Margin: Victim Positions in Atwood’s *The Year of the Flood*,” 60.

¹⁵⁹ *The Year of the Flood*, 295.

¹⁶⁰ *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault*, 120.

¹⁶¹ *MaddAddam*, 238.

¹⁶² Lorenzini, “From Counter-Conduct to Critical Attitude: Michel Foucault and the Art of not being governed quite so much,” 11.

practices and forces that shape us.”¹⁶³ In advanced liberal or neoliberal societies, the forces that shape us are techniques neoliberal governmentality and they refuse to be shaped by this governmentality. God’s Gardeners also refuse its individualization and its normalization. They do not only refuse to be shaped by the techniques of governmentality such that they are not just reactive. They also seek and work for a better world. They, in this sense, “reclaim the task of caring ourselves, for forging our own destinies,” they “foster the creation of new forms of sociality, new sorts of shared subjectivities.”¹⁶⁴ Although some of the members of the Gardeners are working scientists, they refuse to be integrated into the market economy within the limits that the economy determines. They do not oppose science altogether but refuse the domination of the alliance between scientific rationality and economic rationality. The Gardeners, although living in a violent society, do not normalize violence in any kind. They encourage appreciating the sacredness of life.

The second collective resistance comes from the MaddAddamites, who are not as pacifists as the Gardeners. The MaddAddamites split from the Gardeners due to their disagreement over the means to live in a better world. The split occurs after a discussion between Zeb, the leader of the MaddAddamites, and Adam One, the leader of the God’s Gardeners. They argue about what should be done to stop extinction; Zeb tells Adam

Peace goes only so far... There's at least a hundred new extinct species since this time last month. They got fucking eaten! We can't just sit here and watch the lights blink out. Have to begin somewhere. Today SecretBurgers, tomorrow that fucking gourmet restaurant chain. Rarity. That needs to go.¹⁶⁵

Adam One refuses to do something to prevent these. He thinks, “to act like one’s enemies was to descend to their level.”¹⁶⁶ This is the reason why Zeb separates from the God’s Gardeners and establishes his own community. Both communities do not “believe in killing people”¹⁶⁷ but they have different agendas and they use different

¹⁶³ Arnold I. Davidson, “In Praise of Counter-conduct,” *History of the Human Sciences* 24.4 (2011): 32.

¹⁶⁴ Kevin Thompson, “Forms of Resistance: Foucault on Tactical Reversal and Self-formation,” 131.

¹⁶⁵ *The Year of the Flood*, 301.

¹⁶⁶ *The Year of the Flood*, 301.

techniques to cope with the current situations. Zeb and the MaddAddamites want to change the status quo and the Gardeners, rather than dealing with the current problems, plan their future. The Gardeners are pacifists, they are not revolutionary in the sense that they do not try to overthrow the existing system. Rather, they believe in the Waterless Flood, which will abolish the current system. So, what they do, mainly, is to transform themselves into ethical subjects so that they will live an ethical life now and after Waterless Flood will erase most of the population.

The MaddAddamites consist of many top scientists, “who bailed out of the Corps and gone underground because they hated what the Corps were doing.”¹⁶⁸ The MaddAddamites interact with each other through a chat room in the Extinctathon game. This game is about the knowledge of extinct species. The players who know more about extinct species get the highest scores. The MaddAddamites use this game as an arena through which they recruit new players, only the best ones, and they exchange ideas about how to destroy the Compounds. Only the Grandmaster can be members of the MaddAddamites. The designer of the game is not known but Zeb thinks it may be Adam One. Their father, Rev, has the idea that animals are for the pleasure of humans and there they may be exterminated. So Extinctathon may be an “anti-Rev counterinsurgency on the part of Adam.”¹⁶⁹ In the game there are bulletins and the news about the bombings and the insurgencies occurred in the society but this news reflects the reality, the sects of the communities of the real protestors are given in this news. There is also news about new diseases. The MaddAddamites use this game since no one can “think there was anything hidden inside a location that was right out in the open and so obviously ecofreakish.”¹⁷⁰ The MaddAddamites try to change the system now before it’s too late. They do not want to wait for the Waterless Flood, in that sense they may not be as believers as the Gardeners. They do not think the education of the young ones

¹⁶⁷ *The Year of the Flood*, 399.

¹⁶⁸ *The Year of the Flood*, 398-399.

¹⁶⁹ *MaddAddam*, 238.

¹⁷⁰ *MaddAddam*, 237- 238.

is enough. They are, as Crake says, “after the machinery. They’re after the whole system, they want to shut it down.”¹⁷¹ Against the Compounds, they organize bioform resistance and they attack the infrastructure. They plant bioforms to the infrastructure such as “the microbes that ate the asphalt, the mice that attacked the cars.”¹⁷² They try to stop the operation of the Compounds since they are responsible for the destruction of nature, extinction of living species, in general, for the wrongdoings in society. And they use the same techniques that Compounds use to govern the society, the knowledge of the things and living beings.

This knowledge is about biopower, so the resistance of the MaddAddamites is resistance to biopower. Biopower is about fostering life, making it more governable and manageable as well as more effective. It is “about creating the infrastructure of population growth, increased production of effectiveness through training and education of a population.”¹⁷³ From this perspective, efforts that will destroy the infrastructure, the efforts of the MaddAddamites can be characterized as resistance to biopower. The Gardeners’ alternative education as well as their constitution of ethical subjectivities is also resistances to biopower. Resistance to biopower spread from “the pragmatic experience of necessary self-defense, creation of new space, cultivation of an ‘other’ and different ideals and values among individuals, subcultures, and groups that do not subscribe to (all of) the ideals of the dominant discourse.”¹⁷⁴ Both the Gardeners and the MaddAddamites create new spaces. The Gardeners are on move always; they use different buildings for different purposes. The Edencliff Rooftop is their central place and chartroom in Extinctathon is the central place for the MaddAddamites. In these places, they create and cultivate subcultures, the cultures distinct from the Compound culture. Through education, they promote a different lifestyle and they also cultivate “a different set of values,

¹⁷¹ *Oryx and Crake*, 248.

¹⁷² *The Year of the Flood*, 399.

¹⁷³ Lilja and Vinthagen, “Sovereign Power, Disciplinary Power and Biopower: Resisting What Power with What Resistance?,” 119.

¹⁷⁴ Lilja and Vinthagen, “Sovereign Power, Disciplinary Power and Biopower: Resisting What Power with What Resistance?,” 120.

practices”¹⁷⁵ that helps them to resist the life and existence promoted by the Compound. Lives promoted in these communities are no longer manageable lives, no longer efficient and useful lives for neoliberal techniques of governmentality.

As communities, both the Gardeners and the MaddAddamites resist biopower collectively. But the scientists also resist the power mechanisms individually. The scientists’ positions in the trilogy are discussed in detail in the previous chapter. On the one pole, some scientists do not question or criticize the tasks given to them and help to maintain the status quo and some scientists are against ongoing systemic exploitation. Scientists are crucial in generating the necessary knowledge of living beings to govern. It should be emphasized here that by organizing attacks against the running of the Compounds, these top scientists de-subjectivize their subject position. Many successful scientists work for the Compound since the money is there and with money, you have the opportunity to make research.¹⁷⁶ These scientists work for the researches that interest Compounds, which are “profitable commercial applications.”¹⁷⁷ So the scientists are expected to work and research in specific areas, the areas that Compounds allowed. They have limits in using as well as producing knowledge. By choosing to be among the Gardeners or the MaddAddamites they transgress who they are; they transgress the power mechanisms that determine who they are. Transgression and limit, Foucault argues, “depend on each other,” he maintains “ a limit could not exist if it were absolutely uncrossable and, reciprocally, transgression would be pointless if it merely crossed a limit composed of illusions and shadows.”¹⁷⁸ So these scientists know their limits but transgress these limits. They are no longer servants of industry; they are no longer scientists of the Compounds, their actions are no longer limited

¹⁷⁵ Lilja and Vinthagen, “Sovereign Power, Disciplinary Power and Biopower: Resisting What Power with What Resistance?,” 121.

¹⁷⁶ *MaddAddam*, 292.

¹⁷⁷ *MaddAddam*, 292.

¹⁷⁸ “A Preface to Transgression,” in *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, 34.

to what Compounds permit. They choose to be other scientists from what Compounds define and characterize.

Another but complementary reading can be made regarding the resistance of the God's Gardeners and the MaddAddamites. The subjective figures of Hardt and Negri given in the beginning of this chapter are altered in these communities and these alterations are the resistances of these communities. These subjective figures are the indebted, the mediatized, the securitized and the represented. These groups do not own property and they are not using money. They reverse the relationship between the debtor and the creditor. They use abandoned places and they owe nothing to anyone. They create new social bonds in these communities, in this sense, "they do not seek to restore an order and they do not ask for justice or reparation for the offended, they want instead to construct another possible world."¹⁷⁹ They do not use computers or they do not watch the news from the media; they have different sources for the real news. In this sense, they are not mediatized, they "discover a new way to communicate."¹⁸⁰ Although the God's Gardeners is an open community and accept everyone if they are willing to participate in the community, the MaddAddamites are not that inclusive. They recruit the top scientists through a game. The MaddAddamites refuse to be seen, they want to be invisible. So they reverse the relationship with the security mechanisms. "Since security functions so often by making you visible, you have to escape by refusing to be seen. Becoming invisible, too, is a kind of flight."¹⁸¹ And the MaddAddamites choose this path to flight. Lastly, through these communities, they become apart from the subjective figure of the represented. They do everything collectively; they create their own education system, they practice medicine through their own means, they have a different network. They do not involve in current social and political structure; instead they generate an "exodus from the existing political structure."¹⁸²

¹⁷⁹ Hardt and Negri, *Declaration*, 36.

¹⁸⁰ Hardt and Negri, *Declaration*, 37.

¹⁸¹ Hardt and Negri, *Declaration*, 40.

¹⁸² Hardt and Negri, *Declaration*, 47.

In the trilogy, individuals' resistances are as important as collective resistances or resistances of communities. These individual resistances can be called micro resistance, which can be defined as "the inevitable resistance to power at the personal level."¹⁸³ Toby, one of the protagonists of *The Year of the Flood* and *MaddAddam*, is a figure, who personally resists the individuality that neoliberal governmentality promotes. She is a pleeblander; she is graduated from Martha Graham Academy and her branch is Holistic Healing. Although she is a pleeblander, she does not conform to the values and norms that are common in the Pleeblands. As discussed in detail in the previous chapters, in the Pleeblands, selling and buying are the main activities and consumerism is widespread, appearances and physical characteristics like beauty and fitness are given too much importance. She does not internalize these norms but she, passively, accepts the current ways of doing things although she knows that things are wrong.

I knew there were things wrong in the world, they were referred to, I'd seen them in the onscreen news. But the wrong things were wrong somewhere else.

By the time she'd reached college, the wrongness had moved closer. She remembers the oppressive sensation, like waiting all the time for a heavy stone football, then the knock at the door. Everybody knew. Nobody admitted to knowing. If other people began to discuss it, you tunned them out, because what they were saying was both so obvious and so unthinkable.¹⁸⁴

There is a resemblance between Toby and Offred, both know that things were wrong but wrong is somewhere else. This wrong, they assume, would not touch them, they would not be affected by wrong. But in the end, both are affected. Toby joins the Gardeners after her boss in SecretBurger and Adam One get into a fight. She kicks her boss and Adam One rescues her from the situation, brings her to their Garden. This is how Toby becomes a Gardener. She does not decide to become a Gardener, she does not make any decision, but she thinks something else made the decision for her.¹⁸⁵ Again, there is passive acceptance of the situation.

Toby's transformation begins after she joins the Gardeners. Although she does not truly believe in Gardeners' doctrines, she acts as if she is a true Gardener.

¹⁸³ Kelly, *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault*, 110.

¹⁸⁴ *The Year of the Flood*, 284.

¹⁸⁵ *The Year of the Flood*, 52.

She considers leaving the Gardeners since she is not a true believer but then she stops thinking that, she might not “quite a Gardener, yet she wasn’t a pleeblander anymore. She was neither the one nor the other.”¹⁸⁶ During her training as a Gardener, she works with Pilar, learns from her more about the plants and the animals. When Adam One offers her to become an Eve, she says “I can’t accept...it would be hypocritical...I’m not sure I believe in all of it.”¹⁸⁷ By saying she is not sure if she is a true believer, she does not only question herself and distance her position within the Gardeners, but also she questions the established norms of the Gardeners. So she puts her ontological position within the Gardeners in danger. This is an essential component of critique. As Lemke interprets, “to criticize means to expose one’s own ontological status, it involves the danger of falling outside the established norms of recognition.”¹⁸⁸ This component of critique gives rise to “expose oneself as a subject.”¹⁸⁹ By joining the Gardeners, Toby puts her ontological status in danger as a pleeblander. And by refusing to become an Eve, Toby, again, distances herself from the Gardeners, questions the established norms of recognition, and puts her status as a Gardener at risk. However, Adam One answers this by saying “in some religions, faith precedes action...In ours, action precedes faith. You’ve been acting as if you believe, dear Toby.”¹⁹⁰ For Adam One, faith cannot be depended on since “human understanding is fallible,”¹⁹¹ thus he values action over faith. Toby’s “self-distancing and self-questioning” both as a pleeblander and as a Gardener, can be considered as a process of subjectification, and her self-formation; this is her resistance, her becoming otherwise. To be otherwise, other than a regular pleeblander as well as a regular Gardener, Toby

¹⁸⁶ *The Year of the Flood*, 116.

¹⁸⁷ *The Year of the Flood*, 200-201.

¹⁸⁸ “Critique and Experience in Foucault,” 36.

¹⁸⁹ “Critique and Experience in Foucault,” 37.

¹⁹⁰ *The Year of the Flood*, 201.

¹⁹¹ *The Year of the Flood*, 201.

engages in a practical critique, which “takes the form of a possible transgression.”¹⁹² This transgression of the limits, her transformation occurred is more explicit in her behaviors after she left the Gardeners due to the threat of her ex-boss.

By joining the Gardeners, she experiences a different mode of living, she becomes a vegetarian, shares duties and responsibilities within the community, she learns to respect all the living creatures, the plants, and the animals alike. She learns about caring about others. So her rescue “shows her another way - an ethical (spiritual way)...serves a catalyst for Toby’s inner apocalypse, her inner transformation.”¹⁹³ Although she never thinks that “she can converse with the birds”¹⁹⁴ as some Gardeners believe, she is curious about the conditions of the birds, the bees, the plants, she discovers the life within them. She never thinks herself as a true Gardener but after she leaves the community and starts working at the AnooYoo Corp, she maintains her life as a Gardener. She starts “stashing away few supplies - building her own private Ararat,”¹⁹⁵ she maintains her contact with the Gardeners, and with the MaddAddamites, she protects the younger members of the communities when they are in need. She does not eat meat not only because the Gardeners told so but also because the inhuman, the animal is now part of her. During her identity shifting to work in AnooYoo, she had a hair transplant from a human-sheep hybrid. So, she is not truly and only human, a part of her is hybrid. Working at a beauty center, she still thinks, “beauty is only skin deep.”¹⁹⁶ Even after she leaves the Gardeners, she is not a part of consumerism, she is not obsessed with health, fitness, and beauty, she refuses to be the individual that neoliberal governmentality promotes; a self-concerned entrepreneur who is obsessed with

¹⁹² Foucault, “What is Enlightenment,” 125.

¹⁹³ Anna Lindhé, “Restoring the Divine Within: The Inner Apocalypse in Margaret Atwood’s *The Year of the Flood*,” 47.

¹⁹⁴ *The Year of the Flood*, 3.

¹⁹⁵ *The Year of the Flood*, 316.

¹⁹⁶ *The Year of the Flood*, 313.

increasing her human capital. She conducts herself differently, as a caring person, who respects the earth and living creatures.

In evaluating Toby's counter-conduct, the works of Deleuze and Guattari are valuable. Toby is a nomad; she goes "from point to point only as a consequence and as a factual necessity."¹⁹⁷ She never settles, and her journey is never-ending. In these journeys, the reader is introduced to new Tobys. Toby the pleeblander, Toby the Gardener, Tobiatha the beauty seller. She is always on the move and she never really internalizes or embraces a stable, given identity as such she never becomes a true pleeblander or a true Gardener. So the concept of becoming has crucial in understanding Toby's resistance. As briefly discussed in the previous chapter, becoming is a minoritarian concept that is generated by Deleuze and Guattari. By minoritarian, they mean "potential, creative and created becoming."¹⁹⁸ According to them, all becomings "begin with and pass through becoming-women. It is the key to all other becomings."¹⁹⁹ This is because the man "is majoritarian," and the majority implies "a state of domination,"²⁰⁰ whereas woman is not majoritarian. This patriarchal domination is well reflected in *MaddAddam* trilogy. Toby is a woman but her gender does not automatically imply her becoming-woman. Toby's becoming-woman begins with her resistance to her boss. Her boss at the SecretBurger, Blanco, abuses women working there. He mostly resorts to violence and most of the women end up dead. Toby's escape from the SecretBurger and Blanco can be considered as a step-through becoming-woman. She refuses to be the sex slave of Blanco; she refuses her subject position as flesh and meat. She refuses objectification and commodification of her body whereas even among the Gardeners, for instance Ren and Amanda, women can accept their commodification and use their body as a capital. So, Toby first experiences becoming-woman by the

¹⁹⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 380.

¹⁹⁸ *A Thousand Plateaus*, 106.

¹⁹⁹ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 280.

²⁰⁰ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 291.

dissolution of her subject position, by refusing submission to Blanco, by refusing submission to the molar, to the majoritarian, to the male domination

Becoming-minoritarian “necessitates a labor of power, an active micropolitics.”²⁰¹ All becomings require an active politics and all becomings resist the biopolitical power by invoking the living, which consists “in difference and its actualization. The difference is not a thing it is a process. it unfolds...it is alive...with vitality.”²⁰² Biopower is both power over life and power of life. Resistance to power over life can be achieved through the power of life. Becoming-animal, in that sense, is resistance to biopower; it appeals power of life in the inhuman and in the animal; it invokes the life the inhuman within the human, it invokes the animal within the human so that human domination over living species as well as over nature can be broken. Becoming-animal, as discussed in the previous chapter, is a process that overcomes anthropocentrism; becoming-animal is “the creative force that enables (some) humans to transform their conditions of existence, to make, create, invent.”²⁰³ Toby, after joining the Gardeners, becomes more caring and respectful to the living species. Pilar, Toby’s teacher and former Eve Six, teaches her that bees are the “messengers to the dead,” mushrooms are “the roses in the garden of that unseen world.”²⁰⁴ Pilar, before her death, advises Toby to talk with the bees every day so that they receive messages from this world. So, she does it after Pilar’s death. These teachings help Toby’s transformation and her becoming otherwise. Her perception of the living and the vitality has altered. One of the most vivid examples of this transformation can be found in her changing perception of the Pigoons.

After Waterless Flood there are only a few survivals, some of the MaddAddamites and the Gardeners, the painballers, and Jimmy. The Pigoons approach to the survivals, it is known that Pigoons have human brains. When they come closer to the group, Toby thinks, “a low level of grunting is going on, from

²⁰¹ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 292.

²⁰² May, *Gilles Deleuze*, 24.

²⁰³ Elizabeth Grosz, Kathryn Yusoff, and Nigel Clark, “An Interview with Elizabeth Grosz: Geopower, Inhumanism and the Biopolitical,” 135.

²⁰⁴ *The Year of the Flood*, 120.

pig to pig. If they were people...you'd say it was the murmuring of a crowd. It must be information exchange, but God knows what sort of information.”²⁰⁵ Pigoons talk to the group through Blackbeard, one of the Crakers. Pigoons want to help them to kill the painballers to stop them killing their babies. They make an agreement; the Pigoons do not attack the garden and eat the plants and in return, the survivals do not kill the Pigoons or piglets and eat them. This agreement overcomes anthropocentrism; it does not only destabilize the humans’ subject positions in the world, but it also gives the animals their agencies. This agreement reveals the mutual interdependency and interconnectedness between the human and the animal. After the agreement is made, Toby tells the story of the sigoons, and at first, she refers to the pigoon as “it,” and then she thinks “the pigoons were not objects. She had to get that right. It was only respectful.”²⁰⁶ And from then on, Toby never calls the pigoons with the pronoun “it,” and a new relationship emerged among the people, the Pigoons, and the Crakers. Toby becomes something other than herself and this new relationship gives agency to the animals, overcomes the domination and the hierarchy between humans and animals. The mutual dependence and cooperation would be the two elements for the organization of life and living beings after the Waterless Flood.

