

DELEUZE AND CONTEMPORARY DYSTOPIA

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

BY

RAHİME OKAY NEBİOĐLU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

AUGUST 2018

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bilal Kırkıcı
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz (METU, FLE) _____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı (METU, FLE) _____
Prof. Dr. Ronald Bogue (UGA, COMPLIT) _____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı (METU, FLE) _____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Selen Aktari Sevgi (Başkent U., AMER) _____



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: Rahime OKAY NEBİOĐLU

Signature:

ABSTRACT

DELEUZE AND CONTEMPORARY DYSTOPIA

Çokay Nebioğlu, Rahime
Ph.D., Department of English Literature
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Nayk1
August 2018, 279 pages

The turn of the new millennium has seen the rise of late capitalism and witnessed a radical change in the structure of the contemporary world, which initiated a new social formation that is seemingly more flexible and liberating yet indeed more controlling. This dissertation looks at contemporary dystopia in the light of these recent changes, arguing that there is now a new moment in the history of dystopia. This new moment suggests that, just like the contemporary world itself, contemporary dystopia has gradually moved towards the plane of immanence where it has become both a re-presentation of the current dystopian reality and an exploration of ways of affirmative resistance. This dissertation explores these aspects of contemporary dystopia through Deleuzian philosophy, which widely discusses and interprets contemporary societies' movement from a transcendent to an immanent position. Thus, this study aims to reinterpret the history of dystopia from a Deleuzian perspective and create a new theoretical framework and critical tools for the analysis of contemporary dystopia. This dissertation also engages in a Deleuzian analysis of Margaret Atwood's *MaddAddam* trilogy (2000-2013) and China Mieville's *Perdido Street Station* (2000) in order to see how this new theoretical framework applies to contemporary examples of dystopia.

Keywords: contemporary dystopia, Deleuze and Guattari, immanence, late capitalism, schizoanalysis

ÖZ

DELEUZE VE ÇAĞDAŞ DİSTOPYA

Çokay Nebioğlu, Rahime
Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı
Danışman: Doç. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı
Ağustos 2018, 279 sayfa

Yeni milenyumun gelişi, geç kapitalizmin yükselişine ve bu yükselişle birlikte çağdaş toplumun sosyal oluşumundaki radikal değişikliğe tanıklık ederek, eskisine göre daha esnek ve özgürlükçü görünse de eskisinden çok daha etkili ve denetleyici yeni bir toplum oluşumunu beraberinde getirdi. Bu çalışma, son dönemde gerçekleşen bu değişimler ışığında çağdaş distopyayı incelemekte ve sosyal yapıdaki bu değişimlerle distopya tarihinde yeni bir döneme girilmiş olabileceğini savunmaktadır. Bu yeni dönem, tıpkı çağdaş toplumda olduğu gibi, çağdaş distopyanın da içkinlik düzlemine doğru ilerleyerek, hem halihazırdaki gerçekliğin bir temsili olduğu hem de bu distopik gerçekliğe karşı olumlu direniş yollarının arandığı bir girişime dönüşmesi olarak düşünülebilir. Bu çalışma, çağdaş distopyadaki bu özellikleri, çağdaş toplumun aşkınlıktan içkinliğe doğru yönelimini inceleyen ve yorumlayan Deleuzyen felsefe ışığında incelemektedir. Buna dayanarak, bu tez distopya tarihini Deleuzyen bir bakış açısıyla yeniden yorumlayarak çağdaş distopyaya yeni bir kuramsal çerçeve ve inceleme yolları yaratmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra Margaret Atwood'un *MaddAddam* üçlemesi ve China Mieville'in *Perdido Sokağı İstasyonu* gibi çağdaş çalışmaları bu yeni kuramsal çerçeve ışığında Deleuzyen incelemelerini yapmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: çağdaş distopya, Deleuze ve Guattari, içkinlik, geç kapitalizm, şizoanaliz



To My Parents...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Nil Korkut Nayk  for her generosity and guidance as I began this doctoral research. Without her academic support, deep knowledge and curiosity for new horizons in literature and critical theory, this study would not have been possible. I am also indebted to the members of my dissertation committee, Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif  ztabak Avcı and Assist. Prof. Selen Aktari Sevgi for their time, efforts, insights and participation in this study. We all watched how this study evolved into its current form with their contributions.

I also owe a huge debt of gratitude to Prof. Dr. Ronald Bogue for his support, recommendations and comments on my research from the very beginning of this academic adventure I undertook in Deleuze scholarship. His boundless energy and passion for Deleuze studies have been a source of inspiration for this study. I would also like to express my gratitude to Deleuze Studies and Utopian Studies Society and their members for providing me with every opportunity to share and discuss my ideas in conferences, seminars and talks. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Nursel  z z for her detailed reading of my work, her benevolent teaching and academic counselling throughout my academic career.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my academic sponsors at Duke University, Prof. Dr. Kenneth Surin and Prof. Dr. Markos Hadjioannou, for welcoming me so warmly, generously giving their time to read this study and offering invaluable comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Elizabeth Grosz, Prof. Dr. Fredrick Jameson and Prof. Dr. Michael Hardt for all their support throughout my time at Duke. It has been the most productive and festive time of my Ph.D. studies.

I am also deeply grateful for Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zekiye Antakyaliođlu for her constant encouragements and support all the way through my undergrad years. It

was after her philosophy classes that I became attracted to Deleuzian philosophy and pursued my interest so far as to turn it into a doctoral research.

There are many people whom I owe my sincere thanks for their moral support in all steps of my academic endeavour. I would like to thank Yağmur Demir for being a shoulder of support, an ear to listen, and a true friend to share my loudest laughs and deepest worries. I would also like to extend my thanks to Kübra Kangüleç Coşkun for her constant support, encouragement and friendship. Finally, a very sincere thank you to my dear friends, Pelin Doğan, Burcu Çevik, Şule Gönül and Elzem Nazlı for having faith in me and supporting me in the most stressful times.

I am deeply grateful to my late, beloved Dad, my Mum and my brothers. The infinite love and support I have received from them over the years has been my primary source of motivation. Finally, my heartfelt thanks to my husband, Fevzi Nebioğlu, for his unwavering love, encouragement and patience as I spent many long days and nights completing this dissertation. He was always around at times I thought that it is impossible to continue, he helped me to keep things in perspective. I greatly value his contribution and deeply appreciate his belief in me.

It is my fortune to gratefully acknowledge the financial support of The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBİTAK). I am thankful to TUBİTAK for funding my doctoral studies and for their generous support to the many who are able to pursue their studies thanks to their scholarships only.

I am also happy to express my gratitude to the Turkish Fulbright Commission for awarding me with the Ph.D. dissertation research grant. My gratitude also extends to many other who participated in the running of the Fulbright programme.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. A DELEUZIAN INQUIRY INTO CONTEMPORARY DYSTOPIA	16
2.1 Mapping the Traditional Definitions of Utopia and Dystopia	17
2.2 A Deleuzian Look at the Historical Trajectory of Dystopia	29
2.2.1 Transcendent Dystopia.....	29
2.2.2 Transgressive Dystopia	37
2.2.3 Immanent Dystopia	42
2.3 Towards a Deleuzian Definition of Contemporary Dystopia.....	51
2.3.1 Dystopia’s Move Towards the Plane of Immanence	53
2.3.2 Dysterritory of Immanent Dystopia	60
2.3.3 An Invention of a People to Come in Immanent Dystopia ...	64
2.3.4 Immanent Dystopia as a Minor Literature	69
2.3.5 Contemporary Dystopian Writers as Cultural Clinicians.....	78
3. A DELEUZIAN INQUIRY INTO THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD....	81
3.1 Mapping the Societies of Control.....	83
3.2 Dysterritory of Late Capitalism.....	91
3.3 Tracing Oedipal Lines in the Capitalist Social Machine.....	103
3.4 Breakdown or Breakthrough	113
3.5 From The Clinical and Critical Approach Towards Schizoanalysis.	121

4. MARGARET ATWOOD’S <i>MADDADDAM</i> TRILOGY AS AN IMMANENT DYSTOPIA.....	129
4.1 Smooth Spaces of Resistance: From the Compounds to the Pleeblands.....	134
4.2 Alternative Subjectivities in the Trilogy.....	149
4.2.1 Subjectivity beyond the Oedipal Yoke	149
4.2.2 “Zero Hour”: From Organism To Body Without Organs ..	154
4.2.3 “Animals R us!”: Becoming-Animal in the Anthropocentric Stratum	163
4.3 Stuttering Language to Reach its “Rag Ends	172
5. CHINA MIEVILLE’S <i>PERDIDO STREET STATION</i> AS AN IMMANENT DYSTOPIA.....	180
5.1 Smoothing over the “Hybrid Zone”	189
5.2 Deterritorialisation of Subjectivity	203
5.2.1 Hybrid as the New Intermezzo.....	203
5.2.2 Queering Desire and Nomadising Science.....	206
5.2.3 Orphaning Art and Unconsciousness against the Oedipal Yoke.....	211
5.2.4 “To Think Aesthetically” as a Way of Affirming the Hybrid.....	215
5.3 Schizophrenising Language	220
6. CONCLUSION.....	230
REFERENCES	241
APPENDICES	
A. CURRICULUM VITAE	253
B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	255
C. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	279

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

We will say of pure immanence that it is A LIFE, and nothing else. It is not immanence to life, but the immanent that is in nothing is itself a life. A life is the immanence of immanence, absolute immanence: it is absolute power, complete bliss.

(Deleuze, *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life* 27)

The definition and scope of utopia and dystopia have long been a subject of debate, still inviting many scholars to critically engage in expanding the framework of these concepts and in making their own statements to bring new insights and revisions into existing delineations. Ever since these concepts appeared, they have undergone a series of novel definitions and meanings, regarding their nature, form and content. These transformations in the definition and boundaries of utopia and dystopia have necessarily followed parallel lines with major changes in social concerns, politics, economic circumstances, cultural issues, international relations, and scientific and technological developments over the centuries. Each century has introduced new insights into these concepts and into the understanding of the relation between utopia and dystopia.