Another individual resistance is demonstrated through Jimmy - the Snowman. Jimmy is the protagonist of *Oryx and Crake* and a crucial figure in the trilogy; the storyteller, the mythmaker, and the protector of the Crakers. Jimmy is a fluid character; he is a child of two successful scientists and grows in the Compounds. Her mother left the Compound life, which she finds no reason to participate in a lifestyle that is “meaningless in itself” and a lifestyle that made her “suffered with conscience long enough.”²⁰⁷ Jimmy resents her mother’s leaving and never fully understands the reasons behind it. Until the annihilation of the human race, Jimmy never fully adopts a critical awareness and abandons the neoliberal rationality. There are several occasions that he questions the established norms and

²⁰⁵ *MaddAddam*, 327.

²⁰⁶ *MaddAddam*, 427.

²⁰⁷ *Oryx and Crake*, 69.

rationality prevalent in the society but this questioning is never fully transformed into a critical attitude through which he might promote different subjectivity.

Unlike other children grow in the Compound, Jimmy goes to the Martha Graham Academy, the only Art school referred in the trilogy. He characterizes himself among the “words” people as opposed to the “numbers” people though he knows and accepts the fact that words and education given in the Academy are “no longer central to anything.”²⁰⁸ At the age of five, he recognizes the value of animal life at a barbecue, when he saw an animal with a head at the bonfire; for him “the heads made a difference.” And he thinks this “was his fault because he’d done nothing to rescue them.”²⁰⁹ However, he does not maintain this recognition at his later ages, never been a vegetarian or an animal rights activist. He accepts and internalizes the hierarchy between the numbers of people and words people, but he directs his attention to the arts rather than science. He thinks even after the collapse of civilization, art will be there; art is the meaning for him, “human meaning.”²¹⁰ He gives an actancy to the words; the words that no longer have meanings in today’s circumstances, such as the “words of a precision and suggestiveness.” He has a “tender feeling towards such words as if they were children abandoned in the woods and it was his duty to rescue them.”²¹¹ His holding onto the words can be considered as his resistance, a “passive resistance...to...the whole culture preoccupied with the prospects of science...against this mechanistic view of humanity.”²¹² However, his resistance is a passive one and does not lead to a transgression of the limits imposed upon him.

Jimmy and Crake are friends since childhood and they play games together, they watch videos together, videos that are violent and pornographic. They see Oryx

²⁰⁸ *Oryx and Crake*, 219.

²⁰⁹ *Oryx and Crake*, 20.

²¹⁰ *Oryx and Crake*, 197.

²¹¹ *Oryx and Crake*, 230.

²¹² Kuźnicki, Margaret Atwood’s Dystopian Fiction: *Fire is Being Eaten*, 81.

in one of these videos, in a pornographic one. When Jimmy sees Oryx in the video, he, for the first time, comprehends that people in the videos are real people. Before he sees Oryx, “none of those little girls had ever seemed real to Jimmy.”²¹³ The three-dimensional image of Oryx results in Jimmy’s questioning himself and his actions. “For the first time, he’d felt that what they’d been doing was wrong. Before it had always been entertainment, or else far beyond his control, but now he felt culpable.”²¹⁴ However, this awareness about his wrong doings does not stop him from maintaining his active participation in an exploitative culture like his awareness of the value of animal life in his earlier ages does not make him an animal rights’ activist in his later ages. Until the catastrophe, Jimmy seems to accept the reality surrounds him, participate in this reality, though sometimes hesitantly. His acceptance prevents him from desubjugating his subject position and transgressing the limits of neoliberal subjectivity as well as rationality imposed upon him.

Jimmy’s subject position starts to alter with the catastrophe. Crake offers Jimmy a job in RejoovenEssence on their trip to the Pleelands. A week later, he starts working at Rejoov. Crake introduces his department, Paradice, and says they are “working on immortality.”²¹⁵ Crake offers Jimmy a job in the advertisement of ByPlussPill. Later, Crake shows his masterwork, the Crakers. Then Crake tells him that if anything happens to Crake, Jimmy must take care of the Crakers. Jimmy responds to him by saying “there’s people in here much better equipped than I am.” And Crake says “these people are specialists...they wouldn’t have the empathy to deal with the Paradice models, they wouldn’t be any good at it...But you’re more of a generalist.”²¹⁶ So Jimmy looks after the Crakers in the post-catastrophic era and this is the beginning of his new subjectivation. He first changes his name to the Abominable Snowman. The Abonimal Snowman is a creature, which is “existing and not existing...apelike man or manlike ape...known only through rumors and

²¹³ *Oryx and Crake*, 103.

²¹⁴ *Oryx and Crake*, 104.

²¹⁵ *Oryx and Crake*, 344.

²¹⁶ *Oryx and Crake*, 376.

through its backward-pointing footprints.”²¹⁷ He, then, stops using “the abonimal,” and only uses the Snowman. Changing his name is a deliberate step for Jimmy; it is the beginning of his desubjugation of his subject position. When Jimmy first introduces himself to the Crakers he introduces himself as Snowman – “he needed to forget the past - the distant past, the immediate past, the past in any form. He needed to exist only in the present, without guilt, without expectation. As the Crakers did. Perhaps a different name do that for him.”²¹⁸ Changing his name can be seen as a promotion of a new subjectivity in this new world. Self-concerned Jimmy does no longer exist, and the Snowman is taking care of the Crakers, he is the prophet of Crake as well as Oryx. Although he is not fancy about being the prophet, “whether he likes it or not...that, or nothing. And he couldn’t stand to be nothing, to know himself to be nothing.”²¹⁹

Jimmy is different from other resistant subjects; he internalizes the neoliberal rationality, which is driven by competition and rivalry. He is working as an advertiser, and marketing or advertisement, together with psy-expertise, is a sector through which “regulation of lifestyle”²²⁰ is attained, individuals are mobilized to be consumers and integrated into the market economy.²²¹ He is a transmitter of neoliberal rationality, and he is a neoliberal subject. His life is devoted “to developing a large vocabulary in the service of dubious persuasion: of women, he hopes to seduce and then abandon, of consumers he intends to lure into buying ultimately useless or even harmful products.”²²² With the catastrophe, everything is dissolved. *Oryx and Crake* start with Snowman’s waking up to the new world, he looks at his watch, but it is broken, “it no longer works...a blank face what it shows

²¹⁷ *Oryx and Crake*, 8.

²¹⁸ *Oryx and Crake*, 406-407.

²¹⁹ *Oryx and Crake*, 120.

²²⁰ Rose, “Governing ‘Advanced’ Liberal Democracies,” 158.

²²¹ Miller and Rose, “Mobilizing the Consumer,” *Governing the Present*, 129.

²²² Shannon Hengen, “Moral/Environmental Debt in Payback and *Oryx and Crake*,” 130.

him: zero hour.”²²³ This symbolizes the dissolution of “the capitalist system,”²²⁴ which specifically depends on time. However, the dissolution of the capitalist system does not comfort Jimmy, “it causes a jolt of terror to run through him.”²²⁵ This terror derives from the fact that nothing in his previous life exists and he has only memories and language to depend on. Even language does not comfort him because they do no longer represent reality, “no longer linked to the reality.”²²⁶ In this new world, he has a new subjectivity to build, and unlike the pre-catastrophic times, in this world, he has something to take care of, some people who depend upon him, the Crakers.

Jimmy, as he thinks he is the only man to survive, tries to remember things, tries to memorize. He tries to understand how things get here since he is “turning a blind eye” in the past, he was “carefree, thick-skinned...able to get through anything.”²²⁷ But now everything was “major” for him. Jimmy remembers his discussion with Crake and thinks that everything was there, how could he miss these. How could he be so ignorant? And here, Offred’s and Jimmy’s worlds get closer, they both consider themselves as ignorant and ignorance is something to be willed, to work on. Jimmy says, his ignorance is “structured. He’d grown up in walled spaces, and then he had become one.”²²⁸ And he tells himself “move forward,” “make a new you.”²²⁹ Memorizing the past is what keeps him from making a new

²²³ *Oryx and Crake*, 3.

²²⁴ Gerry Canavan, ‘Hope, But Not for Us: Ecological Science Fiction and the End of the World in Margaret Atwood’s *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood*,’ *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 23.2 (2012): 140.

²²⁵ *Oryx and Crake*, 3.

²²⁶ Valeria Mosca, ‘Crossing Human Boundaries: Apocalypse and Posthumanism in Margaret Atwood’s *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood*,’ *Altre Modernità: Rivista di studi letterari e culturali* 9 (2013): 48.

²²⁷ *Oryx and Crake*, 306.

²²⁸ *Oryx and Crake*, 216.

²²⁹ *Oryx and Crake*, 306.

subjectivity. He tells himself “live in the moment,”²³⁰ “why chain your body to the clock, you can break the shackles of time.”²³¹ In the new world, the memory of the past is useless and keeps him attached to his previous identity. Unlike Offred, he needs to forget the past. Forgetting, as Foucault strongly posits, “is a goodbye to night and a pure opening onto a day to come.”²³² In order to embrace the new, what is coming, what is emerging, Jimmy needs to forget the past and the old. Foucault argues, in order to start something new, something, which does not exist yet, forgetting is essential. Foucault claims, “it is in forgetting that the wait remains a waiting: an acute attention to what is radically new, with no bond of resemblance or continuity with anything else.”²³³ This is a perfect demonstration of the desubjectivation, which eventually, leads to the promotion of new subjectivities. This desubjectivation is possible through critique. Critique “problematizes and makes apparent both (1) how governmentalization forecloses or blocks ways in which people can generate their own styles of living... (2) at what points this foreclosure becomes visible.”²³⁴ Jimmy realizes the limits imposed upon him by the Compound life, and he is willing to transgress these limits. He wants to transgress the walls built around him; he wants to make a new subjectivity.

His relationship with the Crakers transforms Jimmy into someone other than himself. In his pre-catastrophic life, he advertises beauty, perfection, and anti-aging products but he realizes that these are not the qualities that he seeks in a person. He feels inferior towards the Crakers; he feels “deformed” since Crakers are perfectly made and this feeling makes him realize “it was the thumbprints of human perfection that used to move him, the flaws in the design.”²³⁵ This feeling breaks the

²³⁰ *Oryx and Crake*, 311.

²³¹ *Oryx and Crake*, 312.

²³² Foucault, “The Thought of the Outside,” 167.

²³³ Foucault, “The Thought of the Outside,” 167.

²³⁴ David Couzens Hoy, *Critical Resistance: From Poststructuralism to Post-Critique*, (MIT Press, 2005), 98.

hierarchical position of Jimmy in front of the Crakers; a deformed human as opposed to the perfect hybrids. This is a step towards overcoming anthropocentrism as well as a retreat from a culture that glorifies and invests in physical qualities. There is no competition and rivalry in the post-catastrophic world; there are cooperation and mutual dependency. The Crakers depend upon Jimmy-the Snowman for his knowledge of the world and his assumed connections with Oryx and Crake and Jimmy needs the Crakers, for being listening and being heard, for being more than nothing. Jimmy through storytelling, gives what the Crakers need; the story of Oryx, the story of Crake, and the story of Zeb. The storytelling is a means of survival for Jimmy as well as it is “a revival of a human narrative in the Craker community,”²³⁶ a narrative that is lost in the pre-catastrophic world. Crake has designed the Crakers by eliminating what he calls G-spot, which would prevent the Crakers from believing in God since Crake has an assumption that “*God is a cluster of neurons.*”²³⁷ However, the Crakers start to “converse with the invisible, they’ve developed reverence.”²³⁸ So Crake’s anticipation about the elimination of religion and its narrative by modifying genes has been proven wrong. It can be stated that Atwood refutes the idea that we’re simply biologically driven creatures and thus we can be perfected by intervening in the life process, into genetics, and so on. She says, “We should probably not try make things perfect, especially not ourselves...we’re stuck with us, imperfect as we are; but we should make the most of us.”²³⁹ Jimmy’s realization of his imperfection leads him to overcome anthropocentrism. Then, his attempts to forget the past and past doings as well as his recognition of his ignorance pave the way for a new subjectivity that is not based on competition and rivalry but based on mutual dependence. Through critique, he

²³⁵ *Oryx and Crake*, 115.

²³⁶ Mark Bosco, “The Apocalyptic Imagination in Oryx and Crake,” 170.

²³⁷ *Oryx and Crake*, 186.

²³⁸ *Oryx and Crake*, 186.

²³⁹ *In Other Worlds*, 95.

reveals the walls that surround and structure him and he tries to destroy these walls to make a new subjectivity. This new subjectivity materializes in the Snowman.

Crake's position in relation to resistance and counter-conduct is ambiguous. Crake has a relationship with both the Gardeners and the MaddAddamites. He is aware of these communities, their goals, and their tactics. He might have been a community member but he chooses another path. He seeks emancipation rather than adapting a micro resistance by promoting counter-conduct. This emancipation, however, is not the emancipation of human beings but the emancipation of nature and planet earth from the domination of human beings. He is pessimistic about the future of the planet as well as pessimistic about something that could be done to repair the damage done to the earth by human beings. He does not consider any potentiality for human beings' becoming ethical subjects. He believes in some kind of a human nature composed of greediness and wastefulness. He considers that human beings had several chances to change their attitudes towards the earth but they do not use these chances. For him, it is time to change the course of things, and for a change "either most of them must be cleared away while there is still an earth, with trees and flowers and birds and fish and so on, or all must die when there are none of those things left. Because if there are none of those things left, then there will be nothing at all. Not even my people."²⁴⁰

So, for the maintenance of the life on earth, he does two things; he produces a pill that will annihilate the people on earth and creates his hybrid people, the Crakers. He is able to do these because of the developments in sciences and technologies as much as due to the spread of neoliberal rationality; the competition and being the "best" version of oneself help the spread of the use of the pill. He uses the current mechanisms and technologies of power. However, he uses these mechanisms to get rid of the power relations altogether, the power relations which end up with the destruction of planet earth. The creation of the Crakers reveals two points; society should be radically transformed in order to save the planet but for such transformation, a new subjectivity is needed.²⁴¹ And the Crakers demonstrate

²⁴⁰ MaddAddam, 354.

²⁴¹ Gerry Canavan, "Hope, But Not for Us: Ecological Science Fiction and the End of the World in Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood*," 152.

this new subjectivity. They lack abstract thinking, which for Crake, is crucial because by eliminating abstract thinking, the conception of God, as well as domination of nature, would be prevented.²⁴² The Crakers, the hybrid creatures, are designed by eliminating faults of human design. They are designed free from greed, competition, and rivalry. They are vegetarian, they do not get sick, and they die at the age of thirty. They are “non-predatory, non-territorial hominid, one adapted to, and not in competition with, the natural environment.”²⁴³ Crake perceives the Crakers as the only alternative forms of being that will be in a harmony with nature. For Crake, the categories such as moral or immoral, ethical or unethical do not make sense or refer anything. All organizations as well as organisms are the results of biology and this biology is destiny. Without changing this biology, one cannot change the wrongdoings that occurred in the world. His solution is to alter malfunctioning or unnecessary biological characteristics of human nature and create new living species. To sum up, Crake is an ambiguous character, rather than seeking his own transformation into ethical subjects, he creates ethical subjects. It is because he sees his own biological “design faults” and pessimistic to correct these faults and he does not believe in or rely on ethics of any kind in human nature. Therefore, he creates biologically perfect creatures. Though, in the end, these biologically perfect creatures develop and learn many features that Crake has eliminated and did not foresee. They have learned writing, telling a story; they have learned narrative and have developed abstract thinking. To conclude, it can be said that Crake tries to create a world that he believes it is objectively true. But in the end, as Crakers develop their own version of truth, a subjective truth.

²⁴² Canavan, “Hope, But Not for Us: Ecological Science Fiction and the End of the World in Margaret Atwood’s *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood*,” 46.

²⁴³ Bouson, “‘It’s Game Over Forever’: Atwood’s Satiric Vision of a Bioengineered Posthuman Future in *Oryx and Crake*,” 149.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The current socio-economic and political circumstances have blinded most of us in such a way that some of us have troubles imagining the present and the future differently. Imagining today and the future differently requires an analysis of the present and utopian thought is a valuable source for such an analysis, as well as for imagining different and better futures. However, there has been a decline in utopian thought since the beginning of the twentieth century. In the twentieth century as well as in the twenty-first century, dystopia becomes the dominant genre. The reason for such an increase in dystopian writings derives from the hegemony of capitalism, the fascists and totalitarian regimes, the triumph of instrumental rationality, and human-made risks such as global warming, and ecological catastrophes. These reasons can widen according to one's perception about a life that is worth living and a life that is not. A common argument made by both utopian and dystopian scholars is that the present conditions generate more dystopias than utopias. And dystopias become a powerful source for providing resistance to the present conditions. They demonstrate worse scenarios, the scenarios that most of the people hope and seek to prevent. The main motivation to write on this topic, on dystopias, was to seek for alternatives to our present circumstances by determining what is wrong in our present and what could go wrong in the future. In this study, dystopias are considered as experience books that transform who we are and what we think. An experience, Foucault posits, "is always a fiction: it's something that one fabricates oneself, that doesn't exist before and will exist afterward."¹ And

¹ "Interview with Foucault," in *Essential Works of Foucault, Vol. 3 Power*, ed. James Fabuion, trans. Robert Hurley and Others (New Press, 2001), 243.

dystopia, as fiction, provides us with the experience that does not exist yet but will exist after we have read or watched the fiction.

This study has focused on three dimensions that constitute our present; the structure of modernity, the power mechanisms that construct, shape, and manipulate this modernity, and the ways to resist and transgress the limits imposed upon us. These were analyzed with Atwood's dystopias with an aim at distancing ourselves from our current situations so that we can perceive the historicity and contingency of current ways of beings and doing things. Dystopias are set in possible worse worlds and these possibilities, in fact, create an actuality. An actuality or the "comprehension of actuality entails... a certain distance from the "now."² By distancing ourselves from the now, dystopia demonstrates and poses critiques to the historicity of what is perceived natural, inevitable, and self-evident. With this kind of awareness and perception, a critical attitude towards ourselves, towards our modernity and the solid or fluid structure of modernity can be revealed and the ways can be opened for being otherwise, constructing other power relations, and to conduct ourselves differently as well as to be conducted differently.

The critique of modernity in terms of its rationality and its institutions become dominant for social and political theories. The critique of modernity consists of the critique of grand narratives, of instrumental rationality, of scientific rationality, of capitalism, of the consequences of advanced technological and scientific developments, and of the subjectivities constituted by modernity. And Atwood has started to write in presence with as well as in parallel with these critiques directed at the consequences of modernity. These critiques cannot be interpreted as direct assaults on modernity. Rather, they are critiques directed to a certain type of objective, a certain type of economic regime that has become possible with modernity. These critiques are also directed to a certain type of rationality. The main objective of this study was to analyze our present in the light of these critiques. It was argued in this study, this critique is directed towards the objective, which aims at making the life most of it, aims at the maximization of life and life capacities of individual and collective bodies so that they can be productively and effectively integrated into the market. Further, it was argued that, integration of individual

² Erinn Gilson, "Actuality," *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, ed. Leonard Lawlor and John Nale (Cambridge University Press, 2014), 11.

bodies into the market is prerequisite for development of capitalism and capitalist accumulation. And advanced capitalism is bound up to the process in which neoliberal rationality becomes the norm. The second objective of this study, which strictly depends on the first objective and the first analysis, is to reveal the alternatives and possibilities to be otherwise, to be governed differently, and to live better lives. It was argued that our present subjectivity is constituted, shaped, and manipulated by neoliberal rationality. Neoliberal rationality produces subjects who are basically individual entrepreneurs; they invest in themselves, increase their capitals and compete with others. As revealed out in these dystopias, promotion of this specific subjectivity is an obstacle towards better futures. Neoliberal rationality generates a "relationship of objectification"³ and consumes all the relationships, energy, and resources; it consumes the planet earth. So it is crucial to put it into a historical perspective so that the perceptions about its inevitability could be broken and the ways to fight against it could be revealed. The promotion of different subjectivities that are not based on competition or rivalry is possible and Atwood's dystopia provides the reader with these possibilities. In all of her four dystopias selected for this study, there is an explicit emphasis on being in the world together, acting collectively, taking responsibilities for oneself and for others, refusal of objectification and commodification, respectfulness to the things and living species. Promotion of different subjectivities is prerequisite if we continue to live, and if we want to live in better conditions.