Utopia, which primarily appeared as a product of modernity, was more or less abandoned as a literary genre –if not as an impulse– in the wake of the twentieth century, which is characterised by a loss of faith in modernity. Instead, dystopia was staggeringly taken up by authors and critics who intended to criticise the rapidly-growing terrors of the new age and problematise the idea of progress inherent to utopia. Dystopia's problematic position in relation to utopia and the idea of modernity accordingly culminated in a diversity of definitions. Some defined dystopia as “anti-utopia” or “negative utopia” (Claeys, “The Origins”

107) while others perceived it as “literary utopia’s shadow” (Moylan, “Scraps” 111) or “[utopia’s] essence” (Claeys, “Three Variants” 15). Throughout its shifting and varied history, dystopia has faced the most tremendous transformations in the contemporary era, which may be said to signal that new definitions and conceptualisations of dystopia are yet-to-come. This dissertation likewise emerges out of the need to create an alternative definition for dystopia which accounts for the transformations it has recently undergone.

With the rapid rise of globalisation and late capitalism particularly from the 1970s onwards, the boundaries between the nation-states gradually have begun to blur, the distinctions between people of different races, cultures and so on have become less pronounced, and identity-defining roots have begun to disappear. All these changes signal a gradual shift from the sovereign nation-states towards new global societies. These new global societies emerge from a new form of power that is decentred, fluid and yet overarching and all encompassing, and a new social formation that is seemingly more flexible and liberating yet indeed more controlling. This dissertation argues that, following the passage from the totalitarian nation-states to seemingly-libertarian global societies, contemporary dystopia has begun to display some significant divergences from the earlier examples in terms of its motivations in portraying dystopian societies, its temporality and its plot endings. Unlike the earlier examples of dystopia which depict imaginary representations of a possible future that is remarkably worse than the present society, contemporary dystopia often tends to portray an imaginary and almost allegorical re-presentation of the present society which could not get worse than its current state. Abandoning the tendency in earlier examples to condemn the resistant dissenter to an inevitable failure in his resistance to society, contemporary dystopia now appears relatively more hopeful and inclined to offer multiple affirmative ways of resistance and alternative modes of life in and for the present society. Thus, dystopia in the new millennium may be said to have passed from a future-oriented and progress-driven form to a process-oriented form that places the emphasis on the here-and-now rather than the future. This dissertation sees this passage as conducive to think of contemporary dystopia alongside

Deleuzian philosophy, which often provides important insights into contemporary life and art. The study, therefore, aims to explore how the new tendencies in contemporary dystopia envision a new phase in the history of this literary form, and attempts to create a new conception of dystopia corresponding to this new phase from a Deleuzian perspective. The dissertation also aims to analyse Margaret Atwood's *MaddAddam* trilogy (2000-2009-2013) and China Mieville's *Perdido Street Station* (2000) in order to demonstrate how this new conception of dystopia works with well-known contemporary examples of the genre.

In utopian studies so far, several studies have been carried out to examine contemporary dystopia from different perspectives. In his recent book *Dystopia: A Natural History* (2017), Gregory Claeys appears to recognise the increasing links between contemporary society and dystopia by calling contemporary dystopia “post-totalitarian dystopia” (447). He argues that dystopia was periodically reshaped particularly after World War II. In the contemporary age, as he suggests “liberal non-totalitarian societies showed serious signs of cultural degeneration into intellectual senility and enslavement to a mindless ethos of hedonistic consumption” (447), and this paved the way for an increase in the creation of dystopian narratives, making it even more difficult to categorise these increasing numbers of dystopian works. In her article entitled “Living in Dystopia” published in *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, On Screen, On Stage* (2013), Raffaella Baccolini also implies the passage in the social formation towards a relatively “soft regime” (44) and underlines that this new soft regime does not necessarily suggest a disappearance of dystopia. On the contrary, as she argues, “today, more than ever, dystopia matters” (45). Yet, she only makes a short remark on this and underlines the necessity of resisting and keeping our hopes alive rather than elaborating on the reasons as to how and why dystopia matters today and in what ways it offers new forms of resistance. Likewise, another book titled *The Age of Dystopia: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future* (2016) examines recently-produced dystopian works, highlighting the fact that the contemporary age is actually an “age of dystopia” (Demerjian 1), but it does not

investigate in what ways contemporary society has become a dystopian one and how the recent dystopian works testify to its becoming a dystopia in itself.

Several similar studies have been carried out which have in one way or another recognised the dystopian potential of the new coming age and the newly-arising aspects in contemporary dystopia. But none of them has truly and critically addressed these aspects in detail, explored the real dynamics behind them, and questioned whether they require a new insight into the contemporary world and into the concept of dystopia. At this point, this dissertation considers that Deleuzian philosophy¹ can be a guiding force in interpreting both the contemporary world and contemporary dystopia, and in creating a new conceptual framework that would account for the new tendencies. The French philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925-95) does not actually present a formal conception of contemporary dystopia and its motivations. He does not even delve into the concept of dystopia in his philosophical trajectory, either. He only briefly touches upon the perception of utopia in his book *What is Philosophy?* (1991) published jointly with the French psychoanalyst and philosopher Felix Guattari. Therefore, it is not Deleuze's own theoretical insights into dystopia but his valuable insights into the contemporary world that have induced this dissertation to consider Deleuze as a good fit for acknowledging the symbiotic relationship between dystopia and contemporary issues. First of all, Deleuze links the afore-mentioned change in the social formation –from a totalitarian system to what Claeys calls a “liberal non-totalitarian” one (*Dystopia: A Natural History* 447)– to the emergence of late capitalism, and defines it as a passage from “disciplinary societies” to “societies of control” (Deleuze, “Postscript” 3). He not only recognises the changing dynamics of the contemporary world but also elaborates on its revolutionary potential in his inquiry into late capitalism. The way that this

¹ Deleuze frequently collaborates with Felix Guattari in his philosophical trajectory. This dissertation focuses on not merely their joint works but also some other works singlehandedly written by Deleuze. In this sense, this dissertation will be referring to both Deleuze and Guattari while making use of their joint work, but the overall reference to their philosophy will be addressed as “Deleuzian philosophy” rather than “Deleuzoguattarian or Deleuze's and Guattari's philosophy” . The reason for this preference is not that this study undermines Guattari's contribution to their theoretical groundwork or deliberately tends to ignore Guattari, but that most of its arguments are based on Deleuze's own works and insights into contemporary world.

revolutionary potential has been theorised by Deleuze and Guattari and represented in fiction by contemporary dystopian writers necessarily leads to the idea that if the passage to late capitalism has brought about a passage to a new form of society as Deleuze and Guattari suggest, it could also signal a passage to a new moment in the history of dystopia.

In engaging with Deleuzian philosophy within the context of contemporary issues and the concept of dystopia, then, this dissertation humbly endeavours to contribute not merely to utopian scholarship but also to Deleuzian scholarship. It is indeed a challenging enterprise to bring these two scholarships to the same plane in order to make a worthwhile comment on contemporary dystopia. Several studies have been carried out to explore the relation between Deleuze and literature, the most significant ones of which are *Deleuze and Literature* (2000) edited by Ian Buchanan and John Marks, *Deleuze on Literature* (2003) by Ronald Bogue, and *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Literature* (2015) edited by Ian Buchanan, Tim Matts and Aidan Tynan. These books are valuable contributions to the field in their attempt to underline the literary lineage behind Deleuzian philosophy, to clarify Deleuze's own insight into literature, to interrogate the ways of a Deleuzian reading of literature, and to experiment with different literary texts ranging from the classics to the contemporary ones to undertake Deleuzian readings. Several other studies have examined Deleuze and Guattari's work along with specific literary movements, genres and techniques, such as Eva Aldea's *Magic Realism and Deleuze* (2010), Ronald Bogue's article, "Deleuze and Guattari and the Future of Politics: Science Fiction, Protocols and the People to Come" (2011), *Postcolonial Literatures and Deleuze* (2012) edited by Lorna Burns and Birgit M. Kaiser, Derek Ryan's *Virginia Woolf and the Materiality of Theory* (2013) and *Understanding Deleuze, Understanding Modernism* (2014) edited by Paul Ardoin, S. E. Gontarski and Laci Mattison. Furthermore, a number of studies have brought different concepts and critical theories together with Deleuzian philosophy, such as *Deleuze and Feminist Theory* (2000), *Deleuze and Space* (2005), *Deleuze and Queer Theory* (2009), *Deleuze and the Postcolonial* (2010), where scholars not merely embrace a Deleuzian look at the critical

theories at hand but also analyse literary and artistic tendencies and works related to these theories. In addition, the relation between Deleuzian philosophy and contemporary phenomena has also been addressed and elaborated on in some significant studies like Michael Hardt's and Antonio Negri's *Empire* (2000), *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (2004) and *Commonwealth* (2009). Although all these studies are highly valuable in shedding new light on Deleuzian perspectives and their relations to society, culture, and literature, none of them has attempted to elucidate the possible conceptual links between the concept of dystopia and the Deleuzian understanding of the contemporary world. This dissertation, therefore, aims to make a unique and significant contribution not only to the field of utopian and dystopian studies but also to understanding Deleuzian philosophy and its implications for literary studies.

The arguments this dissertation puts forward to reinterpret and theorise the concept of dystopia are particularly concerned with Deleuzian notions of “immanence” and “transcendence”. The notion of immanence is one of the most recurrent concepts in Deleuze's philosophical project, manifesting itself through all his work ranging from *Difference and Repetition* (1968), *The Logic of Sense* (1969), *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life* (1995) to those co-authored with Felix Guattari like *Anti-Oedipus* (1972), *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980) and *What is Philosophy?* (1991). Immanence or the plane of immanence, for Deleuze and Guattari, is a major attribute of life or desire, representing its mobility, dynamism, fluidity, creativity, openness and infinity. Life is immanent in the sense that it is in constant variation and mutation, and full of creative and transformative forces that are capable of establishing new connections. It is immanent since it is a plane of pure multiplicity that are not reduced to negative differences. Deleuze and Guattari often tend to relate the notion of immanence to “infinite movement or the movement of the infinite” (*What is Philosophy?* 37), or more specifically, the act of deterritorialisation which is an act of removing any stable reference point to reside on, any destination to arrive at and any roots to refer to. Hence it posits pure chaos without any end, plan, determination, destination or centre. Although these may at first suggest negativity, Deleuze and Guattari regard immanence as a

concept that is utterly affirmative. Yet there are some moments when this *infinite movement or the movement of the infinite* (37; emphasis added) is disturbed and interrupted, which Deleuze and Guattari call “transcendence”. Transcendence or the plane of transcendence corresponds to the organisation and stabilisation of movements, intensities, forces and flows inherent to life’s immanence in accordance with a particular ground, foundation or a priori ideal. Thus, this notion is often used interchangeably with the plane of organisation. Transcendence often coincides with paths of reterritorialisation, that is, an act of restructuring, taking back to certain roots, advancing towards a destination or blocking the flows of life.

This dissertation makes frequent use of these concepts in its delineation of contemporary dystopia particularly because the contemporary world, which constitutes dystopia’s background, could also be described through these concepts. To be more precise, the contemporary world is run by what Deleuze and Guattari call a “modern immanent machine”, that is, late capitalism (*Anti-Oedipus* 261). Capitalism, in a sense, imitates, renders and feeds on life’s immanence. It is an immanent system since it works through a principle of constant variation for the perpetuity of its power and interests. Yet capitalism’s immanence is not affirmative as it is suggested in the immanence of life. It is indeed a relative immanence, which is best understood when the act of deterritorialisation inherent to the plane of immanence is periodically followed by an act of reterritorialisation. This is to say that capitalism deterritorialises the existing codes or blockages on the flows or forces of life; in other words, it opens these flows to new connections, to infinity. But then it quickly creates its own relative limits in the infinite, and recodes or reterritorialises the decoded flows in line with its own purposes. These new recodings or reterritorialisations, as Deleuze and Guattari underline, express “the apparent objective movement” (247), that is, a form of movement restricted to capitalism’s relative limits. In this sense, the immanence of capitalism suggests that it is still a vicious circle, each movement of which is in variation. Most probably as an outcome of this relative immanent system taking the helm of the entire world, there occurs a gradual transformation into a new

form of society that complies with this seemingly-liberative yet in fact more encapsulating working mechanism of late capitalism. Deleuze calls these newly-emerging social formations “societies of control” in his “Postscript” (1992), and defines the current situation as a passage from “spaces of enclosure” to “spaces of free-floating control” (3-4), from the process of molding to the process of modulation (4), and from a closed system to a dynamic system. This is accompanied by some changes in subjectivity, forms of control and organisation, the school system and so on. With this in mind, Deleuze concludes his “Postscript” with a critical question, the question of whether these changes may “give way to new forms of resistance against the societies of control” (7).

In a sense, this dissertation formulates its main argument in relation to the definition of the societies of control and to the critical question Deleuze poses at the end of his “Postscript”. This dissertation argues that these newly-emerging societies have more dystopian potential than the societies of the previous centuries since they are governed with a more insidious form of power and mechanism of control. This dystopian potential makes itself clear in contemporary examples of dystopia in the sense that they predominantly portray the present societies rather than a future model of dystopian societies. In other words, they tend to avoid making specific time references to a future setting or locate the dystopian societies in the present. In this regard, contemporary dystopia becomes today’s dystopia. If dystopia becomes a re-presentation of the here-and-now dystopia, then it simultaneously becomes an exploration of ways of resistance to the present. To depict how contemporary dystopia becomes a resistance to the present, it is necessary to go back to Deleuze’s question and explore “new ways of resistance against the societies of control” (Postscript 7). In line with a Deleuzian perspective, this dissertation claims that the societies of control are more inclined to produce new and affirmative ways of resistance that would comply with the new dynamic peculiar to their formation. The new dynamic of these societies could be seen as the dynamism inherent to late capitalism. As previously discussed, capitalism owes its dynamism and mobility to the constant act of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation. As this dissertation underlines, the act

of deterritorialisation operating for the capitalist interests could be turned against itself and become a weapon to fight against the dystopian reality of the present societies. In other words, the societies of control that also reside on the plane of immanence manifest affirmative forces and flows of desire although they are constantly frozen into fixed forms and structures for capitalist interests. However, whenever the capitalist “immanent machine” deterritorialises and liberates these flows, they are open to drawing revolutionary lines and resisting and escaping further reterritorialisations. Thus, the capitalist act of deterritorialisation could very well be turned into a revolutionary act of deterritorialisation. This is tantamount to saying that what makes the societies of control dystopian in the first place could simultaneously become a tool for their resistance and liberation. Contemporary dystopia accordingly tends to illustrate this complicated yet still promising process by becoming more and more hopeful and affirmative in its portrayal of alternative ways of resistance.

This dissertation considers the newly-arising tendencies in dystopia as an outcome of the newly-arising tendencies in the social formation, which makes it necessary to revisit the history of dystopia in line with the changes in the social formation. More specifically, building upon the afore-mentioned aspects of contemporary society, this dissertation asserts that as the society moves from the plane of transcendence towards the plane of immanence, dystopia also moves from transcendence towards immanence. This movement could be followed in two significant phases in the history of dystopia according to their degree of intensity. We can acknowledge the first phase as the moment of transcendence which predominantly coincides with twentieth century dystopia, the second as the moment of immanence which mostly coincides with contemporary dystopia. Yet this does not necessarily suggest that these two phases are indeed two different fully-determined stages of dystopia or that dystopia has fully evolved from one particular form to another. This study attempts to reinterpret the historical trajectory of dystopia by observing the new tendencies arising in dystopia, show their relation to the contemporary world and finally create an alternative conception that would address these relations. In so doing, however, it does not

circumscribe all dystopian works of a particular age within the strict borders of such labels as “transcendent” or “immanent”. It merely aims to highlight the predominance of some particular aspects in some particular historical periods, and leaves space for exceptions and subversions.

As suggested by the aims stated above, this dissertation is primarily a theoretical study, introducing new ideas and fresh insights not only into utopian scholarship but also into Deleuzian scholarship and offering a new conceptual groundwork for the study of dystopia. In seeking to introduce alternative definitions and conceptions of dystopia, the aim of this dissertation is not to be critical for criticism’s sake but to be creative and productive. Rather than blindly refuting the long-established conceptions, it aims to rethink them from a Deleuzian perspective and go beyond them to be able to address the arising tendencies in contemporary dystopia. The process of rethinking and/or going beyond, in this sense, designates an attempt not only to look into the forces behind the concept of dystopia but also to explore the ways of affirming these forces. These forces could be identified as the potential to resist and to draw subversive lines from the dystopian reality and as the capacity to create affirmative affects and transformations within and for the society. This idea culminates in the creation of not only new definitions but also new tools to work with through these forces in contemporary dystopia. Furthermore, although this is primarily theory-driven, it still needs to experiment with these new definitions and tools by putting them into practice in some contemporary works.

To this end, this dissertation analyses Margaret Atwood’s *MaddAddam* trilogy and China Mieville’s *Perdido Street Station* in the light of these new conceptions and critical tools. Atwood’s and Mieville’s critical engagement with the concept of dystopia is one of the major reasons for bringing these two writers together in this dissertation. As a Canadian canonical dystopian writer, Margaret Atwood has her own conception of dystopia and a long history of dystopian writing. This provides an opportunity to theoretically and practically explore the conceptual links between her understanding and this dissertation’s theorisation of dystopia. Likewise, Mieville, who is a young yet promising British candidate for

being a part of the canon, has powerful insights into the concept of dystopia and into the potential of the contemporary world as dystopia. Unlike Atwood, who is an acclaimed dystopian writer, Mieville is primarily a science-fiction, fantasy and weird-fiction writer. However, as he himself argues, his works often intersect with the political agenda of dystopia. In this sense, bringing these two names together firstly widens the perception of dystopia, making us see dystopia both within its generic boundaries as in Atwood and outside the immediate boundaries of the genre as in Mieville. More specifically, it sheds light upon the ways in which dystopia overlaps with other genres like fantasy, weird fiction and science-fiction. Secondly, these two writers not only offer different treatments of dystopia as a genre and as a concept but also represent the inclinations of two different generations due to their difference in age. Considering that the movement from the plane of transcendence towards the plane of immanence is traceable in the historical trajectory of the societies and of dystopia, it could be asked whether being a member of an older or a younger generation makes it possible to trace some differences in these writers' tendency towards transcendence or immanence in their literary oeuvre. Thirdly, bringing these two writers from different geographical coordinates together allows this study to observe the manifestation of the afore-mentioned moments in the social formation and in dystopia in different geographies. Contemporary dystopia is most widely produced in North America particularly because of the rapid expansion and appropriation of late capitalism in North America. Late capitalism has reached its peak and its most mature form attaining a global and corporate dimension in North America, which inevitably leads to the emergence in literature of more and more dystopian horrors. In this sense, the work of Margaret Atwood, who is a Canadian writer, significantly contributes to authentically depicting the contemporary world and the ways of resisting it under the latest configuration of capitalism. Yet focusing on another example from Western Europe is also significant for observing how the newly-arising social structure is thematised with its dystopian horrors and possible escapes in a different country and literary tradition. Analysing British writer China Mieville's work alongside Atwood's serves this purpose. It also

enables this dissertation to look at and to compare a variety of different treatments of and orientations toward the issues at hand.