In the search of the alternative ways of being in dystopian fiction, the relevance of the utopian and dystopian genres was analyzed in the second chapter. An introduction was given in terms of definitions, traditions, and features of utopian thought. It was argued that utopian thought is shaped by the current political and socio-economic conditions of the era that is written. It provides better alternatives and proposes solutions to the problems of the era, which are sometimes interpreted as prescriptions. Utopian thought has been severely criticized by proposing static and a closed system. However, in this study, utopia and utopian thought was considered as processes that are dynamics. Utopian thought's relation with the present circumstances prevents it from being static. It was argued, utopias and

³ Dardot and Laval, *The New Way of the World*, 295.

utopian thought, rather than offering prescriptions or blueprints to the current ills of the society, proposes alternative ways to be better, thus, they should be considered as a process than a static state of society. Dystopias, on the other hand, can be classified under two categories; they can be anti-utopian or not. Anti-utopia and dystopia are sometimes used interchangeably but in this study, they were not used as such. Anti-utopia can be classified as those fiction writings that are opposed to the utopian ideals. Dystopias, on the other hand, do not have to be anti-utopian; they may or may not criticize utopian ideals. Another dispute among utopian and dystopian scholars is the emergence of critical utopia and dystopia since the 1960s. However, in this study, such a distinction between critical and noncritical dystopia was not made. The proponents of the emergence of critical dystopias argue the critical dystopias "maintained hope on the horizon"⁴ whereas traditional dystopias are not. In this study, dystopias are considered as critical by nature. This critique may contain a hope or little embedded utopia or it may not. Dystopia's most important function is its warning; thus whether it proposes a way out from the ills of society or not does not change its nature. Though in this study, dystopias that propose warnings as well as contain embedded utopias were chosen but this choice belongs to the writer's interest in such dystopias, not because they are critical and traditional dystopias are not. This choice also drives from the writer's belief that utopia and dystopia are not in opposition and can be considered together. Without the determination of the fear of the possible ills, of what is intolerable, the struggle for better worlds cannot begin. So, utopia and dystopia, in this study, are recognized as containing one another. This recognition is in parallel with Atwood's own ideas about utopia and dystopia. Her made-up word for the two - ustopia - proves this point; she argues, "each contains a latent version of other."⁵ And in her dystopias, embedded utopias can be observed and this is the main reason to study Atwood's dystopias. Through these embedded utopias, one can perceive and imagine different worlds, modes of being and thinking, alternative lives, and alternative subjectivities.

⁴ Raffaella Baccolini, "Dystopia Matters: On the Use of Dystopia and Utopia," 3.

⁵ *In Other Worlds*, 66.

The central motivation in the third chapter was to analyze and bring forward the characteristics of our modernity, the characteristics that make us who we are, and their portrayal in *the Handmaid's Tale* and *MaddAddam* trilogy. For this section, more than one conception of modernity was evaluated. It was argued that the characteristics of, later would be named as first modernity or solid modernity constitutes the very basis of the evaluation of the modernity portrayed in *the Handmaid's Tale*. However, a clash of different perception also emerges in *HT*; this perception foreshadows the newly emerging perceptions about modernity, which can be categorized as postmodernity. So for the *Handmaid's Tale* section, first an analysis of the relation between totalitarianism and modernity was evaluated. It was argued that one of the consequences of industrial and advanced industrial society is totalitarianism. In other words, in such societies, totalitarianism emerges as a possibility and *HT* demonstrates this possibility comes true. This possibility derives from the moral and ethical vacuum, the loss of responsibility towards oneself and towards the others, loss of practice of freedom as action, and the loss of judgment. These are the results of advanced industrial society and the universalization of capitalist logic. These are the reasons why a totalitarian regime has become possible in *the Handmaid's Tale*.

Atwood also illustrates the clash between modernity and postmodernity. *HT* was written in an age of transition; transition to a new reality, to an order that would not be solid as the previous order. In this newly emerging reality, the grand narratives of (later called) first, solid modernity have begun to be questioned. These narratives include the emphasis on the scientific truth, the neutrality of science and scientific knowledge, the triumph of instrumental rationality over all other rationalities. Atwood's characters, especially her narrator in *HT*, Offred, develops a critical standing towards the order of the first modernity. She refuses to acknowledge the truth posed by the regime, the universal truth of the regime. She produces her own subjective truth as opposed to the regime's truth. She produces her own knowledge, in a sense, knowledge that is subjugated by the regime. She generates her perspective on the history of Gilead by taping her records. She defies the official history of Gilead. She challenges the strict categories, which have been established by the rationality of modernity. In this novel, one can also recognize the diminishing role of the state-centric evaluation and perspective of power relations.

In *HT*, power relations are discussed through personal relations. Power exists everywhere, operates every type of relations, social, political as well as personal relations. And *HT* perfectly demonstrates this and, in this sense, it portrays the paradigm shift in the analysis of power. Power is no longer defined in macro terms, in terms of relations between states or state and society; it is defined more on micro terms, through every relationship we have built. Power is recognized as the building blocks of our everyday life and everyday relations. Even a pervasive power relation such that totalitarian regime would have been prevented if we acknowledge how this power operates and if we recognize our agency in the operation of this power mechanism.

In *MaddAddam* trilogy, the reader is introduced new type of modernities; a new type of rule, a new type of rationality, a new type of social organization, and new types of subjectivities. So, in this section, the aim was to analyze the type of societal organizations portrayed in the trilogy in relation to the modernity theses that emerged right after postmodernity thesis. These newly emerged and defined modernities are liquid modernity and second or reflexive modernity. It was argued that certain structural changes have led to the emergence of a new modernity. These changes can be summed up as the transformation of the nature of production (from rigid to flexible), of the nature of consumption (from mass to specialized), change in the nature of work (the rise of the service class), the transition to neoliberal policies, universalization as well as decentralization of capitalism. These transformations have led to the diminishing power of the nation-state in the face of global politics and problems as well as in providing basic services to its citizens.

In the third chapter, the general characteristics of society portrayed in *the Handmaid's Tale* and the *MaddAddam* trilogy were discussed. For such a discussion, modernity theses were used since it was argued that our modernity shapes who we are and where we are. The societal institutions, the relationship between the public and the private, our attitudes towards science, objectivity, and rationality are based on a specific idea of modernity, which was discussed in *the Handmaid's Tale* section. With structural transformations such as the transition to neoliberalism, universalization of capitalism, diminishing power of nation-states, our modernity is being questioned and new interpretations, as well as new dynamics, are emerged in explaining our present, our modernity. *The MaddAddam* trilogy reflects the new

dynamics that constitute our present. These arguments are valuable in giving the general picture of contemporary societies; they are crucial in determining the certain epochal shifts in the organization of societies. However, they lack the analysis of power mechanisms that make society at risk and modernity liquid. An analysis of power is crucial in detecting the inherent logic and rationality behind the social organization. It is a step towards imagining the future differently and this is crucial for this study. If the general picture of society is taken as our permanent reality, then this picture cannot be altered. If the inherent rationality that organized our present can be revealed, then, different and better ways of living can be deciphered. The analysis of power is necessary for stepping out of our present. As Hardt and Negri strongly posit “no matter how mighty and arrogant seems that power standing above you, know that it depends on you, feeds on your fear, and survives only because of your willingness to participate in the relationship. Look for an escape door. One is always there.”⁶

In the fourth chapter, the power mechanisms that make our modernity solid and then, liquid and make our society at risk were evaluated in relation to the concept of power, especially around the concept of biopower. The general argument in this chapter was that the modern form of power is biopower. Biopower or biopolitics incorporates life and politics; operates on the social body, on the population through the security mechanisms as well as on the individual bodies through the disciplinary mechanisms. It is the biopower that makes capitalism so spread and neoliberalism as the general rationality as well as the general "ideology" of contemporary societies. Although Foucault is not the first one who uses the term biopower, in this study, his conceptualization of biopower was taken as the basis of the further analysis of biopower. Additional perspectives were chosen based on the subjects and concerns of Atwood's dystopias. The political theology perspective that Agamben proposes was chosen due to its strong emphasis on the totalitarian tendencies in advanced industrial societies. In this perspective, biopower is associated more with power over life instead of the power of life. The political theology perspective was crucial in understanding how power operates and generates totalitarian tendencies and this was a necessary step towards explaining

⁶ *Declaration*, 41.

the power mechanisms in *the Handmaid's Tale*. New materialist approach to biopower was chosen due to its emphasis on the power of life. In this approach, vitality is attributed not only to human beings but also to other living species as well as the matter itself. The power of life is one of the strongest references made in the *MaddAddam* trilogy. Thus, new materialism was added for evaluation of power mechanisms in the trilogy.

The Handmaid's Tale and *MaddAddam* trilogy have been set in different surroundings and regimes; *HT* reflects the fear of totalitarianism as dystopia whereas *MaddAddam* trilogy reflects the fear of the consequences of the advanced industrial society. It was argued throughout the chapter that power and truth produce one another; power requires truth to operate since the government of individuals requires and depends on know-how. Producing truth is necessary for government of individuals and this truth is in parallel with the modalities of power. In the totalitarian regimes and war-like situations, it was argued, sovereign power is more visible than the contemporary political regimes and democracies. Sovereign power is the power that says no, it operates in the juridical sphere and it is the "power to take life and let live." Although it is the power of a monarch, in contemporary oppressive regimes and in totalitarian regimes, sovereign power is mobilized and made operable together with the other modalities of power, such as disciplinary and biopower. For the analysis of power in *The Handmaid's Tale*, thus, political theology approach, which draws our attention to the sovereign power, was crucial. The power regime presented in *HT* is a complex one; it represents the power of life and power over life together. It is the power of life that the regime legitimizes itself; it is the maintenance of healthy a population. This power is biopower. However, the maintenance of the population is achieved through power over life. Regime eliminates what is considered as enemy and enemy is defined in several ways. Political protestors, dissidents, homosexuals, women who have an abortion, and doctors who make abortions are considered the enemies of the regime. For these people, one can observe the power over life rather than the power of life. The determination of the value of life, the life that is worth living, expandable life is a sovereign decision and in *HT* this decision is given utmost importance. The production and the maintenance of the population is the ultimate aim of the regime; to achieve this aim, the regime defines and produces its norms. Based on these

norms, the regime identifies its enemies. The elimination of the enemy is a sovereign decision. However, this decision depends on who can adopt the norms, normalize, and internalize these norms. In the definition and production of the norms, disciplinary power operates. The whole regime is made operable by the disciplinary mechanisms and the whole society is organized according to the disciplinary mechanisms. Through these mechanisms, subjugated individuals are generated, the individuals who obey the norms and the rules. Women's subjugation is more explicitly given and due to this focus, the novel is considered and studied as a feminist dystopia. Women's lives, their bodies, and their identities are subjugated in such a way that they are made properties of the regime. In Gilead, all these three modalities of power exist and exist in their extremes. Biopower depends on disciplinary mechanisms and the regulation of the population. However, in Gilead, biopower also depends on the sovereign decisions. Thus, this power can be characterized as "biosovereignty." All these modalities of power exist but not in their pure forms. They exist with a passage and intersection among them.

MaddAddam trilogy portrays an advanced industrial society; an open and free society. Thus, the presented power mechanism is slightly different than the *HT*. In *MaddAddam*, power depends on a different kind of truth and also a variety of truths. One can observe the emergence of new knowledges about life, about living beings and things as well as the vital processes, and their effects not only on our lives but also on the conceptualization of what constitutes life. So first, these knowledges, the newly emerging knowledges in natural and life sciences were analyzed. These were molecularization of sciences, alterations, and modifications in genes, organ transplant, and artificial organ production. These were considered as the new knowledges that generate new attitudes towards life and politics; towards biopower. As it is stated above, the government of living beings requires specific knowledges, and developments in science and technology provide these knowledges. These knowledges change our binary conceptions about natural/unnatural and human/animal/nonhuman, blur the strict categorizations and conceptualizations. These developments reveal the vitality inherent in living beings as well as the matter. In the trilogy, this adherence to and recognition of vitality is portrayed as a step towards better futures.

The trilogy is based on scientific and technological developments and their effects on our life. These developments are mobilized in the governing of individuals. In the analysis of the power structure in *MaddAddam* trilogy, the concept of governmentality was used. Governmentality is a technique of biopower and it refers to the ways of conducting the conduct of the individuals. Through the concept of governmentality, the rationality behind the subjects discussed in the third chapter on modernity was revealed. Throughout the analysis of the power structure in *MaddAddam* trilogy, it was argued that in contemporary societies, neoliberal rationality governs the conduct of individuals as well as the organization of institutions. This neoliberal rationality results in what was discussed as the consequences of modernity; such as the loss of the function of the nation-state, privatization, commodification, consumer culture, and individualization. This rationality aims at the optimization of life and its capacities, triggers, and integrates competition into the everyday life of individuals. This is done through the spread of and mobilization of freedom. In advanced liberal societies as in the trilogy, one can observe government through freedom. And this has resulted with what has been identified as individualization by theories of modernity as well as the loss of the nation-state's functions. Every individual is given the choice of, i.e., private security, private insurance, private education, and health services. The state is de-governmentalized, its welfare services are transferred to private companies. Also, determination of the value of life, which was once a sovereign decision, are transferred to the medical authorities or professionals. Thus, a zone of indistinction between biopower and sovereign power can be observed. Moreover, in the trilogy, one can observe the commodification of the body as well as life. The body becomes the ultimate, lasting foundation of an individual. This is also a dynamic of biopower. Biopower makes use of the body as well as life; it refers to the optimization of life and its capacities. It is through one's body, one's life, and choices she made, she competes in advanced liberal societies. Governmentality refers to finding the most effective means and techniques in the government of things and living beings.

Reading general characteristics of society with an analysis of what is underlying behind this "generality" opens the way for resisting the general conditions, reversing power relations, and also perceiving and recognizing what is considered as natural is actually historical. The analysis of power is necessary if one

wants to change the current conditions. Power operates and depends on knowledge and in these dystopias, different knowledges are used to govern people and these were evaluated throughout the chapter. A common point in these dystopias is the neoliberal past in *HT* and the neoliberal present in the trilogy. Neoliberalism can be considered around which these dystopias are set. However, this neoliberalism is not just an ideology or it is not just a theory or policy. It is a rationality that governs all aspects of our lives. For a better world, a better way to be governed and to govern, one needs to promote different rationality, different than the neoliberal rationality that promotes competition and rivalry. In the last section on resistance, this alternative rationalities and promotion of different subjectivities by adapting different rationality was the subject.

In the last chapter, the focus has been shifted to the resistance. Although resistance is not sine qua non elements in dystopias, Atwood's dystopias demonstrate the reader a way out from dystopic presents and this is the writer's deliberate choice. Dystopia has started to be recognized as a form of resistance nowadays; they provide critiques to the current conditions, and they ask "what if" question to prevent worse scenarios. In some dystopias like Atwood's dystopias, there are embedded utopias and, in this study, these embedded utopias were considered as points of resistance. It is crucial to emphasize that the critique posed by dystopias is an "enlightenment sense of critique." It is about knowing who we are, finding out our knowledge and its limits. In the third chapter, the aim was to reveal who we are. In the fourth chapter, the aim was to find out the limits of our knowledge by analyzing how our knowledge shape and constitute our reality. In the fifth chapter, the aim was to show the ways for being different, construct different subjectivities by to be conducted differently, and conduct oneself differently. In order to find these, first, our current subjectivity was given.

It was argued that our current subjectivity is constructed through neoliberal rationality. This subjectivation is not a top-down process. It is a process through which a subject is constituted by rationality but also constitutes herself through neoliberal rationality. Through these processes, individuals are made governable subjects. The structures of domination and the techniques of the self are the mechanisms through which subject is constituted. In the structure of domination, a sense of subordination occurs whereas in the techniques of the self, individuals, with

their own means, attain a certain mode of subjectivation by transforming themselves. Subjects are constructed with these two techniques and governed through these techniques but in the second technique, the subject's own goals and subject's own aspirations are triggered. In contemporary societies, those techniques of the self, which transform individuals, which make their lives as a work of art as Foucault suggests, are appropriated into neoliberal rationality. And resistance can be considered as a different form of conduct, being otherwise than the neoliberal subject. The resistance exists where there are power relations. Resistance, in this study, refers to a form of counter-conduct and in contemporary society and the conduct is shaped and modified by neoliberal rationality. The subject is a neoliberal subject, who is the "entrepreneur of the self." The neoliberal subject possesses a human capital, a capital that makes her compete in her everyday life. The entrepreneur of the self is a subject who invest in herself, increases her capabilities and skills in order to compete. The entrepreneur of the self is responsible for her choices, her successes, and her failures. She has to manage the risks and dangers. She constantly evaluates herself. This is the general characteristic of the neoliberal subject. The neoliberal subject is portrayed in *HT* in pre-Gileadean times. The narrator, Offred, is a neoliberal subject. However as little given for pre-Giledean times, the most vivid examples for neoliberal subjectivation comes from *MaddAddam* trilogy.

As power constitutes subject and subjectivation, different modalities of power produce different subjectivation. Also, all modalities of power provide different sites of resistance. As *HT* and *MaddAddam* trilogy reflect different modalities of power, there are different kinds of resistances. *MaddAddam* trilogy directly reflects the neoliberal present as dystopia whereas totalitarian regime is the dystopia in *HT*. However, it should be remembered that the totalitarian take-over in *HT* emerged due to its neoliberal past. And Atwood claims one of the embedded utopias in *HT* is in the past, in the neoliberal past. So, it can be stated, if neoliberal rationality was resisted in the past then, the totalitarian take-over would not have succeeded. The ways to resist to neoliberal rationality are the focal points in *MaddAddam* trilogy, so these ways were discussed in *MaddAddam* section. For the *Handmaid's Tale* section, the ways to resist three different modalities of power (sovereign, disciplinary, and biopower) were discussed without a strong emphasis on neoliberal

rationality. However, it should be highlighted, again, liberalism and neoliberalism is at the heart of biopower, So without understanding liberal and neoliberal rationality, the ways to resist biopower cannot be revealed.

In *The Handmaid's Tale*, it was argued three different types of resistance could be detected. These were organized resistance, the regime's own fractures, and Handmaids' resistances. Power and resistance exist simultaneously; where there is power, there is resistance. The organized resistances are Mayday and The Underground Femaleroad. These two resistance movements have connections with the general power structure in Gilead. Resistance is not exterior to power relations so it is not a coincidence that these two movements have commonality with the regime itself. The Underground Femaleroad is composed of different religious sects, which establishes safe houses and transports Handmaids and those who are in need to different countries. These religious sects have relative freedom since they are Christian as well. These give them relative power, a privileged status. Moreover, regime provides possible flights and escapes to those who are at the top of the hierarchy. Resistance does not always reverse power relations. It may also strengthen power relations. Black markets and the club Jezebel constitute examples for regime's own fracture. They provide high rank officials, their wives, and the Guardians with freedom that they lack in Gilead. This freedom is what they are missing from the old times; thus, their longings for the past, their nostalgia are relieved to a limited degree. This freedom, in return, reinforces the commitment to the regime.

Besides from organized resistances and flights and escapes offered by the regime, and the most crucial form of resistance comes from the Handmaids. Their resistances are resistances against sovereign power, against the disciplinary mechanisms, against the biopower. These resistances are subjective experiences as well as counter-conduct to the specific modalities of power. The most explicit resistances are portrayed as the resistance to disciplinary mechanisms and power. In Gilead, women are silenced, they are deprived of their voices, their identities, and their past. Those who are made Handmaids have lost any connection with themselves, with their past relationship, in short, in their past lives. Any attempt to recall their memories, to give voice, to speak on behalf of themselves or of others can be considered as resistance to disciplinary power. It is disciplinary mechanisms

that make Handmaids and produce the norms of living in Gilead and being a Handmaid. Thus any attempt that defies these constructed norms can be considered as resistance to disciplinary power. Offred's tapes records, displaying an attitude that is prohibited by the regime such as small talks with the Guardians, relationships with the Commanders, or building any form of a close relationship with another Handmaid are resistance to disciplinary power. Even if these are small or micro resistances, resistances that do not lead to macro changes such as overthrowing the totalitarian regime, these behaviors or attempts defy the norms as well as the normal and help transgression of the limits imposed upon us by the disciplinary mechanisms. Offred uses her body as well as her mental world as sites of resistance. She conducts herself differently from a regular Handmaid. This disruption of regularity or normal is resistance against the disciplinary power. Sovereign power and biopower appear as the power over life and power of life respectively. When life becomes the object and subject of power, death becomes its limits. Thus, the act of suicides that have occurred in the *HT* can be considered resistance both to the sovereign and biopower. The right to take life belongs to the sovereign, in the case of suicide, this right is taken away from the sovereign. Moreover, biopower is about the maximization of life and its capacities, when the object of this power is erased, biopower becomes ineffective and inoperable.

It should be emphasized that in totalitarian regimes, these three modalities of power are pushed in their extremities. They become more visible, more explicit but they are never in their pure forms. The main motivation to write this thesis is to find out alternatives to neoliberal rationality, *HT* seems incompatible with this motivation since it portrays a totalitarian regime rather than a neoliberal society. Though, the totalitarian regime has been successful due to the pervasiveness of neoliberal rationality.

Little hope embedded in *HT* is demonstrated as in the past of the book as well as in the post-Gilead. The past, the present, and the future are closely connected in the book. The roads that pave the way for Gilead can be found in the free past and the post-Gilead times have the seeds for the mistakes that have been made before Gilead is established. Atwood never considers individuals as an isolated island and she recognizes the power of taking responsibility and bearing witness, which are crucial characteristics of human beings. In these dystopias, she projects individuals

who are self-concerned and ignorant about their surroundings. These individuals accept the conditions they are living in, they do not question the power relations or politics, and they passively accept the reality given to them and the limits imposed upon them. Transgression of these limits is itself resistance; it promotes counter-conduct. Offred does not have the awareness of these limits until the totalitarian regime is established. For her, the sufferings, exploitation, domination, or other wrongdoings are there for some other people. Whereas people in her close circle, such as Moira and her mother, have fought against domination, against patriarchy, and exploitation. The ways to fight against the current system are more explicitly demonstrated in *MaddAddam* trilogy.

The current system is based on neoliberal rationality and neoliberal rationality stimulates competition and rivalry in every aspect of economics, social, and personal relations. In *HT*, rather than an evaluation or demonstration of neoliberal rationality, Atwood focuses on one of the possible results of this rationality. What is narrowly given in *HT* has a strong and crucial place in the trilogy, the alternative ways of being. Moira and Offred's mother are two examples of alternative subjectivities in *HT* but there is a little reference on how they constitute themselves, how do they fight against the current rationality. In *MaddAddam* trilogy, the resistance to neoliberal rationality is more explicit. Neoliberal rationality depends on the increase in human capital. It depends on the subjectivation of human beings as the "entrepreneur of themselves." This rationality governs individuals through their freedom, which is secured and made operable through individualization. Thus any act and attitude that fight against individualization can be considered as resisting to neoliberal rationality. The neoliberal rationality depends on the subjugation of individuals and to resist this subjugation, formation, and promotion of new subjectivities are crucial. Two communities, The God's Gardeners and the MaddAddamites, are demonstrated as the resistance movements are opposed to the neoliberal rationality. These communities were not composed of rival, competing individuals; rather they are formed around the principle of mutual dependence, mutual respect, and respect to the earth and living beings. They resist the neoliberal rationality through alternative education, which does not serve the industry or maximization of profit. This education is given through oral doctrines. The young members learn to be anti-materialist and anti-consumer. Young ones are

given the knowledge of respect to other living beings. The members of these communities, in general, do not objectify nature, living beings, and things. They overcome anthropocentrism by recognizing the agency and actancy of living beings and matter. They form an ethical community; encourage ethical behavior through which they transform themselves into ethical subjects rather than neoliberal subjects. God's Gardeners are pacifists and refuse to be a part violent culture of the advanced industrial society. They wait for this culture to end and they think, after the collapse of this culture they can live in a better world. The MaddAddamites, on the other hand, take action to end this culture they are not pacifists as the Gardeners. They use the techniques and tactics of neoliberal rationality in order to bring an end to the destruction of the earth. The resistance of both these communities can be considered as resistance to biopower; they use the knowledge of the vital processes, the scientific and technological knowledge about life and living beings in order to promote a different version of being and living.

Besides these two communities, there are also individuals' micro resistances. Micro resistances fight against the power mechanisms at the personal level. Micro resistance and promotion of alternative subjectivity can mostly be found in Toby and Jimmy. These micro resistances are also produced through ethical transformations. In these transformations, one can observe the refusal of being involved in consumer culture, being involved in patriarchy, refusal of the objectification and commodification of animals, plants, human beings, and earth itself. Toby's transformation can be read as a transformation from being a subjection into being a subject. She becomes an ethical subject by rejecting consumer culture and its characteristics. She desubjugates her position as a pleeblander and becomes Gardener, though she never truly becomes a Gardener either. She is a nomad and never adapts a single, fixed identity. Instead, she voyages from identity to identity. She is in a process of becomings. Jimmy is another character that promotes alternative subjectivity. His transformation begins in the post-catastrophic world. Before the catastrophe, he is the genuine representation of neoliberal subjects. He is self-concerned, a genuine consumer, he accepts the reality as it is and never tries to change it. After the catastrophe, his transformation begins with his relationship with the Crakers and his self-assessment of the past. He thinks he is the last man on earth and he tries to be someone else, tries to make himself anew. He is assigned to be the

protector of the Crakers and before the Crakers, he has no one that depends on him. The Crakers' need for Jimmy and Jimmy's need for the Crakers transform their relationship. Mutual cooperation and interdependence are the bases of this relationship and transforms him to become something other than himself.

Promotion of alternative subjectivities is the meaning of counter-conduct and the Crakers are the ultimate alternatives to the neoliberal subjectivities. Crake has started the Paradice Project due to his pessimism about human nature and through this project; he corrects human nature in such a way that it will no longer pose threat to nature. Crake does not believe in ethical transformation, and as a result of his lack of belief, he creates a hybrid being. He creates the Crakers to live in harmony with nature; he eliminates what he thinks the causes of domination and exploitation of nature. They are created free from illness and free from other "design faults." However, in the end, these "faults" seem to be maintained in the Crakers' community.

In the trilogy, the most salient resistance comes from life itself. The power over life is resisted through the power of life. The vitality of things and living beings are recognized and this recognition can be considered as resistance to biopower. Through recognition of vitality, these micro resistances as well as resistances of communities, anthropocentrism is overcome. In this recognition, one can observe becoming other than itself; becoming minor as Deleuze and Guattari posit. Becoming minoritarian subverts the domination and the structures of domination. In the trilogy, one can observe the domination of economic rationality merged with scientific rationality. Any kind of refusal to these rationalities disrupts the domination of the majority. One can observe a transformation of subjectivities into something other than the subjectivities of neoliberal rationality. This becomes possible through transgressions of the limits imposed upon them. These limits are the limits that define them, their position in their societies as well as in their communities. Transgression of the limits is to refute the identities imposed on them. Their new subjectivities are no longer self-concerned. They learn and develop a sense of belonging to the earth and a sense of heterarchy among living beings. Cooperation and mutual dependence, living in harmony with nature, giving actancy to nature, and acknowledging the vitality of the earth are developed and triggered in the fight against neoliberal rationality.

Dystopias, when studied as experience books, reveal the possibilities of being otherwise. All dystopias present the reader a warning; they express the wrongdoings of the current socio-political conditions. They give the reader worse scenarios in order but these scenarios are not ahistorical. They do not appear out of nowhere; specific courses of action lead to dystopias. Dystopia provides a distance to the reader, a distance that is necessary for critique, and a critique that is necessary for possible transformations. Critique comes with a risk, a risk of one's ontological status; a risk "the suspension of one's own ontological status."⁷ Dystopia, without putting one's ontological status at risk, provides this critique. And with this critique, a possibility of transformation is revealed. Fiction in general and dystopian fiction, in particular, provides a transformative experience through which "individual no longer the same as before."⁸

In this study, it was claimed that it is neoliberal rationality that we should fight against; the neoliberal rationality that led to totalitarian take-over in *HT*, and neoliberal rationality that forms corporation-controlled society in *MaddAddam* trilogy. In both these societies, freedom is equated with freedom of choice and results in lack of freedom. The practice of freedom is necessary for fighting against neoliberal rationality. This freedom can be achieved through critique, which is both ethical and political. With advanced capitalism, there has emerged an ethical vacuum in societies. Ethics is no longer considered as the guiding principles of our lives. If ethics is understood as "the self's relation to itself"⁹ a new kind of ethics is necessary for fighting against neoliberal rationality. Neoliberal rationality generates the relations of competition and relations of rivalry. In studied dystopias, rather than relations of competition, relations of mutual dependence and cooperation are valorized and promoted by the resistant subjects. So these books suggest a new kind of ethics, a new type of togetherness. The critique is also political; it criticizes the organizations and "working institutions which appear to be both neutral and

⁷ Judith Butler, "Bodies and Power Revisited," 192.

⁸ Timothy O'Leary, "Foucault, Experience, Literature," 20.

⁹ Arnold Davidson, "Introduction," *Security, Territory, Population*, xxii.

independent."¹⁰ In this critique, the historicity of institutions and organizations can be revealed, thus, an alteration in the power relations could be achieved. The neoliberal rationality is also behind the organizational and institutional structure. Without an analysis of the power structures that form such structures, a transformation would not be possible. These dystopias provide a critique through which we doubt our own reality. In *We*, Zamyatin's narrator, D503, says "the cruelest thing is to make a person doubt his own reality, his three-dimensional-not any other reality."¹¹ And in these dystopias, our three-dimensional reality is disrupted and this is one of the strongest features of dystopias. With this doubt, the possibility of a new reality, a new being, and a new type of living can be experienced.

¹⁰ Rabinow, *The Foucault Reader*, 6.

¹¹ 120.

REFERENCES

Adorno, Francesco Paolo. "Power over Life, Politics of Death: Forms of Resistance to Biopower in Foucault." In *The Government of Life: Foucault, Biopolitics, and Neoliberalism*, edited by Vanessa Lem and Miguel Vatter, 98-111. Fordham University Press, 2014.

Adorno, Theodor W. *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Edited by J.M. Bernstein. Routledge, 1991.

Agamben, Giorgio. "From the State of Control to a Praxis of Destituent Power." In *Resisting Biopolitics: Philosophical, Political, and Performative Strategies*, edited by S.E. Wilmer, and Audronė Žukauskaitė 21-29. Routledge, 2016.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford University Press, 1998.

Agamben, Giorgio. *State of Exception*. The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. "Critical Reflections on Reflexive Modernization." *Theory, Culture & Society* 13.4 (1996): 133-138.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. *The Dark Side of Modernity*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.

Arendt, Hannah. "Society and Culture." *Daedalus* 89.2 (1960): 278-287.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. The University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1973.

Atkinson, Will. "Not All that was Solid Has Melted into Air (or Liquid): A Critique of Bauman on Individualization and Class in Liquid Modernity." *The Sociological Review* 56.1 (2008): 1-17

Atwood, Margaret. "Notes on Power Politics." *Acta Victoriana* 97.2 (1973): 7-19.

Atwood, Margaret. 20 December 2018. "Margaret Atwood: If We Lose the Free Press, We Cease to Be a Democracy." Literary Hub, April 30, 2019. <https://lithub.com/margaret-atwood-if-we-lose-the-free-press-we-cease-to-be-a-democracy/>.

Atwood, Margaret. *MaddAddam*. Virago, 2014.

Atwood, Margaret. *Oryx and Crake*. Virago, 2004.

Atwood, Margaret. *The Handmaid's Tale*. Vintage, 2017.

Atwood, Margaret. *The Year of the Flood*. Virago, 2013.

Atwood, Margaret. *Curious Pursuits: Occasional Writing*. Hachette UK, 2009.

Atwood, Margaret. *In other worlds: SF and the Human Imagination*. Virago, 2011.

Atwood, Margaret. *Moving targets: Writing with intent, 1982-2004*. House of Anansi, 2004.

Atwood, Margaret. *Negotiating with the Dead: A Writer on Writing*. Virago Press, 2003.

Atwood, Margaret. *Second Words: Selected Critical Prose 1960-1982*. House of Anansi, 2011.

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

Atwood, Margaret: Women Will Bear Brunt of Dystopian Climate Future." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, May 31, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/may/31/margaret-atwood-women-will-bear-brunt-of-dystopian-climate-future>.

Baccolini, Raffaella. "Dystopia Matters: On the Use of Dystopia and Utopia." *Spaces of Utopia* 3 (2006): 1-4.

Baccolini, Raffaella. "Gender and Genre in Feminist Critical Dystopias." In *Future Females, The Next Generation*, edited by Marleen S. Barr, 13-34. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

Baccolini, Raffaella. "The Persistence of Hope in Dystopian Science Fiction." *PMLA* 119.3 (2004): 518-521.

Bargu, Banu. *Starve and Immolate: The Politics of Human Weapons*. Columbia University Press, 2014.

Baudrillard, Jean. *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. Sage, 1998.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

Bauman, Zygmunt, and Mark Haugaard. "Liquid Modernity and Power: A Dialogue with Zygmunt Bauman." *Journal of Power* 1.2 (2008): 111-130.

Bauman, Zygmunt. "A Sociological Theory of Postmodernity." *Thesis Eleven* 29.1 (1991): 33-46.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *In Search of Politics*. Polity, 1999.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Modernity*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty*. Polity Press, 2007.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Polity Press, 2008.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Intimations of Postmodernity*. Routledge, 2003.

Beauchamp, Gorman. "The Politics of the Handmaid's Tale." *Midwest Quarterly* 51 (2009): 11-25.

Beck, Ulrich, and Christoph Lau. "Second Modernity as a Research Agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the 'Meta-Change' of Modern Society." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56.4 (2005): 525-557.

Beck, Ulrich. "Beyond Class and Nation: Reframing Social Inequalities in a Globalizing World." *The British Journal of Sociology* 58.4 (2007): 679-705.

Beck, Ulrich. "Interview with Ulrich Beck." *Journal of consumer culture* 1.2 (2001): 261-277

Beck, Ulrich. *Power in the Global Age: A New Global Political Economy*. Polity, 2005.

Beck, Ulrich. *World Risk Society*. Polity press, Cambridge UK, 2000.

Beck, Ulrich. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Vol. 17. Sage, 1992.

Bedford, Anna. "Survival in the Post-Apocalypse: Ecofeminism in MaddAddam." In *Margaret Atwood's Apocalypses*, edited by Karma Waltonen, 71-92. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.

Bell, Daniel. *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1978.

Bennet, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Duke University Press, 2010.

Bennett, Jane. "A Vitalist Stopover on the Way to a New Materialism." In *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, edited by Diana Coole and Samantha Frost, 47-69. Duke University Press, 2010.

Bennett, Jane. "The Force of Things: Steps toward an Ecology of Matter." *Political theory* 32.3 (2004): 347-372.

Berg, Chris. "'Goddamn You All to Hell!': The Revealing Politics of Dystopian Movies." *Institute of Public Affairs Review: A Quarterly Review of Politics and Public Affairs*, The 60.1 (2008): 38-42.

Berger, Peter L. *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociology Theory of Religion*. Doubleday, 1967.

Bernstein, J. "Introduction." *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, by T. Adorno. Edited by J. Bernstein, 1 –25. London: Routledge, 1991.

Blencowe, Claire. “Foucault’s and Arendt’s ‘Insider View’ of Biopolitics: A Critique of Agamben.” *History of the Human Sciences* 23.5 (2010): 113-130

Booker, M. Keith. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994.

Bosco, Mark. “The Apocalyptic Imagination in Oryx and Crake.” In *Margaret Atwood: The Robber Bride, The Blind Assassin, Oryx and Crake*, edited by J. Brooks Bouson, 156-171. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2010.

Bouson, J. Brooks. “‘It’s Game Over Forever’: Atwood’s Satiric Vision of a Bioengineered Posthuman Future in Oryx and Crake.” *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 39.3 (2004): 139-156

Bradbury, Ray. *Fahrenheit 451*. Translated by Dost Körpe. İthaki, 2018.

Braidotti, Rosi. “Posthuman Affirmative Politics.” In *Resisting Biopolitics: Philosophical, Political and Performative Strategies*, edited by S.E. Wilmer, and Audronė Žukauskaitė 30-56. Routledge, 2016.

Braidotti, Rosi. “The Politics of Life itself and New Ways of Dying.” In *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, edited by Diana Coole and Samantha Frost, 201-208. Duke University Press, 2010.

Brans, Jo. “Using What You’re Given.” In *Waltzing Again: New and Selected Conversations with Margaret Atwood*, edited by Earl Ingersoll, 79-89. WW Norton & Co., 2006.

Burchell, Graham. “Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self.” In *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and the Rationalities of Government*, edited by Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose, 19-36. The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Butler, Judith. “Bodies and Power Revisited.” *Feminism and the final Foucault* (2004): 183-194.

Calhoun, Craig. “What Threatens Capitalism Now?.” In *Does Capitalism Have a Future?*, edited by Immanuel Wallerstein, et.al., 131-161. Oxford University Press, 2013.

Canavan, Gerry. "Hope, But Not for Us: Ecological Science Fiction and the End of the World in Margaret Atwood's Oryx and Crake and The Year of the Flood." *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 23.2 (2012): 138-159.

Castro, Jan Garden. "An Interview with Margaret Atwood." In *Margaret Atwood: Vision and Forms*, edited by Jan Garden Castro, and Kathryn VanSpankeren, 215-232. Southern Illinois University Press, 1988.

Chad, Walsh. *From Utopia to Nightmare*. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1962.

Cisney, Cisney and Nicolae Morar, "Introduction: Why Biopower Why Now?." In *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, edited by Vernon W. Cisney, and Nicolae Morar, 1-25. University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Claeys, Gregory. "'The Survival of the Fittest' and the Origins of Social Darwinism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 61.2 (2000): 223-240.

Claeys, Gregory. "Moylan and Dystopia." *Utopian Studies* 31.1 (2020): 194-203.

Claeys, Gregory. "News from Somewhere: Enhanced Sociability and the Composite Definition of Utopia and Dystopia." *History* 98.330 (2013): 145-173.

Claeys, Gregory. "The Origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell." In *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*, edited by Gregory Claeys 107-134. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Claeys, Gregory. *Dystopia: A Natural History*. Oxford University Press, 2016.

Claeys, Gregory. *Searching for Utopia: The history of an idea*. Thames and Hudson, 2011.

Claisse, Frédéric, and Pierre Delvenne. "Building on Anticipation: Dystopia Empowerment." *Current Sociology* 63.2 (2015): 155-169.

Condorcet, "Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind: Tenth Epoch," trans. Keith Michael Baker, *Daedalus*, vol. 133, no. 3, (2004): 65-82

Cooke, Nathalie. *Margaret Atwood: A Critical Companion*. Greenwood Publishing Group, 2006.

Coole, Diana, and Samantha Frost, "Introducing the New Materialisms." In *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, edited by Diana Coole and Samantha Frost, 1-43. Duke University Press, 2010.

Cooper, Pamela. "Sexual Surveillance and Medical Authority in Two Versions of The Handmaid's Tale." *The Journal of Popular Culture* 28.4 (1995): 49-66.

Dardot, Pierre, and Christian Laval. *The New Way of the World: On Neoliberal Society*. Verso Trade, 2014.

Davidson, Arnold E. "Future Tense: Making History in The Handmaid's Tale." In *Margaret Atwood: Vision and Forms*, edited by Jan Garden Castro, and Kathryn VanSpanckeren, 113-121. Southern Illinois University Press, 1988.