This study has selected Atwood's *MaddAddam* trilogy and Mievil's *Perdido Street Station* from among the many novels these writers have produced so far and of the novels written in the contemporary era primarily because these texts meet on a common ground in terms of their experimental and subversive tendencies. In addition, both novels depict the representation of contemporary society in a similar way since they were produced in the same decade, that is, the early 2000s. *MaddAddam* trilogy, which is composed of *Oryx and Crake* (2003), *The Year of the Flood* (2009) and *MaddAddam* (2013), explore a dystopian world run by multinational corporations and devastated by scientific, technological and ecological crises. The trilogy presents a realistic portrayal of and a critique of the latest configuration of capitalism, its collaboration with science and technology, and the dystopian aspects of the societies of control. *Perdido Street Station* (2000), in the same way, depicts the dystopian world of Bas-Lag where capitalist interests have become the primary concern of the government and the means of subjugation, corruption and victimisation. Both crystallise the workings of late capitalism as an "immanent machine" through the constant act of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation and show how this act breeds dystopian disasters in the present society. Not only do they reflect today's dystopian reality, but they also explore the possibilities of resistance in a more hopeful way. These texts become a testimony to the fact that the capitalist act of deterritorialisation can be turned against itself and become a powerful means of resistance to the present. This is illustrated in both *MaddAddam* trilogy and *Perdido Street Station* in the form of both a collective fight and individual attempts initiated and achieved *within* the dystopian world. These texts are also very rich in material demonstrating strong connections between both writers' styles and Deleuzian concepts. They in a sense punctuate the diverse potentials of these concepts.

Despite such similarities in their tendencies and purpose, these texts offer remarkably different treatments of dystopia, too. First, while Atwood adopts a realistic re-presentation of the present dystopian reality in her trilogy, Mievil's

re-presentation gains an almost allegorical dimension. In Mieville's text, to be more precise, it is possible to trace the allegorical embodiments of Deleuzian concepts which this dissertation uses in its delineation of contemporary dystopia. This difference could be resulting from the fact that Atwood is a canonical dystopian writer whereas Mieville is primarily a fantasy and weird-fiction writer who injects dystopia as a political project in his creative oeuvre. The confrontation of dystopia with different genres such as fantasy and weird fiction can broaden the scope of dystopia and increase fictional possibilities through a variety of techniques, one of which is the embodiment of allegory. The allegorical presence felt in the novel could also be interpreted as a political tool to emphasise Mieville's political stance as an ardent socialist. The employment of allegory helps to intensify the political meanings inherent to the text. Second, these texts portray relatively different constellations of social formation, control and resistance. The dystopian society depicted in *MaddAddam* trilogy is a society of control in its fullest sense whilst the one in *Perdido Street Station* is a society in the process of transition from the disciplinary mode to the control mode. This necessarily culminates in some divergences in the ways of control and resistance in these dystopian societies. These differences in the form of the society, the ways of control and resistance and their representation open these texts to extended interpretative opportunities and allow the reader to have a wider understanding of contemporary dystopia and contemporary issues from a Deleuzian perspective.

With the aims and concerns stated above in mind, Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 will constitute the theoretical framework of this dissertation, which entails examining the literary history of dystopia, creating a novel conception for contemporary dystopia and exploring the contemporary world in line with this new conception in the light of Deleuzian philosophy. The second chapter will primarily interrogate the concept of dystopia within the context of traditional definitions and explore contemporary dystopia's new inclinations and divergences from these definitions. This chapter will then interpret these tendencies from a Deleuzian perspective and attempt to find alternative definitions that would take the new moment felt in contemporary dystopia into consideration. The third

chapter will in turn examine how these alternative definitions comply with the Deleuzian understanding of late capitalism, which functions as a background to the contemporary world and contemporary dystopia. Even though the starting point for this dissertation is the connection between contemporary dystopia and the Deleuzian interpretation of the contemporary world, the order of these two chapters has been intentionally designed in such a reverse way so as to avoid the pitfalls of being over-exposed to Deleuzian thought, as a result of which the reader may miss certain important arguments suggested about contemporary dystopia.

Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 will respectively analyse Atwood's *MaddAddam* trilogy and Mieville's *Perdido Street Station* in the light of the new conceptions and tools of dystopia. These texts will be examined primarily according to the ways they move towards the plane of immanence in their portrayal of the dystopian reality and ways of resistance against it. In so doing, this dissertation will make use of some concepts taken from Deleuze's and Guattari's corpus. These analyses, therefore, will also be an attempt to test out the possibilities of a Deleuzian reading of literature, which is highly likely to bring about some difficulties and stakes, considering the fact that although Deleuze and Guattari do offer an alternative way of reading literature they do not provide clear tools or route to follow in the analysis of literary works. To reduce these possible stakes and difficulties to minimum, this dissertation draws a particular path of reading by limiting the application of the concepts at hand to three main fields: space, subjectivity and language. Hence the analyses in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 will first focus on the ways in which space is compartmentalised, categorised and organised in these novels so as to create boundaries and hierarchies. To be more precise, the analysis will look at the ways in which space is "striated" and then it will explore the ways in which space is purged of its problematic compartments, categories, structures and organisations, namely, the ways in which striated spaces are "smoothed" in the dystopian worlds depicted in Atwood's and Mieville's texts. Afterwards, these chapters will examine the kinds of subjectivity in the process of formation and dissolution, more specifically, the process of

“oedipalisation” and “de-oedipalisation” in these novels. Finally, these two chapters will survey how language in a Deleuzian sense simultaneously becomes a part of the dominant power and a weapon against it in the dystopian worlds portrayed by Atwood and Mieville.



CHAPTER 2

A DELEUZIAN INQUIRY INTO THE CONCEPT OF DYSTOPIA

This chapter stages a confrontation between the traditional conceptions of dystopia and a possible Deleuzian understanding of dystopia. Within the framework of this confrontation, this chapter is composed of three sections. The first section focuses mainly on the traditional understanding of the concept, providing a brief survey of the existing definitions and meanings of utopia and dystopia. This section also presents a discussion of the critical problems regarding these definitions and the possible kinship between these two concepts. Building on these traditional definitions and complications, the second section traces some particular shifts which have occurred in contemporary dystopia and which could be said to be distinguishing it from the twentieth century dystopia from a Deleuzian perspective. This dissertation does not claim that these shifts are clear-cut and definitive to suggest that there are certainly two different categories of dystopia. It argues that these shifts are nonetheless significant enough to suggest that there are two different moments in the history of dystopia. The first moment predominantly coincides with the emergence of the early dystopian examples in the twentieth century while the second moment coincides with the emergence of contemporary dystopian examples from the late 1990s onwards. Thus, this section identifies these two significant phases in the history of dystopia and characterises the differences between these phases from a Deleuzian perspective in terms of their tendency towards transcendence or immanence. The Deleuzian concepts of transcendence and immanence are also introduced in three sub-sections, where specific examples ranging from fiction to TV series are provided to clarify what is meant by the shift from transcendent dystopia to immanent dystopia. Since this shift that is argued to have occurred in the history of dystopia entails a novel

understanding of contemporary dystopia, the third section suggests an alternative definition for contemporary dystopia and explores the possibility of resistance to the present as reflected in contemporary examples. The exploration of such a possibility brings together several major questions regarding the function of contemporary dystopia and of the contemporary dystopian writer. Thus, the third section also takes up questions as to whether contemporary dystopia can be regarded as “minor literature” in a Deleuzian sense and whether the contemporary dystopian writer can be regarded as what Deleuze calls a “clinician and symptomatologist” of society.

2.1 Mapping the Traditional Definitions of Utopia and Dystopia

The term utopia was first coined by Thomas More in 1516 from Greek incorporating two homonyms, ou-topos and eu-topos and meaning both “no place” and “good place” respectively. It was More to use the word “utopia” first to define the imaginary island in his book *Utopia*, yet this is not to say that he was first to mention utopianism. Actually, the concept goes back to as early as 380 BC, when Plato created his imaginary ideal city in *The Republic*. Despite the differences in their ways of presentation and the long gap between these two periods, both Plato and More display a similar utopian impulse to pose questions about and offer solutions to their present society. Both present alternative worlds set in a remote future wherein idealised societies are depicted with their alternative ways of organising human relations, daily life and politics. In *The Republic*, the promises of a communal system are proliferated to the extent that the justice and equality among the members of the society are achieved by means of a thoroughly structured control mechanism headed by philosopher-kings. More’s *Utopia*, on the other hand, draws the picture of an idyllic community that has perfected itself and been purged of the ills and evils of More’s society, and has been structured around the principles of morality, equity and tolerance. That is, these two preliminary works seem to be practically on the same plane. They both portray a fictional society that is far removed from the miseries and troubles

of the present society, idealised in its commitment to the pursuit of social justice, peace and security in all its dimensions. They are both intended for awakening people to realise the huge gap between the society they are living in and the idyllic society they might have instead been enjoying, and hence to head for the betterment of their community.

No matter how closely these two initial examples are affiliated in establishing the very characteristics of the genre of utopia, scholars of utopia do not seem to have reached an agreement regarding the scope of the term. Starting its life “as a neologism”, the problematic combination of eu/ou-topos, as Fatima Vieira notes, the meaning and understanding of the concept of utopia have changed many times over the years, undergoing several “process[es] of deneologisation” (“The Concept of Utopia” 3). Therefore, it is not surprising that there is a wide range of definitions or conceptualisations of utopia today and even more are about to come. Moritz Kaufmann’s definition is apparently amongst the earliest and most adopted ones, calling utopia in his 1879 book *Utopias* “a ‘nowhere Land’, some happy island far away, where perfect social relations prevail, and human beings, living under an immaculate constitution and a faultless government, enjoy a simple and happy existence, free from the turmoil, the harassing cares, and endless worries of actual life” (1). Kaufmann as a socialist relates utopia to socialist doctrines. For him, socialist utopianism is a move towards a faultless social structure, moral and material improvement; to be more precise, utopianism moves towards social perfection. This tendency to associate utopia with perfection observed in Kaufmann’s definition is shared by a later scholar Joyce Hertzler. In *The History of the Utopian Thought* (1922), Hertzler regards perfection and progress as a distinctive feature of utopia through his references to More’s *Utopia*. More’s utopia, for him, depicts “a perfect, and perhaps unrealisable, society located in nowhere, purged of the shortcomings, the wastes and the confusion of our own time and living in perfect adjustment, full of happiness and contentment” (1-2). Thus, it is the idea of perfection and belief in social reform that underpins utopia. Krishan Kumar is another milestone contributor to utopian studies who seems to defend the equation between utopia

and perfection. Kumar describes utopia in his 1987 book *Utopia and Anti-Utopia* as “a description of the best [...] society not as an abstract idea, and not simply as a satirical foil to the existing society, but as a society in full operation in which we are invited vicariously to participate” (25). Refuting the idea of utopia as an abstraction and as a mere critique of the existing society, Kumar defends the understanding of utopia as a perfection-seeking enterprise. In these three prominent scholars’ visions, utopia is patently a future-perfect society far removed from the deficiencies, fallacies and disorders of the present.

This discrepancy between the utopian society and the existing society inevitably becomes the focus of interest for contemporary scholars as well, paving the way for new definitions. These definitions seek to explore the relationship between the ideal society depicted in utopia and the present society, and the utopian writer’s stance towards and projects for the existing society. In his 1994 article “The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited”, Lyman Tower Sargent acknowledges this divergence between the utopian alternative and the present society by defining utopia in its broadest sense as “social dreaming -the dreams and nightmares that concern the ways in which groups of people arrange their lives and which usually envision a radically different society than the one in which the dreamers live” (3). What is envisioned in utopia is then a dream of a better –if not perfect– life than the existing one. It not only expresses dissatisfaction with the present state of affairs but also a desire for social fulfilment and improvement. In her book entitled *The Concept of Utopia* (2010), in quite a similar fashion, Ruth Levitas comes up with a novel definition of utopianism and utopia. Regarding utopianism as “a precondition, a disparity between socially constructed experienced need and socially prescribed and actually available means of satisfaction” (*The Concept of Utopia* 211), Levitas describes utopia as “the desire for a different, better way of being” (209). For her, utopia is a political practice of yearning for improved ways of living and a condition of happiness. In this respect, Sargent’s and Levitas’ understandings shed light both upon the circumstances conducive to the emergence of utopia and upon

the objectives of utopia. It is obviously the ills of the existing society that generate the utopian impulse to dream of a transformation and betterment.

While some contemporary scholars like Sargent and Levitas concentrate on the notion of utopia as a desire for betterment and a social function, others like Tom Moylan and Michael Griffin perceive utopia as an impulse. Rather than tackling the socio-economic circumstances triggering the production of utopian works or the political agenda behind utopian enterprises, these scholars regard utopia as an impulse that can be embraced and utilised in a great variety of texts. In his introduction to *“Exploring the Utopian Impulse: Essays on Utopian Thought and Practice”* (2007), Moylan and Griffin explicate utopianism as “a process of social dreaming that unleashes and informs efforts to make the world a better place, not to the letter of a plan but to the spirit of an open-ended process” (1). The emphasis accordingly shifts from utopia as a literary form to utopianism as an impulse, which can be considered as an attempt to broaden the scope of utopian studies. Unlike previous conceptions that limit utopia to the literary form in which the utopian impulse is actualised, Moylan’s and Griffin’s understanding rejects reducing utopianism to a single actualisation, a single narrative model invented by More. They believe that utopian studies should “identify and study utopian tendencies as and when they are articulated through theories, texts (literary, both eutopian *and* dystopian; legal; political; theological; filmic; visual; musical; architectural; and others), and social practices (such as religious and secular intentional communities, political movements, and cultural practices)” (1-2).

Throughout its varied history, then, utopia has been defined by several scholars with reference to several parameters. Scholars such as Kumar, Hertzler and Kaufmann have paid regard to the description of an idyllic society in their definitions, comparing the utopian alternative with the present society. Others such as Moylan and Griffin have directed their focus on utopia as an impulse and explored literary forms that embrace utopian horizons while some like Sargent and Levitas have formulated their definitions by foregrounding utopia’s function and objectives. Amongst these orientations (utopia as a perfect society, utopia as a

function and utopia as an impulse in various literary forms), as Fatima Vieira argues, the perception of utopia “as a matter of attitude” and/or “the desire for a better life, caused by a feeling of discontentment towards the society” is notably important in depicting utopia’s stance towards the present (“The Concept of Utopia” 6). The existing society with which the utopian writer is increasingly discontented becomes a background against which the utopian alternative is created. While creating the ideal society, however, the utopian writer cannot be claimed to be severing all the ties with the society he lives in. On the contrary, the utopian alternative takes its material from the existing society, and serves both as a criticism addressed to the unbearable realities of the present and as a solution proposed to resolve them. This alternative comes up with an idyllic model in the writer’s mind against which the present conditions are measured and future objectives are determined. To be more precise, utopia emerging as a reaction to the present comes to function as a standard designed for the future.

This utopian quest to design a better future which began with Plato and culminated with More in the 16th century continued to draw considerable attention in the 17th century. During this period, Tommaso Campanella’s *The City of the Sun* (1602), Francis Bacon’s *New Atlantis* (1627), James Harrington’s *The Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656) and Margaret Cavendish’s *The Blazing World* (1666) were among prominent examples of the genre. In these utopian examples, the writers followed the trend commenced by More, beginning their narrative with the travel of the protagonists and ending with their arrival at the imaginary paradises where transformations proposed for the existing society are entirely achieved. These examples, which contributed a lot to the formation and proliferation of the utopian genre, tended to rely on the potential of the human mind and effort to attain the desired progress in the betterment of the society. The reliance on human progress, reason and scientificism in utopia rose dramatically in the 18th century, also known as the Age of Reason. The Enlightenment was one of the periods during which the utopian impulse was most felt since man’s faith in reason, rationality and science made it possible to imagine radical changes and improvements in the society. Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1727) was the

most praised utopian narrative in this period, not merely exemplifying the utopian impulse originating from faith in science and progress but reflecting the portrait of the current state of Britain in comparison with its utopian alternative. In addition to Swift's satirical utopian piece, François Fenelon's *The Adventures of Telemachus* (1699), Voltaire's *Candide* (1759), Louis-Sebastian Mercier's *The Year 2440* (1771) were among celebrated utopian narratives of the age. Samuel Butler's *Erewhon* (1872), Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888) and William Morris' *News from Nowhere* (1890), likewise, illustrated the continuing utopian impulse in the 19th century. These utopian pieces were depicting more and more conspicuously the increasing disappointment with the existing society, a society bearing the grim consequences of the newly-emerging industrialisation.

Not surprisingly, this utopianism which still enjoyed its prime time until the beginning of the twentieth century came to a halt upon encountering the grim face of modernity. To be more precise, utopia primarily appeared as a product of modernity, positing the pursuit of progress. This progressivism was found problematic first in the sense that it turned into a totalising ideology itself. Second, the newly-flourishing age was characterised by wars, rising fascism, nuclear weaponry, geo-political conflicts, depression, traumas and disillusionments. Relating these negative changes in the sociopolitical atmosphere to the idea of modernity, writers began to see its possible threats and destabilising effects and hence lost their faith in the myth of progress. This disillusionment with modernity necessarily killed the utopian imagination and the hopes for the betterment of society. Hence, it was a kind of discontent with modernity that primarily conduced to the emergence of dystopia. Against this background, the term dystopia, which was first employed as the antonym of utopia by John Stuart Mill in 1868 in a parliamentary debate, made its first appearance in the literature of the twentieth century as a reaction to "what others have called the 'grand narratives' of modernity: reason and revolution, science and socialism, the idea of progress and faith" (Kumar, "Utopia's Shadow", 19). That is, dystopia appeared in order to problematise modernity. Yet it is hard to say that it actually achieved to problematise it; on the contrary, it has fallen into the same trap of progressivism

and modernity. Early works such as Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* (1921), Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and George Orwell's *1984* (1949) presented a critique of the society driven by the logic of progress by portraying its possible nightmarish future. These first instances depicted a fictional society worse than the present society, where an atmosphere of pessimism and terror was reigning as a consequence of the irredeemable social, economic and political changes the alternate society would have undergone. The better horizons intended in utopian works were replaced by the radically worse horizons intended to frighten and warn people to tidy up their present society so as not to get stuck in such a future since the impulse for utopianism was no longer regarded as influential enough to effectively raise an efficient awareness in the wake of the terrors of the new century.

The move from the better horizons to the worse was actually signalling a change in attitude towards the ever-increasing problems of the existing society. Whereas utopia reacts to the shortcomings of the society by proposing an idyllic alternative for the future, dystopia counters these shortcomings with its nightmarish alternative that is envisioned to be on the way unless any positive transformation in the society occurs. In this regard, as Gregory Claeys remarks:

Dystopia' is often used interchangeably with 'anti-utopia' or 'negative utopia', by contrast to utopia or 'eutopia' (good place), to describe a fictional portrayal of a society in which evil, or negative social and political developments, have the upper hand, or as a satire of utopian aspirations which attempts to show up their fallacies, or which demonstrate, in B. F. Skinner's words, 'ways of life we must be sure to avoid' – in the unlikely event that we can agree on particulars. ("Origins" 107)

What positions dystopia in direct opposition to utopia, for most critics like Claeys, is the depiction of a considerably worse society than the present one. This is also why it is perceived as more pessimistic about the current issues of the society. Lacking the utopian optimism dystopia is frequently defined in comparison and contrast to its utopian counterpart as Claeys does in another definition of his. For him, "if 'utopia' entails the depiction of any kind of

idealised society regarded as superior to the present by its author, ‘dystopia’ implies *its negation*, or any kind of society regarded as inferior by its author” (“Three Variants”) [emphasis added]. As in Claeys’ definition accentuating dystopia as utopia’s *negation*, M. Keith Booker regards dystopian literature as the negation of utopian literature, saying that “dystopian literature is specifically that literature which situates itself in direct opposition to utopian thought, warning against the potential negative consequences of arrant utopianism” (*Dystopian Literature* 3).