Davidson, Arnold I. "In Praise of Counter-Conduct." *History of the Human Sciences* 24.4 (2011): 25-41.

Davidson, Arnold I. "Introduction." *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-78*. Edited by Arnold I. Davidson, translated by Graham Burchell xviii- xxxiv. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Davis, Laurence. "Dystopia, Utopia and Sancho Panza." In *Dystopia (n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage*, edited by Fátima Vieria, 23-37. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.

Davis, Laurence. "History, Politics, and Utopia: Toward a Synthesis of Social Theory and Practice." In *Existential Utopia: New Perspectives on Utopian Thought*, edited by Michael Marder, and Patricia Vieira, 127-39. Bloomsbury Publishing USA, 2012.

Dawson, Matt. "Bauman, Beck, Giddens and Our Understanding of Politics in Late Modernity." *Journal of Power* 3.2 (2010): 189-207.

Dean, Mitchell. "Risk, Calculable and Incalculable." *Soziale Welt* (1998): 25-42.

Dean, Mitchell. *Governing Societies: Political Perspectives on Domestic and International Rule*. McGraw-Hill Education, 2007.

Death, Carl. "Counter-Conducts: A Foucauldian Analytics of Protest." *Social Movement Studies* 9.3 (2010): 235-251.

Deleuze Gilles, and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*. Translated by Brian Massumi. University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Michel Foucault, "Intellectuals and Power." In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*. Edited by Donald F. Boucard, translated by Donald F. Boucard and Sherry Simon, 205-217. Cornell University Press, 1996.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Negotiations, 1972-1990*. Columbia University Press, 1995.

Dowd, Douglas Fitzgerald Dowd. *Capitalism and its Economics: A Critical History*. Pluto Press 2004.

Dunning, Stephen. "Margaret Atwood's Oryx and Crake: The Terror of the Therapeutic." *Canadian Literature* 186 (2005): 86-101.

Ellenzweig, Sarah, and John H. Zammuto, "Introduction: New Materialism: Looking Forward, Looking Back," In *The New Politics of Materialism: History, Philosophy, Science*, edited by Sarah Ellenzweig, and John H. Zammuto, 1-15. Routledge, 2017.

Featherstone, Mark. "Event horizon: Utopia-dystopia in Bauman's thought." In *Bauman's Challenge*, edited by Mark Davis and Keith Tester, 127-140. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2010.

Ferns, Chris. "The Value/s of Dystopia: The Handmaid's Tale and the Anti-Utopian Tradition." *The Dalhousie Review* (1989):373-382.

Foucault, Miche. "Social Security." In *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977 –1984*. Edited by Lawrence D. Kritzman, translated by Alan Sheridan and Others, 159-177. Routledge, 1990.

Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at College de France 1978-1979*. Edited by Arnold I. Davidson, translated by Grahan Burchell. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Foucault, Michel. "Body/Power." In *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, 55-62. Edited by Colin Gordon, translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham and Kate Soper. Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. "Discussions about Truth and Subjectivity." In *About the Beginning of the Hermeneutics of the Self: Lectures of Dartmouth College 1980*. Translated by Graham Burchell, 93-126. The University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Foucault, Michel. "Power and Strategies." In *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, 134-145. Edited by Colin Gordon, translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham and Kate Soper. Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. "A Preface to Transgression." In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*. Edited by Donald F. Boucard, translated by Donald F. Boucard and Sherry Simon, 29-52. Cornell University Press, 1996.

Foucault, Michel. "Interview with Foucault." In *About the Beginning of the Hermeneutics of the Self: Lectures of Dartmouth College 1980*. Translated by Graham Burchell, 127-138. The University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Foucault, Michel. "On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress." In *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought, with Major New Unpublished Material*. Edited by Paul Rabinow, 340-372. Pantheon Books, 1984.

Foucault, Michel. "Subjectivity and Truth." In *The Politics of Truth*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer & Lysa Hochroth, 171-198. Semiotext(e), 1997.

Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8.4 (1982): 777-795.

Foucault, Michel. "The Thought of the Outside." In *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. Edited by James D. Faubion. translated by Robert Hurley et al. New York: New, 1998, 147-171.

Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power." In *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, 109-133. Edited by Colin Gordon, translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham and Kate Soper. Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. "Two Lectures." In *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, 78-108. Edited by Colin Gordon, translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham and Kate Soper. Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. "What is Enlightenment?." In *The Politics of Truth*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer & Lysa Hochroth, 7-22. Semiotext(e), 1997.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd Edition. (trans.) Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1977.

Foucault, Michel. *Society must be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*. Edited by Arnod I. Davidson, translated by David Macey. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: An introduction, volume I*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage 95, 1990.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: The Use of Pleasure*. Vol. 2. Translated by Robert Hurley. Vintage, 1990.

Foucault, Michel. *On the Government of the Living: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1979-1980*. Edited by Arnold I. Davidson, Translated by Graham Burchell. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-78*. Edited by Arnold I. Davidson, translated by Graham Burchell. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Foucault, Michel."Interview with Foucault," in *Essential Works of Foucault, Vol. 3 Power*. Edited by James Fabuion, translated by Robert Hurley and Others, 239-298. New Press, 2001.

Foucault, "What is Critique?," In *The Politics of Truth*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer & Lysa Hochroth, 23-82. Semiotext(e), 1997.

Freibert, Lucy M. "Control and Creativity: The Politics of Risk in Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale." In *Critical Essays on Margaret Atwood*, edited by Judith McCombs, 280-291. GK Hall, 1988.

Gaiman, Neil. "Sunuş." In *Fahrenheit 451*, 1-13. İthaki, 2018.

Gane, Nicholas. "Zygmunt Bauman: Liquid modernity and beyond." *Acta Sociologica* 44.3 (2001): 267-275.

Gerald, Gregory Fitz Gerald, and Kathryn Crabbe. "Evading the Pigeonholders." In Margaret Atwood: *Conversations*, edited by Earl Ingersoll, 131-139. Firefly Books, 1990.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Polity Press, 1991.

Gilson, Erinn. "Actuality." *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 10-12. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Goodwin, Barbara, and Keith Taylor. *The Politics of Utopia: A Study in Theory and Practice*. Vol. 5. Peter Lang, 2009.

Gordon, Colin. "Afterword to." In *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, 229-259, edited by Colin Gordon, translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham and Kate Soper. Pantheon Books, 1980.

Grace, Dominick. ""The Handmaid's Tale": Historical Notes" and Documentary Subversion." In *Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale*, 155-166, edited by Harold Bloom. Chelsea House Publishers, 2001.

Gros, Frédéric. "Is There a Biopolitical Subject? Foucault and the Birth of Biopolitics." In *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, edited by Vernon W. Cisney, and Nicolae Morar, 259-273. University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Grosz, Elizabeth, Kathryn Yusoff, and Nigel Clark. "An Interview with Elizabeth Grosz: Geopower, Inhumanism and the Biopolitical." *Theory, Culture & Society* 34.2-3 (2017): 129-146.

Grosz, Elizabeth. "Bergson, Deleuze and the Becoming of Unbecoming." *Parallax* 11.2 (2005): 4-13.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Legitimation Crisis*. Translated by Thomas Carthy. Heinemann Educational Books, 1980.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Modernity versus Postmodernity." Translated by Seyla Benhabib. *New German Critique* 22 (1981): 3-14.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Modernity: An Unfinished Project. " In *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity: Critical essays on the Philosophical Discourse of*

Modernity. Edited by Maurizio Passerin d'Entrèves, and Seyla Benhabib, 38-55. MIT Press, 1997.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Modernity's Consciousness of Time and Its Need for Self-Reassurance." *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Polity Press, 1998 1-22.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Naturalism and Religion: Philosophical Essays*, Polity, 2008.

Hammond, Karla. "Defying Distinctions." In *Margaret Atwood: Conversations*, edited by Earl Ingersoll, 99-108. Firefly Books, 1990.

Hansot, Elisabeth. "Selves, Survival, and Resistance in The Handmaid's Tale." *Utopian studies* 5.2 (1994): 56-69.

Haraway, Donna. "A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s." *Australian Feminist Studies* 2.4 (1987): 1-42.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Declaration*. Argo Navis Author Services, 2012.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. Penguin Press, 2004.

Haraway, Donna. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 1991.

Harvey, David. *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*. Oxford University Press, 2014.

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

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Introduction to the Philosophy of History: With Selections from the Philosophy of Right*. Translated by Leo Rauch. Hackett Publishing, 1988.

Held, David. *Models of Democracy*. Polity Press, 2006.

Heller, Agnes. "What is 'Postmodern'—A Quarter of a Century After?." *Moderne begreifen*. DUV (2007): 37-50.

Hengen, Shannon. "Moral/Environmental Debt in Payback and Oryx and Crake." In *Margaret Atwood: The Robber Bride, The Blind Assassin, Oryx and Crake*, edited by J. Brooks Bouson, 129-140. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2010.

Hobsbawm, E. "Tarihi Perspektif içinde Kapitalizmin Bunalımı." In *Dünya Kapitalizminin Krizi*, edited by N. Satlıgan, S. Savran, 71-89. İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 2009.

Horkheimer, Max, Theodor W. Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Edited by Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, translated by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford University Press, 2002.

Horkheimer, Max. *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell and others. Continuum, 2002.

Howells, Coral Ann. "Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Visions: the Handmaid's Tale and Oryx and Crake." In *The Cambridge Companion to Margaret Atwood*, edited by Coral Ann Howell, 161-175. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Howells, Coral Ann. "The Handmaid's Tale." In *The Handmaid's Tale*, edited by J. Brooks Bouson, 91-111. Salem Press, 2010.

Hoy, David Couzens. *Critical Resistance: From Poststructuralism to Post-Critique*. MIT Press, 2005.

Ingersoll, Earl G. "Survival in Margaret Atwood's Novel Oryx and Crake." In *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Margaret Atwood*, edited by Harold Bloom, 111-125. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2009.

Itoh, Makoto, and Costas Lapavitsas. *Para ve Finansın Ekonomi Politiği*. Yordam Kitap, 2012.

Jacobsen, Michael Hviid, and Keith Tester. "Introduction: Utopia as a Topic for Social Theory," ed. *Utopia: Social Theory and the Future*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2012, 1-6.

Jacobsen, Michael Hviid, and Keith Tester. "Sociology, Nostalgia, Utopia and Mortality: A Conversation with Zygmunt Bauman." *European Journal of Social Theory* 10.2 (2007): 305-325.

Jameson, Fredric. "Foreword to." Jean François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition, A Report on Knowledge. vii–xxi*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester University Press, 1984.

Jameson, Fredric. "Postmodernism and Consumer Society," in *The Anti-Aesthetic: The Essays Postmodern Culture*. Edited by Hal Foster. Bay Press, 1987.

Jameson, Fredric. "Utopia as Method, or the Uses of the Future." In *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*. Edited by Michael D. Gordin, Helen Tilly, and Gyan Prakash, 21-44. Princeton University Press, 2010.

Joseph, Terra Walston. "Victims of Global Capitalism in Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Imaginary." In *The Age of Dystopian: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*. Edited by Louisa MacKay Demerjian, 35-46. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016.

Kaminski, Margaret. "Preserving Mythologies." In *Margaret Atwood: Conversations*, edited by Earl Ingersoll, 27-32. Firefly Books, 1990.

Kelly, Mark. *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault*. Routledge, 2010.

Ketterer, David. "Margaret Atwood's" The Handmaid's Tale": A Contextual Dystopia (" La servante écarlate" de Margaret Atwood: une dystopie contextuelle)." *Science Fiction Studies* (1989): 209-217.

Koestler, Arthur. *Darkness at Noon: A Novel*. Simon and Schuster, 2019.

Kumar, Krishan. "Aspects of the Western Utopian Tradition." *History of the Human Sciences* 16.1 (2003): 63-77.

Kumar, Krishan. "The Ends of Utopia." *New Literary History* 41.3 (2010): 549-569.

Kumar, Krishan. "Utopia's Shadow." In *Dystopia (n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage*. Edited by Fátima Vieria, 19-22. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.

Kuźnicki. Sławomir. *Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Fiction: Fire is Being Eaten*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017.

Lash, Scott, and John Urry. *The End of Organized Capitalism*. University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

Lash, Scott. "Reflexive Modernization: The Aesthetic Dimension." *Theory, Culture & Society* 10.1 (1993): 1-23.

Lash, Scott. "Reflexivity as non-linearity." *Theory, Culture & Society* 20.2 (2003): 49-57.

Lash, Scott. *Sociology of Postmodernism*. Routledge, 2014.

Le Guin, Ursula. "Ursula K Le Guin's Speech at National Book Awards: 'Books Aren't Just Commodities'." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, November 20, 2014. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/nov/20/ursula-k-le-guin-national-book-awards-speech>.

Lee, Raymond LM. "Bauman, Liquid Modernity and Dilemmas of Development." *Thesis Eleven* 83.1 (2005): 61-77.

Lee, Raymond LM. "Reinventing Modernity: Reflexive Modernization vs Liquid Modernity vs Multiple Modernities." *European Journal of Social Theory* 9.3 (2006): 355-368.

Lemke, Thomas. "“A Zone of Indistinction”—A Critique of Giorgio Agamben’s Concept of Biopolitics." *Outlines. Critical Practice Studies* 7.1 (2005):3-13.

Lemke, Thomas. "Critique and Experience in Foucault." *Theory, Culture & Society* 28.4 (2011): 26-48.

Lemke, Thomas. "Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique." *Rethinking marxism* 14.3 (2002): 49-64.

Lemke, Thomas. "New Materialisms: Foucault and the ‘Government of Things’." *Theory, Culture & Society* 32.4 (2015): 3-25.

Lemke, Thomas. "Rethinking Biopolitics: The New Materialism and the Political Economy of Life." In *Resisting Biopolitics: Philosophical, Political, and*

Performative Strategies, edited by S.E. Wilmer, and Audronė Žukauskaitė 57-73. Routledge, 2016.

Lemke, Thomas. “‘The Birth of Bio-politics’: Michel Foucault’s Lecture at the Collège de France on Neo-liberal Governmentality.” *Economy and society* 30.2 (2001): 190-207.

Lemke, Thomas. “The Risks of Security: Liberalism, Biopolitics, and Fear.” In *The Government of Life: Foucault, Biopolitics, and Neoliberalism*, edited by Vanessa Lem and Miguel Vatter, 59-74. Fordham University Press, 2014.

Lemke, Thomas. *Biopolitics: An advanced Introduction*. NYU Press, 2011.

Levitas, Ruth. “Discourses of Risk and Utopia.” In *The Risk Society and Beyond: Critical Issues for Social Theory*, edited by Barbara Adam, Ulrich Beck, and Joost Van Loon, 198-200. Sage, 2000.

Levitas, Ruth. “For Utopia: The (Limits of the) Utopian Function in Late Capitalist Society.” *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 3.2-3 (2000): 25-43.

Levitas, Ruth. *Utopia as Method: The Imaginary Reconstitution of Society*. Springer, 2013.

Levitas, *The Concept of Utopia: Utopianism and Communitarianism*. Syracuse University Press, 1990.

Lilja, Mona, and Stellan Vinthagen. “Sovereign Power, Disciplinary Power and Biopower: Resisting What Power with What Resistance?.” *Journal of Political Power* 7.1 (2014): 107-126.

Lindhé, Anna. “Restoring the Divine Within: The Inner Apocalypse in Margaret Atwood’s The Year of the Flood.” In *Margaret Atwood’s Apocalypses*, edited by Karma Waltonen, 41-55. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.

Lorenzini, Daniele. “From Counter-conduct to Critical Attitude: Michel Foucault and the Art of not Being Governed quite so much.” *Foucault Studies* (2016): 7-21.

Lorenzini, Daniele. “Governmentality, Subjectivity, and the Neoliberal Form of Life.” *Journal for Cultural Research* 22.2 (2018): 154-166.

Lyon, David, and Zygmunt Bauman. *Liquid Surveillance: A Conversation*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity, 2013.

Lyotard, Jean François. *The Postmodern Condition, A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by G. Bennington and B. Massumi. Manchester University Press, 1984.

Macpherson, Heidi Slettedahl. *The Cambridge Introduction to Margaret Atwood*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Malak, Amin. "Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale and the Dystopian Tradition." In *Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale*. Edited by Harold Bloom, 3-10. Chelsea House Publishers, 2001.

Malthus, Thomas. *An Essay on the Principle of Population: An Essay on the Principle of Population, as it Affects the Future Improvement of Society with Remarks on the Speculations of Mr. Godwin, Mr. Concordet, and Other Writers* (1798). Electronic Scholarly Publishing Project, 1998.

Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia*. Routledge, 2013.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Negations: Essays in Critical Theory*. Translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro MayFlyBooks, 2009.

Marcuse, Herbert. *One-dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Routledge, 2007.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Towards a Critical Theory of Society Vol.2*. Edited by Douglas Kellner. Routledge, 2001.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Technology, War and Fascism: Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse, Volume 1*. Edited by Douglass Kellner. Routledge, 1998.

May, Todd, and Ladelle McWhorter, "Who's Being Disciplined Now? Operations of Power in a Neoliberal World." In *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, edited by Vernon W. Disney, and Nicolae Morar, 245-258. University of Chicago Press, 2015.

May, Todd. "When is a Deleuzian Becoming?." *Continental Philosophy Review* 36.2 (2003): 139-153.

May, Todd. *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Mbembé, J. Achille. "Necropolitics." Translated by Libby Meintjes. *Public Culture* 15.1. (2003):11-40.

Mendez-Egle, Beatrice. "Witness Is What You Must Bear." In *Margaret Atwood: Conversations*, edited by Earl Ingersoll, 162-70. Firefly Books, 1990.

Miller, Daniel. *Consumption and its Consequences*. Polity, 2012.

Miller, Peter, and Nikolas Rose. "Governing Economic Life." *Economy and Society* 19.1 (1990): 1-31.

Miller, Peter, and Nikolas Rose. *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal life*. Polity, 2008.

Mills, Catherine. *Biopolitics*. Routledge, 2018.

Miner, Madonne. ““Trust Me”: Reading the Romance Plot in Margaret Atwood’s *The Handmaid’s Tale*.” In *Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale*, edited by Harold Bloom 21-39. Chelsea House Publishers, 2001.

Mohr, Dunja M. “Transgressive Utopian Dystopias: the Postmodern Reappearance of Utopia in the Disguise of Dystopia.” *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 55.1 (2007): 5-24.

Mosca, Valeria. “Crossing Human Boundaries: Apocalypse and Posthumanism in Margaret Atwood’s *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood*.” *Altre Modernità* 9 (2013): 38-52.

Moylan, Tom “To Stand with Dreamers: On the Use Value of Utopia.” *The Irish Review* 34, (2006): 1-19.

Moylan, Tom. *Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination*. Vol. 14. Peter Lang, 2014.

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

Mumford, Lewis. "Utopia, the City and the Machine." *Daedalus* (1965): 271-292.

Offe, Claus. *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. Edited by John Keane. Hutchinson & Co, 1984.

Ojakangas, Mika. *On the Greek Origins of Biopolitics: A Reinterpretation of the History of Biopower*. Routledge, 2016.

Palumbo, Alice M. "On the Border: Margaret Atwood's Novels." In *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Margaret Atwood*, edited by Harold Bloom, 21-34. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2009.

Patton, Paul. "Deleuze's Political Philosophy." In *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*. Edited by Daniel W. Smith and Henry Somers-Hall, 198-219. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Polak, Frederick. *The Image of the Future: Translated by Elise Boulding*. Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, 1973.

Protevi, John. "Deleuze and Life." In *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*, edited by Daniel W. Smith and Henry Somers-Hall, 239-264. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Rabinow, Paul and Nikolas Rose, "Biopower Today." In *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, edited by Vernon W. Cisney, and Nicolae Morar, 296-324. University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Rabinow, Paul. "Introduction to." *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought, with Major New Unpublished Material*. Edited by Paul Rabinow, 3-29. Pantheon Books, 1984.

Raccolini, Raffaella, and Tom Moylan. "Critical Dystopia and Possibilities." In *Dark horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*, edited by Rafaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan, 233-49. Routledge, 2003.