Dystopia evidently sparks many critics to come up with their own definitions and neologisms regarding its function and conception. Yet, what remains almost constant in these definitions and neologisms is the major characteristics that most dystopian narratives tend to employ. These narratives created from the 1910s onwards till the end of the twentieth century picture utterly undesirable future societies dominated by totalitarian regimes where power and technology become the major means of the control of the people. Since control mechanisms in these totalitarian states view individualism as a threat to the perpetuity of their power, they dictate a kind of collectivism that cancels out all the individual differences and reduces heterogeneity in all aspects of life to a forced homogeneity. People are kept under constant surveillance; freedom and human rights become a luxury, and justice remains only as an expectation.

No matter how frequently dystopia is delineated as the opposite of utopia, these characteristics of dystopian narratives can be argued to bring the term closer to its counterpart, not as its negation but as its continuation. Even the earliest examples of utopia prove to be drawing a picture of an equally totalitarian regime as in dystopian examples. Plato’s *Republic*, to begin with, illustrates a totalitarian regime hidden under the guise of the ideal society. To build up the perfect egalitarian system, Plato establishes a hierarchy, placing the philosopher-kings as rulers at the top of the hierarchy. The hierarchical system in *The Republic* underpins a strict class system in which people are separated into three categories: the guardians having gold-souls function as leaders and

controllers, the silver-souled auxiliaries serve as soldiers, and the producers having bronze-souls work as farmers, merchants and labourers (Book III). All citizens of *The Republic* are under constant surveillance of the guardians and exposed to strict education and training. This training is, however, maintained to eliminate their individuality, make them accept their social status and finally turn them into obedient citizens. The communal rule in *The Republic*, though designed in favour of justice and equality, bears strong resemblances to those in dystopian narratives. Another communal rule can be observed in More's *Utopia* in which an equally hierarchical and patriarchal social structure is established. In More's utopian society, people are restricted to a brutal sameness; they wear the same clothes, eat the same meal in the same diner, earn the same amount of money, do the same labour, live in the same houses (Book IV, V). Although this sameness targets the obliteration of social and economic inequality, it ends up with the obliteration of private lives and individualism.

Therefore, many critics, noticing the dystopian touches in utopian narratives, have revised their definitions underlining the position of dystopia as the opposite of utopia. One such moderate attitude towards the possible kinship between utopia and dystopia comes from Claeys who previously tended to accept the traditional understanding of dystopia as negative utopia in his 2010 entry in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* (107). But in his 2013 article "Three Variants on the Concept of Dystopia", he questions such definitions that reduce dystopia merely to a negation. Reconsidering the relation between utopia and dystopia, he accepts the fact that "there are problems even with the idea of dystopia as the negative of 'ideal' societies", and goes on saying that "just as one person's freedom fighter is another's terrorist, one person's utopia is another's dystopia. Dystopia, in other words, rather than being the negation of utopia, paradoxically may be *its essence*" ("Three Variants" 15; emphasis added). As clearly seen in Claeys's statements, the societies pictured in utopian narratives are more likely to be the archetypes of totalitarian states depicted in subsequent dystopias than to be the archetypes of idyllic societies. No matter how idealistically the utopian writer strives to portray a dream society stripped of all

faults and deficiencies of the present society, dystopia sneaks into this dream as “the alter ego of utopia. Like Sancho Panza in Cervantes’ masterpiece *Don Quixote*, it helps to pull its dreamy companion back down to earth” (Davis 26).

The kinship recognised between utopia and dystopia necessarily puts the date regarding the emergence of dystopia into question: whereas dystopia has appeared in its actual form in the 1900s, its lineage apparently goes back to the times the first utopian narratives were created. As such, Kumar, stressing that dystopia is not the opposite of utopia, argues that dystopia owes its appearance to the appearance of utopia itself. As such, the earliest utopian works such as Plato’s *Republic* and More’s *Utopia* reveal strong dystopian overtones due to the totalitarian regimes hidden inside their utopian ideals. This affiliation between canonical utopian works and dystopian impulse brings to the fore the idea that every utopia comes along with an implicit dystopia. Later utopian works such as Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*, Voltaire’s *Candide* and Butler’s *Erewhon* seem to be justifying this. These works come closer to dystopia due to their critical stance towards utopian conventions and their critique of utopian reliance on reason, science and technology. They are utopias that have gone wrong. If dystopia were the opposite of utopia, then these early works would definitely be called dystopia. Yet still they are not considered as ‘dystopia in its genuine form’ since they are merely “satires on the rationalist and scientific utopias of More and Bacon” (Kumar “Utopia’s Shadow” 19). Although it is undeniable that there have been many utopian works that appear to be dystopian in their treatment of the subjects, “it is mainly in the twentieth century that dystopia truly comes into its own” (19).

Obviously, it is not merely utopian narratives that display the opposite tendency since dystopian narratives may also manifest in themselves the utopian impulse to transform the existing society. This complicated situation arises from utopia’s and dystopia’s relation to modernity. Utopia, which is a product of modernity, and dystopia, which supposedly emerges as a reaction to modernity, fall into the same trap, that is, the trap of totalising ideology. Both somehow intend to reach an anticipated transcendent ideal. Hence, it is not unusual to find

a degree of dystopia in utopia and a degree of utopia in dystopia. Keith Booker, in his enlightening book titled *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature*, acknowledges this common intention of creating a change in the present to form the future alternative as follows:

Not only is one man's utopia another man's dystopia, but utopian visions of an ideal society often inherently suggest a criticism of the current order of things as nonideal, while dystopian warnings of the dangers of 'bad' utopias still allow for the possibility of 'good' utopias, especially since dystopian societies are generally more or less thinly veiled refigurations of a situation that already exists in reality. Moreover, dystopian critiques of existing systems would be pointless *unless a better system appeared conceivable*. One might, in fact, see dystopian and utopian visions not as fundamentally opposed but as very much part of the same project. (15; emphasis added)

Apparently, both utopia and dystopia use the same narrative devices, creating an imaginary society, either idyllic or dystopic, locating it in a distant place in the remote future, crowding it with people characterised by their sameness rather than their distinctiveness, governing it by strong control mechanisms organising all fields of social, economic, political and private life. Both narratives have the same motive for a change and transformation in the existing society. Presenting either an alternate society that is worse than the existing one to show how things could go wrong or an idyllic society that is idealistic in all terms to depict how things could be improved, these sibling genres foreground their intentions to ameliorate the present to reach *a better system* designed for the future in mind. While the impulse of hope dominates utopias, the impulse of fear governs dystopias to cope with the prompt yet voluminous changes of the age; but what remains the same in both is a dream for *a better future*. In other words, what remains the same is a progressive movement towards the future.

Considering these sibling concepts' simultaneous embodiment of both utopian and dystopian horizons and their common progressivism for the creation of *a better future world*, it can be claimed that the boundaries between utopia and dystopia have long been blurred and these terms can even be used

interchangeably. In this regard, Levitas' definition of utopia as "the expression of desire for a better way of living and being" (*Concept of Utopia* 17) could also be said to be standing for the definition of dystopia. Building upon Levitas' emphasis on *desire*, this study argues that there is always an agenda for the future, i.e. a desire for future improvement, and the present serves only as a ladder (to be built up) to reach it in the traditional understanding of utopia and dystopia. This future-oriented tendency, however, suggests a linear logic which orients itself around a telos. In linear logic there is a constant urge for the end, the product, the telos. In a sense, it desires closure. Linear logic accordingly dictates the truthfulness and superiority of the centre it revolves around. It is structured by roots and pinnacles, to be more precise, a beginning to stem from and an end to arrive at. It could also be argued to be a dualistic logic since it operates through binaries. In this respect, this study will term dystopia's linear logic, future-orientation and closure-orientation as linear temporality. Linear temporality of utopia and dystopia creates a segmentation between the past, the present and the future, and necessarily implies a teleology. In other words, although both utopia and dystopia find their sources in the ills of the *present*, hopes are preserved only for a future possibility, and transformation in the present is necessitated only for the fulfilment of this future possibility. The increasing gap between the present society and the future alternative, furthermore, intensifies this linear temporality and segmentation. The traditional conception of dystopia is then grounded upon the idea of a telos, overweighing the future over the present and coming up with a grand alternative. This dissertation designates this traditional conception as the first moment in the history of dystopia. This is the moment when dystopia leans towards transcendence in a Deleuzian sense.

2.2. A Deleuzian Look at the Historical Trajectory of Dystopia

2.2.1. Transcendent Dystopia

Although one can trace the genealogy of dystopia back to the times during which the first utopias were written, the actual emergence of dystopia as a genre is still accepted to have occurred in the twentieth century. The new century with the World Wars, epidemics, depression, violence, repression, increasing totalitarianism, scientific and technological developments expectedly became a total disillusionment for man and laid the groundwork for the appearance of dystopia in its full sense. The early examples produced in this era by Yevgeny Zamyatin, Aldous Huxley, George Orwell and so forth constituted the agreed canon of dystopia. These canonical works have been placed in many scholarly debates, and these debates have often addressed totalitarianism, gender relations, body politics, Foucauldian disciplinary aspects and the like. Yet none of them has probed into these works from a critical point of view, putting them at stake and questioning their problematic tendencies.

In drawing the distinct features of contemporary dystopia, this dissertation also puts these tendencies in twentieth century dystopia into question and interprets them through a Deleuzian lens. To this end, this study finds the affinity between the concept of dystopia and telos-orientation quite controversial in the sense that it suggests a commitment to a grand alternative, a foundation or ground for and from which dystopia emerges. This is primarily because progressive movement towards a particular telos, as Lisa Garforth points out, “at its heart, is about the relationship between ends and means, and the purposive action that seeks to bring them together. [It] posits specific goals or objects, commits to particular outcomes, and suggests that action can be oriented towards bringing them about” (10). Progress-orientation then necessarily implies an orientation towards a transcendent ideal as it is observed in the early examples of dystopia. That is why there is always a dialectical logic lying behind the idea of telos, which subjects the interior mechanisms of dystopia to a negation. Thus, no matter what

good intentions the twentieth century dystopia might have in its emergence, the idea of telos has a paralysing effect on the way dystopia operates. This culminates in a kind of contradiction with the very motives in the emergence of dystopia since it creates the same gravity that a transcendent centre of power can create, and this sense of gravity is what dystopia has emerged in the first place to warn people against. Apart from this dialectical aspect, the idea of telos implied in dystopia's closure-orientation also suggests a linear temporality. In other words, the idea of betterment is envisioned only for the future, which necessitates a continuous progression towards the future. In this respect, this orientation towards the future keeps dystopia not only from recognising the very forces and potentialities of the present for transformation but also from taking any action for the present. The present serves merely as a means while the future becomes an end only, as suggested in traditional conceptions in the previous section. With this in mind, it can be argued that the linear temporality that prioritises the future recognisably contradicts the very logic of dystopia. Although dystopia emerges to negate the idea of progress that comes along with modernity and the growing tendency towards totalitarianism observed in the present society, it ends up submitting to the same progressive ideology and turns against itself by displaying similar problematic tendencies towards totalitarianism in its essence. In this sense, it could be argued that dystopia betrays itself.

Not surprisingly, the canonical works of the early twentieth century such as British writers Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and George Orwell's *1984* (1949) predominantly tend to host these problematic tendencies as well. To begin with the earliest British dystopian example, Aldous Huxley wrote *Brave New World* in the wake of the rising capitalism and the bourgeois British society. The novel draws a picture of a dystopian society in which a highly stratified cast-system is built up, classifying people as Alphas, the members at the top of the society, who are assigned for leadership positions, Betas for positions requiring intelligence, Gammas and Deltas for occupations demanding no intelligence, and Epsilons, those at the bottom of the class system, for physically demanding positions. This sharp classification that allows no change of status is not an

outcome of natural selection among those with more intelligence or those with less intelligence; on the contrary, it is literally created by the pioneers of Fordism. The citizens of the Brave New World are not naturally born but are designed and produced by means of reproductive technology. They cannot move up or down in the class ladder since it is their genes that determine their social status. Much as people are genetically designed for their classes, they are still subjected to conditioning via hypnopaedic, which is a technique used to teach the doctrines during sleep, in order to prevent the buildup of any potential resistance. To reinforce the illusion of happiness, they are continually delivered soma, a kind of drug serviced by the government to control the citizens' attachment to reality. In this dystopian society, the concept of family loses its meaning since any kind of emotional attachment is assumed to be dangerous and hence restricted; sex is reduced only to a physical need and satisfaction; literature, art and history are seen as the cruelest enemies of the state and strictly banned from access. Instead of all these, the citizens are encouraged to recklessly consume. This dystopian regime ruled by Fordism meets its resistant dissenters, Bernard Marx and John the Savage. Bernard Marx is an Alpha who is genetically programmed to serve the state as an intellectual yet a systematic error occurring during his reproduction enables him to realise the grim reality he is surrounded with. As for John the Savage, unlike Marx, he is neither produced by breeding machines nor raised by the Ford state since he is a natural born living in the primitive part of the state, called "Savage Reservations". These characters, still preserving their humanity despite the dehumanising practices, resist by questioning the principles of the state; however, their resistance is doomed to fail: while Marx is banished from the state in order to prevent his destructive potential, John the Savage chooses to commit suicide after a period of self-exile at the end of the novel.

Written as a critique of the period during which technology was rapidly replacing the labor force and fell into the hands of the government, and the society was gradually canalised to embrace consumerist capitalism, *Brave New World* can be said to be sharing the afore-mentioned dangers of telos-orientation and linear temporality. Realising the threatening potential of the *present*, Huxley launched

out into scheming a worse-possible future alternative for the present. Linear temporality is highly observable in Huxley's text, in which he not only presents a dystopian future but also offers a relatively more preferable alternative, which testifies to the dialectical logic behind dystopia. *Brave New World* under the control of the Fordist state, the dystopian pole of the novel, stands in direct contrast with the Savage Reservations, the utopian pole, that are purged of all technological, social, political and even psychological contamination seen in its dystopian counterpart. As Huxley himself remarks in the 1947 foreword to his novel, "[t]he Savage is offered only two alternatives, an insane life in Utopia², or the life of a primitive in an Indian village, a life more human in some respects" (7). Dissatisfied with the primitive alternative against the dystopian society, however, Huxley further explains his regret for not giving a third alternative as follows:

If I were now to rewrite the book, I would offer the Savage a third alternative. Between the utopian and the primitive horns of his dilemma would lie the possibility of sanity – a possibility already actualised, to some extent, in a community of exiles and refugees from the Brave New World, living within the borders of the Reservation. In this community economics would be decentralist and Henry-Georgian, politics Kropotkinesque cooperative. Science and technology would be used as though, like the Sabbath, they had been made for man, not (as at present and still more so in the Brave New World) as though man were to be adapted and enslaved to them. Religion would be the conscious and intelligent pursuit of man's Final End, the unitive knowledge of the immanent Tao or Logos, the transcendent Godhead or Brahman. And the prevailing philosophy of life would be a kind of Higher Utilitarianism, in which the Greatest Happiness principle would be secondary to the Final End principle – the first question to be asked and answered in every contingency of life being: 'How will this thought or action contribute to, or interfere with, the

² Huxley writes his dystopian novel as a critique of utopia, so he describes the dystopian society in his novel as "Utopia". This study argues that although Huxley's dystopia emerges as a reaction to utopia, it comes up with its own utopia, which is the primitive alternative in the novel.

achievement, by me and the greatest possible number of other individuals, of man's Final End?' (8)

This is the state of future that Huxley desires his present society to transform into. He desires a future community where economy would be prorated, politics cooperative and where technology would be at the service of man and for the benefit of man. This third alternative, though not given in the novel itself, obviously proves the tendency towards a transcendent ideal followed by a linear temporality in Huxley's dystopian vision. The desire for betterment is obviously preserved not for the present which he observes is getting worse but for the future utopian alternative. This makes his dystopian text bear all the threats of utopia.

Following Huxley's work, George Orwell's masterpiece *1984* is among the pioneers of the dystopian genre. Written in 1949, the novel portrays the totalitarian dictatorship of Oceania where, unlike the previous dystopian societies pretending to be caring about the happiness of their citizens, power becomes the only objective of the state. To hold the absolute hegemony, Oceania utilises technology by implementing telescreens everywhere in the country including the private houses of its citizens, manipulates language by making up Newspeak, a limited language which is designed to limit people's thought. People are under constant surveillance not only by means of telescreens keeping track of their each and every movement, but also through the family spies trained to betray those transgressing the state's principles. The sexual activity of the citizens is controlled on the grounds that sex wastes the human energy necessary for the maintenance of the state's power and hence is only allowed for the purpose of reproduction. The thoughts and reality of the citizens are regulated by subjecting them to doublethink, a kind of practice forcing people to simultaneously keep two conflicting beliefs in their minds. Their past and present are reconstructed by manipulating all the previous and current newspapers, textbooks, films and documents. 'Two minutes hate' rituals are performed every day to keep people's hatred alive towards the common enemy, which distracts them from thinking about their present situation and resisting the authority. The nonconformist of this totalitarian regime exerting oppression on every single aspect of life is Winston

Smith, a clerk hired to rewrite historical documents in the Ministry of Truth. In Oceania where the sexual act is regarded as an act of rebellion, Smith's act of resistance happens to be sexual intercourse with Julia, yet another nonconformist who sees herself as a rebel from the waist. As in the previous dystopian novels, their resistance ends with failure: both are arrested by the government and brainwashed with the cruelest techniques until they blindly succumb to the authority of Big Brother.

Orwell, like his predecessors, wrote his novel at a time of political turmoil following the Spanish Civil War, the Spanish Revolution, the rising Stalinism and Nazi practices, World War II and the Cold War years. Orwell was a man who spent a considerable amount of his life as a policeman in Burma, witnessed and even had to implement the laws of an authoritarian political regime. Although there was not such a strict totalitarian regime reigning in the countries at the time, he was sensing the increasing political authority of the Soviet Union, Spain and Germany and became alarmed at these countries' inclination towards the monopoly of power in a single party and hence towards totalitarianism. Thus, he aimed to warn people against such a future possibility by portraying Oceania as a state under the despotic control of Big Brother and people whose lives are under constant surveillance by means of technological devices. *1984* was not merely a critique of the society Orwell was living in; rather, it was a prophecy for a possible future. It not only alerted people to a dystopian future but also offered a better alternative which he preserved for the future: socialism. The whole novel was, in this respect, grounded on the conflict between socialism and totalitarianism. Orwell's text exemplifies closure-orientation because Orwell apparently provisioned for an ideal socialist political regime and wrote his novel to lead people to make provisions against the threats to liberal democracy and to start the transformation initiated in the present society only to reach the ideal state in his agenda.

The telos-orientation and linear temporality observed in these early dystopian texts bring the genre to a transcendent and authoritarian pole whereby the concept of dystopia opens up to a controversial trajectory that does not comply

with its initial motives, which this dissertation perceives as the first moment in the history of dystopia. This transcendence not only implies the existence of a binaristic thinking system sneaking into the concept, but also results in the emergence of some recurring patterns and conventions. The transcendent pole of early dystopia eliminates the likelihood of any individual victory in or escape from the dystopian societies. Each protagonist shows an individual effort to resist the totalitarian nation-state he is immersed in and looks for a way out by carving out a revolutionary space, yet each attempt to overthrow the dystopian system culminates in failure. The inevitability of the protagonists' tragic ends adds another patch to the traditional definition of dystopia. The protagonists of the dystopian novel come closest to becoming modern tragic heroes but they cannot. "Tragic hero", in its broadest sense, designates a character who, despite his heroic or revolutionary deeds to achieve his ideal, brings his own demise due to his tragic flaw. The dystopian protagonists appear to be heroic in their rebellious acts against the corruption and oppression of the totalitarian states and in their tragic ends; nonetheless, they cannot be regarded as truly tragic heroes since it is neither their tragic flaws nor "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" that drag them to their disastrous ends, but the tricky hands of the dystopian writers. This is because most of the twentieth century dystopian writers tend to furnish their dystopian vision with a cruel pessimism and to condemn their protagonists to ultimate failure so that they can increase their texts' influence on the reader. These dystopian writers apparently believe that this shocking effect on the reader will trigger the transformation in the present society to escape the dystopian future depicted in their dystopian texts and to achieve the better alternative instead.