Read, Jason. "A Genealogy of Homo-economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity." *Foucault studies*, 6 (2009): 25-36.

Revel, Judith. "The Literary Birth of Biopolitics." Translated by Christopher Penfield. In *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, edited by Vernon W. Cisney, and Nicolae Morar, 29-47. University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Riceour, Paul. *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*. New York, NY: Columbia ,1986.

Rigney, Barbara Hill. *Margaret Atwood*. Macmillan International Higher Education, 1987.

Rose, Nikolas, and Filippa Lentzos, "Making Us Resilient: Responsible Citizens for Uncertain Times." In *Competing Responsibilities: The Politics and Ethics of Contemporary Life*, edited by Trnka, Susanna, and Catherine Trundle, 27-48. Duke University Press, 2017.

Rose, Nikolas, and Peter Miller. "Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government." *British Journal of Sociology* (1992): 173-205.

Rose, Nikolas. "Governing "Advanced" Liberal Democracies." In *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and the Rationalities of Government*, edited by Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose, 37-64. The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Rose, Nikolas. "The Death of the Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 25.3 (1996): 327-356.

Rose, Nikolas. "The Politics of Life Itself." *Theory, Culture & Society* 18.6 (2001): 1-30.

Rose, Nikolas. *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century*. Princeton University Press, 2007.

Rose, Nikolas. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Sandler, Linda. "A Question of Metamorphosis." In *Waltzing Again: New and Selected Conversations with Margaret Atwood*, edited by Earl Ingersoll, 18-36. WW Norton & Co., 2006.

Sargent, Lyman Tower, and Gregory Claeys. *The Utopia Reader*. New York University Press, 1999.

Sargent, Lyman Tower. "Authority & Utopia: Utopianism in Political Thought." *Polity* 14.4 (1982): 565-584.

Sargent, Lyman Tower. "In Defense of Utopia." *Diogenes* 53.1 (2006): 11-17.

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

Sargent, Lyman Tower. *Utopianism: A very Short Introduction*. Vol. 246. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Sargisson, Lucy. "The Curious Relationship between Politics and Utopia." in *Utopia Method Vision: The Use Value of Social Dreaming*. Edited by Lucy Sargisson, Tom Moylan and Raffaella Baccolini. Peter Lang, 2007: 25-46.

Schmeink, Lars. *Biopunk Dystopias. Genetic Engineering, Society and Science Fiction*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2016.

Schmitt, Carl. *Political Theology Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Schmitt, Carl. *The Concept of the Political*. Translated by George Schwab. University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Senellart, Michel. "Course Context." *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-78*, 369-401. Edited by Arnold I. Davidson, translated by Graham Burchell, . Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Sennett, Richard. *The Culture of the New Capitalism*. Yale University Press, 2006.

Sørensen, Mads P., and Allan Christiansen. *Ulrich Beck: an introduction to the theory of second modernity and the risk society*. Routledge, 2013.

Staels, Hilde. "Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*: Resistance Through Narrating." In *The Handmaid's Tale*, edited by J.Brooks Bouson, 227-241. Salem Press, 2010.

Stapleton, Patricia, ““The People in the Chaos Cannot Learn’: Dystopian Vision in Atwood’s MADDADDAM Trilogy.” In *The Age of Dystopian: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*, edited by Louisa MacKay Demerjian, 19-34. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016.

Stein, Karen. "Margaret Atwood's Modest Proposal: The Handmaid's Tale." *Canadian Literature* 148 (1996): 57-73.

Stein, Karen. "Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale: Scheherazade in Dystopia." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 61.2 (1992): 269-279.

Stillman, Peter G. "Twenty-first Century Critical Dystopias." In *More After More: Essays Commemorating the Five Hundredth Anniversary of Thomas More's Utopia*, ed. Ksenia Olkusz et. al., 53-70. Facta Ficta Research Center, 2017.

Stillman, Peter G., and S. Anne Johnson. "Identity, Complicity, and Resistance in The Handmaid's Tale." *Utopian Studies* 5.2 (1994): 70-86.

Stillman, Peter G.. "'Nothing Is, but What Is Not':Utopias as Practical Political Philosophy." *Critical Review of International and Political Philosophy* 3.2-3 (2000): 9-24.

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

Tan, Sherman. "Contemporary Visions of Power and Resistance: On the relevance of Jürgen Habermas, Michel Foucault and Judith Butler." *Inaugral Annual Ph. B. Conference*. 2011.

Taylor, Charles. "Two Theories of Modernity." *Hastings Center Report* 25.2 (1995): 24-33.

Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Taylor, Chloë. "Biopower." In *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*, edited by Diana Taylor, 41-54. Acumen Publishing, 2011.

Taylor, Chloë. "Birth of the Suicidal Subject: Nelly Arcan, Michel Foucault, and Voluntary Death." *Culture, Theory and Critique* 56.2 (2015): 187-207.

Thompson, Kevin. "Forms of Resistance: Foucault on Tactical Reversal and Self Formation." *Continental Philosophy Review* 36.2 (2003): 113-138.

Tolan, Fiona. "Feminist Utopias and Questions of Liberty: Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale as Critique of Second Wave Feminism." *Women: a cultural review* 16.1 (2005): 18-32.

Twigg, Alan. "Just Looking at Things That Are There." In *Margaret Atwood: Conversations*, edited by Earl Ingersoll, 121-130. Firefly Books, 1990.

Van der Tuin, Iris, and Rick Dolphijn. "The Transversality of New Materialism." *Women: A Cultural Review* 21.2 (2010): 153-171.

Vieira, Fátima. "Introduction." In *Dystopia (n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage*, edited by Fátima Vieira, 1-7. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.

Weafer, Miles. "Writing from the Margin: Victim Positions in Atwood's The Year of the Flood." In *Margaret Atwood's Apocalypses*, edited by Karma Waltonen, 57-70. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.

Weber, Max. "Science as Vocation." In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Edited by and translated by Hans Heinrich Gerth, and C. Wright Mills, 129-159. Oxford University Press, 1946.

Weber, Max. "Technical Advantages of Bureaucratic Organization." In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Edited by and translated by Hans Heinrich Gerth, and C. Wright Mills, 214-216. Oxford University Press, 1946.

Weber, Max. "The Social Psychology of The World Religions." In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Edited by and translated by Hans Heinrich Gerth, and C. Wright Mills, 267-301. Oxford University Press, 1946.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. Routledge, 2005.

Wells, Herbert George. *A Modern Utopia*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Wilmer, S.E., and Audronė Žukauskaitė, "Introduction." In *Resisting Biopolitics: Philosophical, Political, and Performative Strategies*, edited by S.E. Wilmer and Audronė Žukauskaitė, 1-18. Routledge, 2016.

Wisker, Gina. *Margaret Atwood: An Introduction to Critical Views of her Fiction*. Palgrave Macmillan 2012.

Wood, Ellen Meikins. "Modernity, Postmodernity or Capitalism?," *Review of International Political Economy* (1997): 551-560.

Zamyatin, Yevgeny. *We*. Avon Books, 1987.

APPENDICES

A. CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name : Görmez, Ayça Berna
Nationality : Turkish
Date and Place of Birth : 08 November 1986, Ankara
Phone : +90 5079747177
Email : gormezayca@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MS	METU, International Relations	2013
BS	İhsan Doğraması Bilkent University, Political Science	2010

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2011- Present	Manisa Celal Bayar University Department of Public Administration	Research Assistant

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

English (Advanced)

PUBLICATIONS

Journal Article

Görmez, A. B. "The Formation of a Nation: The Case of Bosnian Muslims." *Global Journal on Humanites & Social Sciences.* [Online]. 04, 118-127, 2016.

Paper Presentations

Görmez, Ayça Berna. "Biopower: A Way Towards Harmony." *19th Utopian Studies Society, Europe: In Search of New Harmonies*, 2018.

Görmez, Ayça Berna. "From Care of the State to the Care of the Self: A Foucauldian Perspective on the Relations Between Neo-Liberalism and Welfare States." *13th Conference of the European Sociological Association (Un)Making Europe: Capitalism, Solidarities, Subjectivities*, 2017.

Görmez, Ayça Berna. "Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma ve Toplumsal Sürdürülebilirlik." *KAYSEM*, VII, 2012.

Yaman, Fatih, Ayça Berna Görmez. "Ethical Foundations of the Sustainability and the Sustainable Development." *3rd International Symposium on Sustainable Development*, 2012.

B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu çalışma Margaret Atwood distopyalarında (*Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü* ve *Antilop ve Flurya, Tufan Zamani, DelliAdem* romanlarından oluşan *DelliAdem* üçlemesinde) modernite, iktidar ve direniş analizlerine odaklanmaktadır. Modernite kavramı bütün distopyaların modern olmaları, moderniteyi ve/veya onun sonuçlarını problemleştirmeleri ve bu sonuçlara eleştiri yöneltmeleri sebebiyle seçilmiştir. İktidar kavramı ise hemen hemen her ütopya ya da distopyanın iktidar kavramı ele aldığı iddiasından yola çıkarak seçilmiştir. Ütopyalar iktidarı başka bir şeyle değiştirmek isterken distopyalar yozlaşmış iktidarlarla ya da iktidarın nasıl yozlaştırıldıgına odaklanır. Direniş kavramı ise her distopyanın bir mücadele içeriği savından yola çıkarak seçilmiştir. Bu mücadele distopyaların kurulduğu senaryolara karşı verilir.

Bu çalışma hem betimsel hem de eleştirel analiz sunmaktadır. Yaşadığımız dünyayı anlamak ve anlamlandırmak için betimsel analize başvurulmuştur ve bu analiz modernite teorilerinin yardımıyla yapılmıştır. Modernite teorileri ile yaşadığımız koşullar, önemli toplumsal, siyasi ve ekonomik dönüşümler analiz edilmiştir. Aynı zamanda yaşadığımız koşulları oluşturan iktidar mekanizmalarının analizi ile eleştirel bir analiz de sunulmaktadır. Sadece yaşadığımız dünyayı anlamlandırmakla yetinilmemiş aynı zamanda günümüzün nasıl oluştuğu, hangi mekanizmalar tarafından şekillendirildiği de analize tabi tutulmuştur. Yani bu çalışma hem günümüzü anlamlandırma hem de günümüzü oluşturan mekanizmaları ortaya çıkarma çabası içermektedir.

Çalışma distopyaları birer bilgi formu olarak ele almaktadır. Bilgi formu olarak distopyalar hakikatten ziyade deneyim sunmaktadır. Bu çalışma evrensel bir hakikati aramamakta, şimdinin betimsel ve eleştirel deneyimini sunma çabası içermektedir. Yani bu çalışmada distopyalar deneyimsel kitaplar olarak ele alınmaktadır. Deneyim kitapları kendilerini bir hakikat ile ya da bir hakikati sunmak ile sınırlamaz. Hakikati problemleştirek okuyucuya olayların doğallığından ya da

olağanlığından uzaklaştırmayı amaçlayan kitaplardır. Deneyim kitapları günümüz toplumları, toplumların örgütlenmesi ve yapıları hakkında bize bilgi vermektedir. Bunlarla sınırlı kalmayıp bu örgüt ve yapılanmanın içinde insanların varoluş biçimlerini de sunmaktadır. Distopyalar senaryolarını başka dünyalarda ya da gelecekte kurarak okuyucuya yabancıllaşma ya da uzaklaşma yoluyla yaşadığı dünyanın dışına çıkarır. Ve bu uzaklaşma ile eleştirel bakışın yolu açılır. Hem ütopyaların hem distopyaların okuyucu üzerinde dönüştürücü etkileri vardır.

Bu çalışmada ütopyalar ve distopyalar birbirinin antitezi olarak ele alınmamaktadır. Bunlar birbirlerini dışlayıcı olarak düşünülmmezler. Distopyaları anti-ütopyalar olarak ele almak da mümkün değildir. Anti-ütopyalar genelde ya bir ütopik ideale ya da ütopya kavramının kendisine karşı senaryolar üretmektedir. Ancak bu çalışmada ütopik ideallere karşı senaryolar üreten distopyalar ele alınmamaktadır. Bu çalışmanın konusu olan distopyalar, daha ziyade yaşadığımız dünyadan daha kötü dünyaları bize sunan kitaplardır. Margaret Atwood'un kitapları ütopya karşıtı kitaplar değildir. Aslında, çalışmaya konu olan kitapların içinde gömülü ütopyalar ya da ütopik niyetler de yer almaktadır. Bu gömülü ütopyalar, ütopik idealler ve geleceğe dair umut ışığı Atwood'un distopyalarının eleştirel distopya olarak tanımlanmasına yol açmıştır. Ancak bu çalışmada eleştirel ve klasik distopya ayrimı yapılmamış her distopyanın eleştirel olduğu öne sürülmüştür. Ütopyacı bir dürtü öne sürmesi ya da gömülü bir ütopya sunması distopyayı eleştirel yapan özellik olarak düşünülmemiştir. Distopyalar birer uyarı niteliği taşırlar ve distopik senaryolardan olası çıkış yollarının kurguya dahil edilmesi distopyaların niteliğini değiştirmez. Ütopyalar ve distopyalar bozuk paranın iki yüzü gibi düşünülmektedir. Birinin ütopyası başka birinin distopyası olabilir. Ütopya ve distopya arasındaki kapsayıcı ilişki Atwood'un distopyalarında açıkça gösterilmektedir. Çalışmaya konu olan kitaplar sadece uyarı niteliği taşımazlar aynı zamanda okuyucuya distopik senaryolardan kaçış yolları sunmakta ve farklı şekilde olma ve yaşama umudu sunmaktadır.

Bu çalışma ütopyacı ya da distopyacı düşünce ile toplumsal teorileri birleştirme amacı taşımaktadır. Ütopyaların ve distopyaların olası dünyalar sunması, bu olası dünyalar içerisinde daha iyi ve daha kötü siyasaları öne çıkarıp analiz etmesi hem ütopyaların hem distopyaların sosyal ve siyasi teoriler içerisinde sistemik rolleri olduğu düşüncesini sağlamlaştırmaktadır. Bu bağlamda yapılmaya çalışılan

şey daha kötü dünyalar sunan distopyaların nasıl kurulduğunu anlamak, şimdile ilişkilerini kurmak ve olası çıkış yollarını analiz etmektir. Bu amaç için Atwood'un distopyalarının seçilme sebeplerinden ilki bu kitaplarının iki farklı distopia geleneğini yansıtmasıdır. Atwood, *Damızlık Kızın Öyüüsü* kitabında Orwell geleneğini devam ettirmektedir. Orwell geleneği kontrol ve gözetimin gündelik hayatın en derinliklerinde yaşadığı baskıcı ve totaliter bir rejimi ele almaktadır. *DelliAdem* üclemesi ise Huxley geleneğini devam ettirmekte yani görünürde özgür, kapitalist ve hedonist bir kültürü sergilemektedir. Yani bu çalışmada iki farklı distopia geleneği analiz edilmiştir. Bunun yanı sıra Atwood ifade özgürlüğü ihlalleri ve insan hakları ihlallerine karşı mücadelede aktif bir rol oynar.

Bu çerçevede ikinci bölüm ütopyalara ve distopyalara kavramsal bir giriş niteliği taşımaktadır. İlk olarak, distopyadan daha eski bir tür olan ütopyanın gelenekleri, tanımları ve özellikleri verilmiştir. Daha sonra modern ütopyaların kaynakları tartışılmıştır. Bu kaynaklar mükemmelleştirilebilirlik ve sonsuz ilerleme düşüncesi, aydınlanma ve sekülerleşme süreci olarak tanımlanmıştır. Daha sonra modern bir tür olan distopyaların tanımları ve içeriği konular ele alınmıştır. Her ne kadar tanımlar, içerikler ya da amaçlar konusunda farklı düşünceler olsa distopyanın uyarı niteliği taşıdığı hemen hemen her düşünür tarafından kabul edilmiştir. Bu uyarılar genelde insan eylemlerinin sonuçlarına yönelikdir. Distopyalar yirminci yüzyılda baskın bir tür haline gelmiştir ve baskınlık kapitalizmin ya da komünizmin yetersizlikleri, faşizm, bilim ve teknolojideki ilerlemenin sonuçlarının öngörülememesi ve araçsal aklın hakimiyetinin sonuçları gibi sebeplerden kaynaklanmaktadır. Ütopyalar ve distopyalar her ne kadar başka dünyalarda ya da gelecekte kuruluyor olsa da yazıldığı dönemin koşullarından bağımsız düşünülemezler. Yazıldıkları dönemin sosyo-politik ve sosyo-ekonomik koşullarını yansıtırlar. Okuyucuya bir adım öteye götürüp yaşanan dünyaya dışarıdan bakmaya olanak sağlarlar. Böylece eleştirel bir pencere açıp yapıcı değişim ve yapıcı gelişmelere olanak sağlarlar. Bu anlamda ütopyalar ve distopyalar toplumsal teoriler için önemli role sahiptirler. Hem toplumsal teorilerin hem ütopya ve distopia türünün problematiği benzerdir. Ütopyalar daha iyi alternatiflere, daha iyi politikalara ya da daha iyi örgütlenme biçimlerini ararken distopyalar daha kötü alternatifleri okuyucuya sunarak bu kötü alternatiflerin nasıl engellenebileceğini düşünmeye sevk eder. Bu sebeple ütopya ve distopya türü toplumsal teorinin bir

parçası olarak düşünülebilir. En azından, toplumsal teorileri besleyici rolleri bulunmaktadır.

Üçüncü bölümde Atwood'un distopyalarında anlatılan toplum modernite teorileri yardımıyla betimlenmiş ve analiz edilmiştir. Bu betimlemedeki amaç gündelik hayatın, siyasal koşulların, toplumsal örgütlenmenin ve bu örgütlenmenin içindeki bireyin genel portresini çıkarmaktır. Atwood'un çalışmaya konusu olan dört distopyası ileri sanayi toplumlarının olası iki sonucunu yansıtmaktadır. Bunlardan ilki totaliter devlet rejimi diğer ise şirketlerin kontrolünde olan bir toplum. *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü* ileri sanayi toplumlar ile totaliter rejimlerin ilişkisini konu almaktadır. Totaliter rejimlerin ileri sanayi toplumlarının bir sonucu hatta ileri sanayi toplumlarına içkin olduğu öne sürülmektedir. Kapitalizm ve liberalizm totaliter yönetimin yönetimi devralmasına sebep olmuştur. Bu sebeple öncelikle kapitalizm, liberalizm, ileri sanayi toplumları ve totaliterlik arasındaki ilişki analiz edilmiştir. Bu ilişki araçsal aklın ve kapitalizm mantığının topluma yayılması ile kurulmuş ve derinleşmiştir. İleri sanayi toplumları yabancılaşmış ve yalıtlı insanlar üremektedir. Bunun sonucu olarak da kolektif hareket bağılılığından yoksun, var olan problemleri yadsıyan ya da görmezden gelen, sorumluluk bilinci azalan ya da olmayan bireyler ortaya çıkmaktadır. İleri sanayi toplumları kitle toplumları üretmektedir. Bu toplumlarda yükselen hayat standartları ayak uydurmamayı ya da uydurmayı reddetmeyi lüzumsuz ve gereksiz yapmaktadır. Bu toplumlarda özgürlük seçme özgürlüğü olarak düşünülmekte ve tüketicilikle özdeşleşmektedir. *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'nde hem Gilead rejimi öncesi hem Gilead rejimi sırasında ahlaki ve siyasi duruş sergileme eksikliğidir göze çarpmaktadır. Bu eksiklik totaliter rejimin yönetimi ele geçirmesine olanak sağlamıştır.

Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü 1985'de kaleme alınmıştır. Yazıldığı dönem itibarıyle bu kitap aynı zamanda postmodernizmin özelliklerini de taşımaktadır. Atwood bu kitapta modern ilkelerle postmodern ilkelerin çatışmasını da konu almıştır. Modernite hakikatin nesnelliğine ve tarafsızlığına, bilimsel aklın araçsal akılla birleşmesine ve bu aklın zaferine vurgu yapar. Postmodernizm ise bu nesnelliği ve tarafsızlığı sorgular. Postmodernizm gerçekliği problematize eder. Postmodern dünya parçalanmış bir dünyaya işaret eder ve bu dünyada bilgi, fark ve çokluğun anlatısı olarak karşımıza çıkar. Modernite tarafından sabitlenen sınırlar postmodernizm ile aşındırılmaya çalışılmıştır. Atwood bu çatışmaya kitabında

önemli bir yer vermiştir. Kitabın anlatıcısı Offred'in deneyimlerini kaydettiği kasetlerin nesnel olmamasından dem vuran bilim insanların kendi öznelliklerini görememesi, bilimsel bilginin nesnellik uğruna bağlamı kaçırması kitabı en önemli eleştirel noktalarındandır. Başka bir deyişle, bu kitapta bilimsel bilgi ile öznel anlatının çatışmasına şahit olmaktayız. Öznel anlatılar bilimsel bilgi tarafından dışlanmaktadır. Offred'in kayıtları olarak karşımıza çıkan bu anlatılar Gilead'da gündelik hayatın nasıl işlediğine dair önemli bilgiler sunmaktadır. Ancak bilim insanları tarafından fazla öznel olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Aynı zamanda bu kitapta siyasal olana ve siyasete devlet merkezli yaklaşan bakış açısı da eleştirilmektedir. Offred kasetlerinde devletin işleyişine dair bilgi vermemektedir. Ve bilim insanları bunun büyük bir eksiklik olduğunu öne sürmektedirler çünkü bilim insanları siyaseti hala devlet merkezli tanımlamaktadır. Kitapta devletin direkt eylemlerinden ziyade kişisel ve öznel deneyimler okuyucuya sunulmaktadır. Gündelik hayatın siyasalın bir konusu olduğunun vurgusu yapılmakta ve özel olanın politik olduğu gözler önüne serilmektedir.

Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü aynı zamanda dikkatleri çevre tahribine, doğal kaynakların yok oluşuna, radyasyon ve hava kirliliği kaynaklı doğum oranlarının azalmasına çekmektedir. Bunlar ileri sanayi toplumlardan kaynaklanan sorunlardır. 1960'lardan itibaren çevreyi konu alan ütopyalar ve distopyalarda artış gözlemlenmektedir. Her ne kadar *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü* bu konuları ele almış olsa da asıl odağı totaliter rejimin yönetimi ele geçirmesidir. Yazıldığı dönem itibarıyle totaliter rejim korkusunu ele alması Atwood'u eleştirilere maruz bıraksa da günümüz toplumlarda baskıcı ve totaliter rejimler korku odağı olmaktan çıkmamıştır. Bu anlamda Atwood'un kaygısı anlaşılabilir bir kaygıdır. *DelliAdem* üçlemesinde ise Atwood dikkatini başka yöne çevirmiştir. Bu üçlemede Atwood hem çevresel kaygıları, hem bilim ve teknolojideki ilerlemelerin öngörelemez sonuçlarını hem de özgürlük kisvesi altında üretilen baskı rejimlerini konu almıştır. Üçleme totaliter rejimle yönetilen bir toplumu değil şirket kontrollü bir toplumu ele alınmıştır. Her ne kadar *DelliAdem* üçlemesi özgür bir toplumu tasvir ediyor gibi görünse de temelde iki rejimde de özgürlükler kısıtlanmaktadır. *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'nde devlet tarafından kısıtlanan özgürlükler *DelliAdem* üçlemesinde güvencesizlikler, belirsizlikler ve eşitsizlikler yüzünden kısıtlanmaktadır. Şunu belirtmek gerekir ki hem *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü* hem de *DelliAdem* üçlemesi temelde dünyaya ve

yaşama bağlılığın azalmasına, problemlerin görmezden gelinmesine, kolektif eylemlerin yokluğuna ve bireyleştirmenin sonuçlarına vurgu yapmaktadır.

1990lardan itibaren distopya türünde kıyamet (apocalyptic) senaryoları baskın hale gelmiştir. Atwood'un *DelliAdem* üçlemesi de genelde bu çerçevede değerlendirilmektedir. Bu bakış açısı kapitalizmin kaçınılmazlığı savıyla doğrudan ilintilidir. Kapitalizm kaçınılmaz olarak düşünüldüğü için değişim ve dönüşüm imkansız olarak değerlendirilmekte ve var olan sistemin alternatifi ancak ve ancak kıyamet sonrası gelecekte aranmaktadır. Ancak Atwood'un da belirttiği gibi bu üçleme kıyamet senaryosu veya kıyamet sonrası senaryosu değildir. Çünkü yok olan şey sadece insanlığın bir kısmıdır. İnsanlığın bir kısmının yok olması da kıyameti işaret etmez. Bunun yanı sıra Atwood distopik senaryosunu kimilerinin kıyamet olarak adlandırdığı insanlığın bir kısmının yok oluşunda değil bu yok oluşa sebep olan koşullarda kurmuştur. Yani *DelliAdem* üçlemesine konu olan distopya günümüz ileri sanayi ya da ileri kapitalist toplumların yarattığı koşullarda aranmalıdır.

DelliAdem üçlemesinde yeni bir toplum tasavvuru vardır, şirketlerin yönettiği bir toplum. Bu açıdan *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'yle bir kıyaslama yapılabilir. Her distopya en azından bir korkuyu ele alır, bu korkuyu işler ve hatta bu korkuyu ileri götürür. *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'nde bu korku totaliter rejimin yönetimi ele geçirmesiyken *DelliAdem* üçlemesinde bu korku şirketlerin yönetimi ele geçirmesi olarak düşünülebilir. Şirketlerin yönettiği bir toplum tasavvuru ise neoliberalizmin analizini zorunlu kılmaktadır. Üçlemenin analizinde neoliberal politikaları geçiş ile birlikte toplumlarda yeni bir örgütlenmenin ortaya çıktığı öne sürülmektedir. Neoliberalizm sadece kurumları, onların politikalarını ve iktisadi plan ve programları değiştirmekle kalmamış aynı zamanda bireylerin kendileriyle, toplumlariyla, çevreleriyle ve şeylerle ilişkilerini de değiştirdiği öne sürülmüştür. Bu üçleme 2000li yılların endişelerini ve problemlerini yansıtmaktadır. Genelde güvensizlik, belirsizlik ve risk gibi konular üzerinde durulmuştur. Bu problemler modernite teorilerinde neoliberal politikalara geçişin sonuçları olarak ele alınmaktadır. Bu geçişle beraber ulus-devletlerin güçlerinin azaldığı iddia edilmektedir. Devlet tarafından sunulan hizmetlerin, refah devleti hizmetlerinin hemen hemen hepsi özelleştirilmiştir, bireyselleşme ve bireyleştirme artmış ve tüketim yeni yeniden-üretim aracı haline gelip üretimin yerini almıştır.

Üçlemenin analizinde modernite teorilerinde yaşanan paradigmaya değişikliğinden yararlanılmıştır. Bu paradigmaya değişikliği moderniteye getirilen postmodern eleştiri ile başlamış ki bu eleştiri *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'ne de konu olmuştur. *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'nden farklı olarak *DelliAdem* üçlemesinde yeni modernite anlayışları da işlenmiştir. Modernitenin kurumlarının (aile, refah devleti, ulus-devlet, vb.), örgütlenme biçimlerinin ve iktisadi rejiminin değiştğini, yeni ortaya çıkan toplumsal sorumlara çözüm üretemediği ve hatta bu kurumların yer yer yok olduğunu öne süren teorilerden yararlanılmıştır. Bu teoriler Bauman'ın öne sürdürdüğü 'akışkan modernite,' Beck'in ortaya attığı 'ikinci modernite' ya da Beck, Giddens ve Lash'in ortak kullandığı 'düşünümsel (reflexive) modernite' kavramları çerçevesinde tartışılmıştır. Her ne kadar bu kavramlar arasında farklılıklar ve çatışmalar olsa da hepsinin ortak vurgusu günümüz toplumlarının katı veya birinci modernite kavramlarıyla ve kurumlarıyla açıklanamayacağı olacaktır. Bu teorilere göre günümüzde modernleşme kendisini sorgulamaya başlamıştır. Yani bir anlamda modernleşmenin kendisi modernleşmektedir. Katı, hiyerarşik örgütlenmeler yerini esnek örgütlenmelere bırakmış, sanayileşmeyle beraber gelen merkezileşme ve hantal yapıların yerini merkezsiz ve esnek ağlar almıştır. Sanayileşmenin sonucunda çevre sorunları ortaya çıkmış ve küresel tehdit haline gelmiştir. Bu süreçte modernleşmenin getirdiği katı kategorilerin yerini belirsizlik ve güvencesizlik almıştır. Devletin fonksiyonları ve hizmetleri özel sektörde devredilmiştir ve birey bu hizmetlerin temininde sorumlu tutulmuştur. Öyle ki, güvenlik dahi devlet tarafından değil bir şirket tarafından sağlanmaktadır. Aile, sınıf, refah devleti ya da ulus-devlet gibi birinci modernite kurumlarından artık söz etmek mümkün değildir. Sadece bireysel sorumluluklar ve riskler değil evrensel sorumluluklar ve riskler de artmıştır. Belki de en önemlisi bu risklerin görünür hale gelmesidir. Atwood'un üçlemesine konu olan toplum tam da böyle bir toplumdur. Devlet artık yoktur, yönetimi şirketler devralmıştır. Devletin refah hizmetlerinin hepsi şirketler tarafından özel olarak sağlanmaktadır. Bu sebeple toplumda büyük bir eşitsizlik ortaya çıkmıştır. Atwood bu eşitsizliği iki farklı dünya gibi düşünülebilecek olan Compound ve Pleebland ile ortaya koymuştur. Compound'da yaşayanlar genelde bilim insanları ve onların aileleridir. Onlar görece daha güvencelilerdir. Eğitim, sağlık ve barınma gibi temel ihtiyaçları şirket tarafından karşılanır. Bu karşın Pleebland'da hayat güvencesizdir. Burada yaşayanlar bu hizmetleri karşılaşacak

ekonomik güçe sahip değildirler. Şiddet toplumun geneline yayılmış olsa da Pleebland'de daha olağan karşılaşır. Fakat şunu belirtmek gerekmek ki şirketlerle olası bir çıkar çatışması halinde herhangi bir bilim insanın hayatı Pleebland'de yaşayan bir insanın hayatı kadar degersizdir. Bunun yanı sıra, *DelliAdem* üclemesinde küresel riskler yaşamın genel ilerleyişine tehdit oluşturmaktadır. Bu küresel riskler ve tehditlerin herkesi eşitleyici bir rolü vardır. Kimse bu risklerden muaf değildir ve bu riskleri ortadan kaldırabilecek ya da çevre sorunlarını çözebilecek bir otorite ya da küresel bir hükümetten bahsedilmez. Bireyler her açıdan yalnız bırakılmıştır. Her birey başarısından ya da başarısızlığından, güvenliğinden ya da güvencesizliğinden sorumludur.

Modernite teorileri günümüz toplumlarını betimsel olarak analiz ederler. Geçmişle günümüz arasındaki bağlantıları ve kopuşları, değişimleri ve dönüşümleri analiz etmede çok değerli anlatılar ve bilgiler sunarlar. Ancak günümüz toplumlarını değiştirmek için betimsel analiz yeterli değildir. Betimsel analizin yanı sıra eleştirel analiz de gerekmektedir. Ve bu çalışmada eleştirel analiz için iktidar analizine başvurulmuştur. Tüketimi yeniden üretim aracı yaparak üretimin yerini almasına yol açan, bireyi onu 'kısıtlayan' bağlarından (aile, geleneğ, din gibi) kopararak onu 'özgürliğe' kavuşturan, sanayileşmenin sonucunda ortaya çıkan risk ve tehlikelerin risk ve tehlike olarak adlandırılmasına, bir anlamda görünürlük kılınmalarına sebep olan mekanizmanın ortaya çıkarılmasının iktidar analiziyle mümkün olduğu savunulmaktadır. Bu sebeple dördüncü bölümde *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'nın ve *DelliAdem* üclemesinin iktidar analizi yapılmıştır.

İktidar analizi toplumsal örgütlenmenin arkasında yatan mekanizmaların ve akılsallığın ortaya çıkarılmasında önemli bir rol oynar. Toplumsal örgütlenmenin hangi araçlarla, hangi mantıkla ya da hangi akılsallığa dayanarak sağlandığını anlamak, bu örgütlenmeye alternatif örgütlenme biçimlerinin araştırılmasında ve ortaya çıkarılmasında belki de ilk adım olarak düşünülebilir. Eğer toplumların şimdiki var oluş biçimini kaçınılmaz ya da daimi gerçeklik olarak algılanırsa toplumda herhangi bir değişiklik ya da bir dönüşüm olması muhtemel değildir. İşte ütopyalar ve distopyalar bu kaçınılmazlık ve daimi gerçeklik algısını bozarak toplumların değişimine yol açabilirler. Dördüncü bölümdeki amaç tam da budur. Bazılarımıza kaçınılmaz gelen kapitalizmin, neoliberal politikaların, bireyleştirmenin hangi

yollarla kaçınılmaz kılındığının analizini yapmaktadır. Bu analiz için de iktidar analizine başvurulmuş özellikle biyoiktidar analizi üzerinde durulmuştur.

Bu bölümdeki temel argüman modern iktidar formunun biyoiktidar olduğunu göstermektedir. Biyoiktidar yaşam ve siyaset arasında ilişki kurar, bunları birleştirir. Bu iktidar güvenlik mekanizmaları yoluyla toplumsal beden yani nüfus üzerinde işler. Disiplinci mekanizmalar yoluyla da bireysel beden üzerinde işler. Dördüncü bölümde iktidar mekanizmaların işlemesi ve yönetmesi için hakikat ve bilginin üretimine başvurduğu ve ihtiyaç duyduğu öne sürülmektedir. Her iktidar biçimini kendi hakikatini ve kendi bilgisini oluşturmaktadır. Bu bölümde temel olarak Foucault'cu iktidar analizine başvurulmuştur. Ancak biyoiktidar analizi birçok düşünür tarafından ele alınmış, yeniden kavramsallaştırılmış, farklı tarihselliklere ve hatta bazen tarih-dışılığa oturtulmuştur. Bu sebeple seçilen kitaplara konu olan kavramlar ve sorunsallar göz önünde bulundurularak üç farklı biyoiktidar analizinden yararlanılmıştır. Foucault'nun biyoiktidar analizinin yanı sıra, başını Agamben'in çektiği siyasal teoloji perspektifinden ve yeni materyalizmin biyoiktidar analizlerinden yararlanılmıştır. Önce Foucault'cu iktidar analizi ve iktidar kipleri anlatılmıştır. Bunlar egemen iktidar, disiplinci iktidar ve biyoiktidardır. Her iktidar biçimini kendi mekanizmasıyla işler. Egemen iktidar toprak parçası üzerinde kurulan iktidardır, üretici kapasiteden yoksun, sınır koyan ve hayır diyen bir iktidar biçimidir. Disiplinci iktidar ise toprak üzerinde değil bireylerin bedeni üzerinde iktidar kurar. Düzeltici bir iktidar biçimidir, normalleşme kodları ve normlar yoluyla öznellik kurar. Bireyler bu iktidar biçiminin hem nesnesi hem de iktidarı kullanmanın araçlarındandır. Biyoiktidar nüfusu hedef alır. Egemen iktidarın öldürme hakkı ve yaşamaya izin verme hakkının tersine bu iktidar kipi yaşamı yapma ve ölüme terk etme biçiminde işler. Biyoiktidar yaşamı besler, büyütür ve teşvik eder. Belirsizliklerin, bilinmeyenlerin ve risklerin ölçülmesi ve düzenlenmesi bu iktidar mekanizmaları tarafından yapılır. Risklerin azaltılması, faydanın çoğaltılması ve nüfusun verimliliğinin artırılması bu iktidar biçiminin temel amaçlarındandır. Biyoiktidar yaşamı ve yaşamın mekanizmalarını hesaplamalar alanına sokar ve bu hesaplamalar sonucunda insan yaşamını dönüştürür. Biyoiktidar 'yaşamın ekonomi-politiğidir.' Bu üç iktidar biçimini birbirini iptal etmezler, birbirinden faydalayırlar.

Foucault'nun iktidar kiplerinin tanımlanmasından sonra diğer perspektiflerin hangi çözümlemeler için kullanıldığını belirtmekte ve kısaca onlara degeinmekte de yarar vardır. Agamben'in formüle ettiği siyasal teoloji perspektifi totaliter rejimleri, savaş benzeri durumları ve olağanüstü halleri açıklamada önemli bir yer tutar. Foucault modern iktidar biçiminin biyoiktidar olduğunu ileri sürer ve egemen iktidarın modern iktidar biçimini açıklamada yetersiz olduğunu ileri sürer. Egemen iktidar yasal düzlemden işler ancak modern yönetimsellik yasal düzleme siğmaz. Bu savın aksine Agamben egemenin ve egemen iktidarın modern siyasal düzlemden hala önemli bir rolü olduğunu savunur. Yaşamın değerini belirleyen egemen iktidardır ve bu belirlenim sonucunda kimin öldürülebilir olduğunu da egemen iktidar belirler. *Damızlık Kızın Öyüksü* totaliter bir rejimi tasvir eder ve bu tip rejimlerde dost/düşman ayrimını, düşmanın tanımını, kimin yaşamının değerli olup kimin harcanabilir olduğunu egemen iktidar belirlemektedir. Bu sebeple özellikle bu kitabın analizinde Agamben'in iktidar çözümlemesinden yararlanılmıştır. Bunun yanı sıra *DelliAdem* üçlemesinde de yaşamın değeri önemli bir yer tuttuğu için analizde Agamben'den yararlanılmıştır. Ancak *DelliAdem* üçlemesi sadece yaşamın değeri değil yaşamın ne olduğu ya da kime ve neye ait olduğu gibi soruları da gündeme getirdiği için farklı bir analize de ihtiyaç vardır. İşte bu noktada yeni materyalizmin biyoiktidar çözümlemesine başvurulmuştur. Yeni materyalizm dikkatlerimizi maddeye ve yaşama, maddenin ve tüm canlıların yaşamsal kapasitelerine çekmektedir. Şeylerin gücüne (thing-power) vurgu yapar. Bilimsel ve teknolojik gelişmeler yeni materyalizm için önemli bir yer tutar. Çünkü bu alanlardaki gelişmeler yaşama, canlıya, insana veya maddeye dair düşünce ve kavramlarımıza değiştirmektedir. Bu gelişmeler insan/insan olmayan, organik/inorganik ve doğal/yapay gibi ikili ve zıt düşünce ve kavramları altüst etmiştir. *DelliAdem* üçlemesi bu ikili düşünce sisteminin yaşadığımız dünyayı açıklamada yeterli olmadığını çok net bir şekilde ortaya koymuştur. Yeni materyalizm canlılığa, yaşama ve maddeye yeni bir bakış açısı sunmaktadır ve bu bakış açısı canlılık süreci hakkında bize önemli bilgiler sunmaktadır. Yönetim ya da yönetimsellik de ortaya çıkan bu yeni bilgileri iktidar mekanizmasına dahil eder. Biyoiktidar yaşayan canlıların ve şeyleri yönetimi olarak düşünüldüğünde yeni bilgiler ve teknolojik gelişmeler dahilinde farklı bir yönetim tarzının oraya çıkması

kaçınılmazdır. İşte bu yeni yönetim tarzı *DelliAdem*'in en vurucu noktalarından biridir bu sebeple üçleme için yeni materyalizmin analizlerine de yer verilmiştir.

Dördüncü bölüm boyunca, Foucault'ya referansla, canlıların ve şeylerin yönetimi için bilgi ve hakikatin gerekligini ve bilgi ve hakikatin totaliter rejimlerde ve özgür toplumlarda farklı kaynakları olduğu ileri sürüldü. Totaliter rejimlerde hakikat bilgiden daha önemlidir. Bu hakikat egemen iktidar tarafından üretilir. Özgür ve demokratik rejimler ise bilgi ile yönetilmektedir. Bu tip toplumlarda farklı bilgi kaynakları, farklı bilgi türlerine sahip uzmanlar ya da bilirkişiler vardır. *Damızlık Kızın Ökübü*'nın iktidar rejimine baktığımızda Foucault'nun öne sürdüğü üç iktidar kipinin aynı anda var olduğunu görmekteyiz. Totaliter rejimlerde ve Gilead'da yaşam politikası ve ölüm politikası aynı anda var olmaktadır. Rejimin meşruiyeti biyopolitik kaygılarla sağlanır. Bu kaygıların en başında sağlıklı bir neslin üretilmesi ve devamlılığı yer almaktadır. Ancak bu amacın gerçekleştirilmesi için, rejim sürekli olarak egemen iktidarın öldürme hakkını kullanmaktadır. Bu öldürme hakkı rejimin devamlılığına mani olan ya da sağlıklı bir neslin üretilmesine engel teşkil eden kişilere karşı kullanılır. Biyopolitikanın iki boyutu vardır. Birinci boyutu onun yaşam siyaseti olması diğer boyutu ise onun ölüm siyaseti olmalıdır. Bu bağlamda, savaş benzeri durumlarda, baskıcı ve totaliter rejimlerde biyopolitikanın ölüm siyaseti özelliği yaşam siyaseti özelliğinden daha görünür ve baskındır. Ancak ölüm ya da öldürme hakkı ancak ve ancak yaşamın devamlılığı temelinde kullanılabilir. Toplum sağlığını ve toplumun devamlılığını tehdit eden her unsur, yine toplumun iyiliği için, ortadan kaldırılır. Bu durumda kimin tehdit oluşturduğu egemenin karara bağlıdır. Aynı zamanda kimin yaşamının değerli olduğu ya da kimin yaşamının degersiz olduğu da egemen iktidarın kararıdır. Bu kararlar totaliter rejimlerde daha görünürlerdir. Yani totaliter rejimlerde egemen iktidar ön plana çıkar. Ancak bu iktidar biyopolitik endişelerle hareket eder. Bu anlamda bir birleşmeden söz etmek mümkündür. Bunların yanı sıra rejim disiplinci mekanizmalarla toplumu düzene sokar, normları üretir ve normalizasyon sürecini tamamlar. Yani Gilead rejiminde Foucault'nun üç iktidar kipi aynı anda var olur ve bu iktidar kipleri en uç noktalarında hissedilir.

Üçlemede ise canlılık süreçleri hakkında bilgilerin gelişmiş olduğu bir toplum betimlenmektedir. Bu bilgiler yaşam, madde ve doğalarındaki bilgilerimizi, kavramlarımızı ve düşünce biçimlerimizi değiştirmiştir. Doğal/yapay,

insan/hayvan/insan olmayan gibi sınırları modernite ile çizilmiş kategorilerin sınırları bu yeni bilgi türleriyle bulanıklaşmaya başlamıştır. Bu yeni bilgi ikili düşüncce yapısını ortadan kaldırmaya başlamıştır. Bilim molekülerleşmiş, insanın doğal olarak adlandırılan bütün özelliklerini değişe aćık hale gelmiştir. Canlılık süreçlerinin değişe aćık olduğu bu süreçte artık bu süreçler kader olarak değil imkan olarak algılanmaktadır.

Üçleme ileri sanayi toplumunu tasvir eder ve bu çalışmada ileri sanayi toplumlarının neoliberal akılsallık ile yönetildiği ileri sürülmüştür. Bu yönetim sürecinde yönetim uzmanlara aktarılmıştır. Uzmanların yanı sıra egemen bireylerde yönetim dahil olmuştur. Bu süreçe yönetimsellik denmektedir. Yönetimsellik neoliberal akılsallıkla sürdürülmemektedir. Neoliberal akılsallık özgürlük ilkesine dayanmaktadır. Yani bireyler kendi özgürlükleriyle yönetilmektedir. Bu anlamda bir önceki bölümde tartışılan ulus-devletin yavaş yavaş yok olması, refah hizmetlerinin özelleştirilmesi, tüketimin üretimin yerini alması, aile gelenek gibi kurumların fonksiyonlarını yitirmesi yönetimsellik üzerinden okunmalıdır. Bireyler kendi özgürlükleriyle yönetilmektedir. Kendi kendisini yönetmesi gereken birey hayatının bütün sorumluluğunu almakla yükümlüdür. Bu yönetim için gerekli bilgi uzmanlardan bireye aktarılmaktadır. Burada yeni bir ilişkilenme biçimini ortaya çıkmaktadır. Özgürlüğyle yönetilen birey, kendi hayatındaki bütün başarı ve başarısızlıklarından sorumludur. Birey başarısı için, güvenliği için yani aslında en temelinde kendi hayatı için rekabet etmek durumundadır. İleri sanayi toplumlarında kendi başına bırakılmış bir birey vardır ve bu birey girişimci bireydir. Yani neoliberal akılsallıkla yönetilen ileri sanayi toplumlarında yeni bir özne ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu özne girişimci neoliberal öznedir.

Neoliberal öznenin özünde rekabet vardır. Rekabet etmek içindeki girişimci tarafı ortaya çıkarması gerekmektedir. Bu anlayışta pazar bir keşfetme ve öğrenme yeridir. Ekonomik özne pazar tarafından şekillendirilir. Girişimci pazarın kurallarını öğrenen, onun değişimlerine adapte olan bireydir. Girişimci rasyonel davranışmayı öğrenen, kendi risklerini ölçebilen ve bu riskleri yönetebilen kişidir. Girişimci kendine yatırım yapan ve insan sermayesini arttıran kişidir. İnsan sermayesini artırmasının sebebi ise rekabet için daha iyi koşullara ve özelliklere sahip olması gerektiğine inançtır. Bu süreçte neoliberal özneler kendi kararlarından ve kararlarının sonuçlarından sorumlu tutulur. Sadece tüketici değıllerdir. Tüketim

onların tatminini üretir, yani neoliberal özneler aynı zamanda üreticilerdir. Bu öznellik üçüncü bölümde anlatılan bireyleştirme ile paralel gitmektedir. Bireyleştirme (individualization) yönetimselliğin bir tesiridir ve tabi kılma biçimidir. İktidarın bir etkisi olarak düşünüldüğünde, bireyleştirmenin altındaki mekanizma anlaşılsa bu öznellik karşı çıkılabilir ve değiştirilebilir. İşte altta yatan mekanizma da rekabeti temel alan neoliberal akılsallıktır.

Bu çalışmada mücadelenin neoliberal akılsallığa karşı verilmesi savunulmaktadır. *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'nde totaliter rejimin yönetimi eline geçirmesi neoliberal akılsallığın yaygın olması sebebiyle mümkün olmuştur. Aynı şekilde *DelliAdem* üçlemesinde şirket kontrolünde bir toplumun ortaya çıkması, doğanın tahribi ve türlerin yok olması yine neoliberal akılsallığa bağlanabilir. Bu kitaplarda tasvir edilen toplumlarda özgürlük seçme özgürlüğü olarak anlaşılmış ve sonuç olarak özgür olmayan toplumlar ortaya çıkmıştır. Neoliberal akılsallığa karşı mücadelede özgürlüğün sürekli olarak pratik edilmesi gerekmektedir. Bu pratiklere örnekler çalışmaya konu olan distopyalarda yer almaktadır. Bu örneklerin analizi direniş kavramı üzerinden okunmuştur. Direniş kavramı bu çalışmada iki türlü anlaşılmaktadır. Birincisi başka liderler tarafından, başka amaçlarla ve başka amaçlar için yönetilmektir. Yani eğer bu çalışmada ileri sürüldüğü gibi günümüz toplumlarda neoliberal akılsallılıkla yönetiliyorsak başka akılsallıklarla yönetilmek istemek ve bu sebeple başka akılsallıklar üretmek direnişin ilk anlamıdır. Direnişin ikinci anlamı ise kendimizi farklı şekilde yönetmekten geçer. Neoliberal akılsallık rekabet temelinde işler. Rekabeti içselleştirmeyip rekabete zıt eylemler (örneğin karşılıklı bağımlılık, kolektif eylem, dayanışma) üretmek direniş demektir. Ancak belirtmek gerekir ki, bu çalışmaya konu olan direniş mikro direniştir. İktidara karşı mücadelenin kişisel düzeyde verilmesidir. Kitaplarda kolektif direniş örnekleri verilmiş olsa da, bu direnişlerde rejimi dönüştürmeyi amaçlamamaktadır. Bu direnişler en temelde etik ile alakalıdır ve kişisel dönüşümü amaçlar.

İktidar ve direniş birbirinden bağımsız düşünülemez ve her iktidar biçimini kendi direnişini yaratır. *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü* ve üçlemede Atwood, kendi çıkarları peşinde koşan, çevresel faktörleri ya da siyasi koşulları görmezden gelen insan örnekleri vermiştir. Bu bireyler yaşadıkları koşulları pasif şekilde kabul etmiş, iktidarın eylemlerini ya da siyasal koşulları sorgulamayan bireylerdir. Bu bireylerin özgürlüklerinin ve eylemlerin sınırları çizilmiştir. Bu sınırların aşımı başlı başına

direniş örneğidir. *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'nde hem egemen iktidara hem disiplinci iktidara hem de biyoiktidara direniş örnekleri bulunmaktadır. Egemen iktidar öldürme hakkını elinde tutan iktidardır. Bu hakkın başka kişilerce kullanımı bu iktidara karşı direniş örneği olarak yorumlanabilir. Yani intihar egemen iktidara direniş olarak düşünülebilir. Bunun dışında herhangi bir öldürme eylemi de egemen iktidara karşı direnişdir. Disiplinci iktidar *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*'nde tasvir edilen toplumun genel işleyişini sağlayan iktidar biçimidir. Bu iktidar biçimini en çok damızlık (handmaid) olarak adlandırılan kadınların kimliklerini silen, onları tabi kılan iktidar biçimidir. Bu iktidar biçimini kadınları belirli bir norma uydurmaya çalışır. Bu kadınların eski hayatlarını tamamen unutmaları gerekmektedir. İsimlerini, hayatlarını, geçmiş deneyimlerini silmeleri disiplinci iktidarın alanına girmektedir. Bu damızlık olarak adlandırılan kadınların kendi geçmişlerini hatırlamaları, birbirlerinin isimlerini öğrenmeleri, deneyimlerini paylaşmaları, Offred'in anılarını kaydetmesi disiplinci iktidara direniş örnekleri olarak düşünülebilir. Son olarak rejim meşruiyetini yaşamın devamlılığı üzerine kurmuştur. Bu devamlılığı sekteye uğratacak her eylem biyoiktidara direnişdir. İntihar bu anlamda biyoiktidara karşı bir direniş eylemi olarak yorumlanabilir. İntihar, yaşamı yani biyoiktidarın öznesini ve nesnesini ortadan kaldırmaktadır.

Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü'nde neoliberal akılsallıktan çok neoliberal akılsallığın bir sonucu olarak totaliter rejim distopyanın konusu olarak verilmiştir. Ancak kitapta da birçok kere yinelendiği gibi neoliberal akılsallık benimsenip bir norm haline gelmeseydi totaliter rejimin yönetimi ele geçirmesi mümkün olmayacaktı. Üçleme ise distopyayı doğrudan neoliberal akılsallığın hüküm sürdüğü ileri sanayi toplumunda kurar ve bu toplumu tasvir eder. Bu sebepten neoliberal akılsallığa direniş daha net bir şekilde ortaya konulmuştur. Bu direniş rekabeti temel ilke haline getirmiş neoliberal akılsallığa karşı alternatif öznellikler üretmekten geçer.

Neoliberal akılsallık girişimci özneler üretmektedir. Bu girişimci özneler kendi insan sermayesini arttıran ve sadece kendisiyle ilgili ve ilişkili bireylerdir. Neoliberal akılsallığın bireyleştirme çabasına karşı yürütülen her mücadele direniş kapsamında okunabilir. Üçlemede öne çıkan iki topluluk vardır (*God's Gardeners* ve *the MaddAddamites*). Bu topluluklar neoliberal akılsallığa karşı durmaktadır. Örneğin bu topluluklar tüketim kültürüne karşıdır. Rekabeti değil karşılıklı

bağımlılığı ve işbirliğini öne çıkarırlar. İnsanların, şeylerin ve doğanın metalaşmasına karşı durmaktadır. Onlar yaşayan canlılar arasında hiyerarşi olduğu savına karşı durmaktadır. Genç üyelerine alternatif eğitim olanakları sunmaktadır. Bu eğitim ticari kaygılardan bağımsız, materyalizm karşıtı bir eğitimdir. Gençlere yaşayan canlıları (bitkileri, hayvanları, doğayı) tanıtmaktadır ve tüketici karşıtı bir eğitim vermektedir. Tüm canlıların ve şeylerin eyleme yetisini yani aktörlüğünü tanıyarak insanmerkezci bakış açısını reddetmektedirler. Özellikle Tanrı'nın Bahçivanları (God's Gardeners) ahlaki bir topluluk oluşturmuştur. Rejimi değiştirmek yerine yeni bir ahlaka, yeni bir akılsallığa dayanarak kendilerini dönüştürmektedirler. Bu topluluk şiddet yanlısı kültüre karşı pasifist bir tutum sergilemektedir.

Bunların dışında bireysel mikro direniş örnekleri de bulunmaktadır. Toby ve Jimmy karakterlerinin eylemleri bireysel düzeydeki mikro direnişler örnekleri açısından incelenebilir. Toby bulunduğu hiçbir konuma, kimliğe ya da topluluğa kendini ait hissetmemektedir. O bir anlamda bir göçebedir. Tanrı'nın Bahçivanlarıyla tanışmasıyla beraber onun ahlaki dönüşümü başlamıştır ancak kendisini hiçbir zaman inançlı bir bahçivan olarak düşünmemiştir. Bu ahlaki dönüşüm sürecinde tüketim kültürüne, patriyarkaya ve metalaşmaya karşı tutumlar sergilemeye başlamıştır. Pleeblander olarak yaşadığı yolculuğuna göcebe olarak devam etmiştir. Tek sabit bir kimlik benimsememiştir. Bunun yerine kimliklerden kimliklere geçiş yapmıştır. O bir oluş içerisindeindir ve bu oluş her zaman için minör bir oluşturur. Toplumun dayattığı normatif pozisyonların yani majörün redi Toby'nin oluşunun ve aynı zamanda Toby'nin direnişinin önemli bir parçasıdır. Toby insanmerkezci bakış açısını hayvanlarla, bitkilerle, doğayla konuşarak, onlardan yardım alarak ve onların eyleme gücünü tanıyarak ve kabul ederek aşmaktadır.

Jimmy de kişisel düzeyde direniş gösteren bir karakterdir. Ancak Jimmy'nin direnişi ile Toby'nin direnişi aynı şekilde ilerlemez. Jimmy Compound'da yaşayan ayrıcalıklı bir azınlığın arasında doğmuş, büyümüş ve eğitim almıştır. Bu ayrıcalıklı azınlık bilim insanları ve onların ailelerinden oluşmaktadır. Ancak Jimmy hiçbir zaman bir bilim insanı olmamış daha çok 'kelime insanı' olmuş ve sanat okumuştur. Bilimi değil sanatı seçmesi onu ayrıcalıklı pozisyonundan biraz sıyrımiş olsa da Jimmy'nin direnişi ancak insanlığın neredeyse tamamını yok eden felaketten sonra başlamıştır. Felaketten önce Jimmy bir neoliberal öznedir. Sadece kendisiyle

ilgilenen, tüketici, insanmerkezci bakış açısını benimsemiş, kadınları, yaşayan tüm canlıları metalaştıran bir karakterdir. Felaketten sonra yeni bir tür olan Craker'larla ilişkisi onun dönüşümünün başlangıcıdır. Kendisini dünyada kalan son insan olarak düşünen Jimmy, Crakerların mükemmelliği karşısında kendi eksiklerini görmeye başlar ve geçmişini değerlendirir. Rekabet edemeyeceği Craker'larla farklı bir ilişki kurmaya başlar. Crakerların Jimmy'e ihtiyaç duyması ve Jimmy'nin de Craker'lara ihtiyaç duyması Jimmy için yeni bir dönemin başlangıcı olmuştur. Bu süreçte işbirliği ve karşılıklı saygı, karşılıklı bağımlılık Jimmy ve Craker'ların ilişkilerinin temellerini oluşturmuştur.

Üçleme aslında biyoiktidara karşı direnişin yine yaşamın kendisinden geldiğini çok net bir şekilde ortaya koymaktadır. Yaşam üzerindeki iktidara yine yaşamın kendisiyle, yaşamın gücüyle ve yaşamın tanınmasıyla karşı konulmaktadır. Şeylerin ve canlıların canlılığının tanınması biyoiktidara karşı en güçlü direnişi oluşturmaktadır. Bu canlılığın tanınmasıyla beraber insanmerkezci, hiyerarşik bakış açısı terkedilmiştir. Aynı zamanda üçlemede iktisadi akılsallığın bilimsel akılsallıkla birleşmesi ve toplumda hüküm sürmesi gözlemlenmektedir. Bu akılsallıkların reddi majörün reddi anlamına gelmektedir ve direniş bir örnektir. İşbirliği ve karşılıklı bağımlılık, doğayla uyum içerisinde, doğanın, yaşayan tüm canlıların ve şeylerin eylem kapasitelerinin tanınması, dünyanın canlılığının farkına varılması neoliberal akılsallığa karşı geliştirilen taktikler olarak betimlenir.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmada distopyalar deneyim kitapları olarak ele alınmış ve bu kitapların alternatif oluşumlara ışık tutabileceği savıyla hareket edilmiştir. Distopyalar uyarı niteliği taşıyan yazılardır. Yaşanan ya da gelecekte yaşanması öngörülen gelişmelerin ya da krizlerin olası kötü sonuçlarını okuyucuya verirler. Bu gelişmeler ya da krizler tarihten bağımsız değildir ve günümüz dünyasıyla ilişkilidir. Bu anlamda distopyalar eleştirel bir fonksiyona da sahiptirler. Senaryoyu başka dünyalarda ya da gelecekte kuruyor olmalarıyla okuyucuya günümüz dünyasından uzaklaştırıp eleştirel bakışın yolunu açmış olurlar. Bu eleştirel bakışın dönüştürücü bir etkisi vardır. Bu çalışma bir anlamda bu eleştirel bakışı sağlamayı amaçlamıştır. Toplumsal bir norm haline gelmiş olan neoliberal akılsallığın iki farklı sonucunu eleştirel bir göze analiz etmek çalışmanın temel amacını oluşturmaktadır. Bu eleştirel bakış ile doğal ve kaçınılmaz olarak gördüğümüz bazı tarihsel dönüşümlerin analizi yapılmıştır. Doğal ve kaçınılmaz

olarak algıladığımız tarihsel olaylar başka türlü olmanın, başka türlü yönetilmenin, başka amaçlar benimsemenin yollarını tıkamaktadır. Günümüz dünyasını analiz etmek için modernite teorilerine başvurulmuştur. Genel bir çerçeve verdikten sonra olayların tarihsellliğini, doğal ve kaçınılmaz olarak algıladığımız şeyleri bize öyle algılatan mekanizmaların ortaya çıkartılması için iktidar analizi yapılmıştır. Son olarak başka türlü olmak için, başka türlü yönetilmek ve alternatif öznellikler kurmak için de direniş analizi başvurulmuştur. Çalışmaya konu olan kitaplarda neoliberal akılsallığa karşı mikro direniş özellikleri taşıyan direniş türleri verilmiştir. Bu mikro direnişlerin en somut hali alternatif öznelliklerin üretilmesidir. Bu alternatifler insanmerkezci bakışın terk edildiği, birlikte yaşamın ve karşılıklı bağımlılığın öne çıktığı, metalaşmaya karşı hem canlıların hem şeýlerin eyleme kapasitesinin tanındığı öznellikler olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır.

C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Social Sciences
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics
- Enformatik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Informatics
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Görmmez
Adı / Name : Ayça Berna
Bölümü / Department : Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi / Political Science and Public Administration

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): THE ANALYSES OF MODERNITY, POWER, AND RESISTANCE IN THE DYSTOPIAS OF MARGARET ATWOOD

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans / Master** **Doktora / PhD**

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years.** *
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months.** *

* *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*

/

A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date

*(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)*

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.