Stripping the dystopian alternative of any possibility of hope and liberation, the early dystopian writers locate hope and liberation only in the *better* alternative. They offer the existing society an either/or option and threatening with the cruelest pessimism and the inevitable failure of any attempt at resistance. Their "transformative potential", as Levitas acknowledges, "depends on locating it in the future, on thinking through the process of transformation from the present, and identifying the potential agents of that transformation" ("Utopia in Dark Times"

14). Since their intentions preserved for the future could only be achieved through a transformative action initiated in the present, they seek to educate people's desire for change for the agenda at the back of their minds by foregrounding a dystopian context where individuals and individual attempts for resistance no longer make sense. Yet this transcendent tendency breeds a contradictory situation. Although the change provisioned for the future can only be achieved through the individual efforts of the whole community, the individual efforts of the protagonists in these dystopian examples are, at every turn, doomed to get nowhere. Nonetheless, the more contradictory these dystopias sound, the more revealing they become in disclosing their underlying agenda. These texts apparently serve as open letters to the present society to prevent them from making the wrong choice since the wrong choice made in the present will culminate in the emergence of a dystopian future depicted in these texts. By condemning the resistant dissenters in the novels to inevitable defeat at the end, they assure that once the dystopian world is created out of today's wrong choices, then there will be no way to overcome it. This kind of dystopia that reserves utopianism for the better alternative while dooming other revolutionary alternatives to failure essentially has strong totalising aspects albeit the fact that it seems to be criticising totalitarianism itself. All totalising systems have a closed nature that is structured upon binary sets and hence reduce differences and contradictions of any kind to negation. The early dystopian texts seem to have adopted such totalising systems that exclude any possibility for furthering revolutionary projects beyond their pre-determined and binaristic agenda. They have become the totalising negation of totalitarianism. Thus, the twentieth century dystopia predominantly bears the risk of being "holistic, social, future-located, committed, and linked to the present by some identifiable narrative of change" (Levitas 15). This is why this dissertation henceforth calls them "transcendent dystopia".

2.2.2. Transgressive Dystopia

“Will perhaps the twenty-first century finally create that new world order which was beyond the capabilities of the twentieth century, at the beginning of which the crisis of modernity became visible?” (3) asks Hans Küng in his book entitled *A Global Ethic For Global Politics and Economics*. The twentieth century was a disillusionment for many, witnessing genocide, wars, terror, epidemic diseases, the Holocaust, national traumas, oppression and apartheid. As suggested by Küng, the century missed many opportunities:

- after the First World War, instead of a new world order and a real ‘league of nations’, there was unprecedented world chaos,
- after the Second World War, instead of a new world order and a truly ‘united nations’, there was unprecedented world division,
- after the collapse of the Soviet Communism, instead of a new world order and a common ‘house of Europe’, there was a new world disorder. (3)

To be sure, this social context facilitated the emergence of dystopias that were inclined to be highly pessimistic. Losing their faith in the twentieth century, thus, critics like Küng instilled a hope for the new-coming century and dreamed that it would be the century to reach transcendent ideals. Yet, the twenty-first century turned out to be another century full of even more terrors. The incident of 9/11, the war waged on terrorism, environmental disasters, 2008 financial meltdown, late capitalism and globalisation made the new century host an outpouring of dystopian works ranging from literature and movies to games. *The Hunger Games* (2008, 2009, 2010), *Divergent* (2011, 2012, 2013) and *Maze Runner* (2009, 2010, 2011) series came one after another as massively popular examples of dystopian fiction and were later filmed and screened, which made them gain even more in popularity. This new millennium also witnessed other fiction-to-movie and comic-to-tv series adaptations like Cormac McCarthy’s *The Road*, David Mitchell’s *Cloud Atlas* (2004), Eric Garcia’s *The Repossession Mambo* (2009) and the black-and-white comic book series *The Walking Dead* (2003-). There has also been a

remarkable rise in the number of dystopian video games like *Battlefield 2142*, *Year Zero*, *BioShock* and *Robotron 2084*.

Much as the contemporary era seemed to be a continuation of the twentieth century in its abundance of terrors and predicaments, it has indeed witnessed a remarkable change in its social formation with the rise of late capitalism and hence dystopian works of this new century have created a new phase in the history of dystopia by differing from those written in the previous century in terms of telos-orientation and temporality. In the 1970s, with the onset of postmodern thought, dystopia also began to take a different turn, following the new trend towards multiplicity, fragmentation and subversion. The principles of transcendence began to shatter with a change in emphasis from telos to process, future to present. This change that has moulded into its mature form in contemporary dystopia nevertheless did not occur all at once; on the contrary, it was an outcome of a gradual but steady transition. This transition from the transcendent dystopia of the twentieth century to contemporary dystopia was made possible through the emergence of a new articulation of dystopia, which appeared in the 1970s as something in between transcendence of the twentieth century and immanence of the 21st century. Moylan and Baccolini became the first critics to recognise this new articulation of dystopia and their distinct features from the twentieth century dystopia with regard to their degree of pessimism. For Moylan and Baccolini,

Although most dystopian texts offer a detailed and pessimistic presentation of the very worst of social alternatives, a few affiliate with a eutopian tendency as they maintain a horizon of hope (or at least invite readings that do); while many are false 'dystopian' allies of Utopia as they retain an anti-utopian disposition that forecloses all utopian possibility; and yet others negotiate a more strategically ambiguous position somewhere along the antinomic continuum. (*Dark Horizons* 6)

To Moylan and Baccolini, the early dystopian pieces seem to have retained “anti-utopian” disposition while those written in the 1970s showed a “eutopian tendency³” and did not entirely leave the glimpse of hope. The grim pessimism, which doomed the rebellious protagonists of transcendent dystopia to an inevitable defeat by totalitarian powers, was then replaced with a utopian possibility. In other words, anti-utopian dystopia was replaced with eutopian dystopias, which were later categorised as “critical dystopias”.

This useful definition of critical dystopia⁴ was first introduced by Sargent 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 worse than contemporary society but that normally includes at least one eutopian enclave or holds out hope that the dystopia can be overcome and replaced with a eutopia” (“US Eutopias” 222). Under the influence of the newly-emerging postmodern thought, these new constellations of dystopia of the 1970s strived to go beyond the monolithic discourses of the age. They left out the utterly pessimistic mode lamenting the failure of achieving the transcendental goal. Instead, they carved a little space for hope and transformation. As Moylan and Baccolini argue, “[t]hese historically specific texts negotiate[d] the necessary pessimism of the generic dystopia with a militant or utopian stance that not only br[oke] through the hegemonic enclosure of the text’s alternative world but also self-reflexively refuse[d] the anti-utopian temptation that lingers in every

³ Lyman Tower Sargent, in his article “Three Faces of Utopianism”, makes a useful discrimination between utopia and eutopia, calling the latter “positive utopia” (9). While utopia is defined as “a non-existent society described in considerable detail and normally located in time and space”, eutopia is considered to be “a non-existent society described in considerable detail and normally located in time and space that the author intended the contemporaneous reader to view as considerably better than the society in which the reader lived” (9).

⁴ One of the motives behind Sargent’s coinage of “critical dystopia” is his idea that the dystopian works of the 1980s *critically* address the problems of the present society with their subversive modulations on content and form. The author of this dissertation, however, argues that the critical dimension cannot be peculiar to a particular form of dystopia but is something inherent in the very concept of dystopia and utopia. In this regard, although the author does not agree with this particular idea of Sargent, she finds this definition quite useful in the sense that it testifies to the fact that the recent constellations of dystopia depict distinct features as against the earlier examples and these features are significant enough to be recognised and to trigger a need for alternative definitions as Sargent does.

dystopian account” (*Dark Horizons* 7). The intentional break from the anti-utopian pessimism marked a change in the content, particularly in the endings of dystopian narratives, making them more open and ambiguous. This change in content is strengthened with a change in the form as well. These narratives began to transgress the boundaries of the dystopian genre by deliberately merging it with other genres, which could also be seen as a microcosm of the strive to go beyond anything that claims of absoluteness or has the risk of turning into a grand narrative. This attempt in the 1970s to go beyond the singularity and hegemony of authoritative discourses and to blur genre boundaries might be claimed to have made dystopia recognisably transgressive and moved it from the transcendent pole that the twentieth century dystopia fell into. In a sense, it paved the way for the emergence of contemporary dystopia that portrays the real break from the plane of transcendence. Therefore, this dissertation calls this form of dystopia transgressive dystopia.

The transgressive stance emerging in the late twentieth century dystopia can be observed in the early works of Ernest Callenbach, Joanna Russ, Ursula Le Guin, Marge Piercy and many others. To illustrate, one can begin with Margaret Atwood’s *Handmaid’s Tale* (1985), one of the best known examples of its kind. Atwood’s feminist text portrays the dystopian future of the United States now depicted as the Republic of Gilead. Presenting a critique of the patriarchal discourse emergent in her present society, Atwood comes up with an extremely religious totalitarianism which reduces marriage to a legal union contracted to increase the number of obedient citizens, and women to empty vessels utilised only for breeding purposes. As in the early examples of the genre, the society is highly striated, separating particularly women into several categories with regard to their roles in society: Wives, Marthas as servants, handmaids as breeding vessels, Aunts as guardians and overseers of the handmaids, Jezebels as prostitutes and Unwomen as workers in the colonies. In this dystopian future, not only women but also men are subject to strict rules of the totalitarian state, banned from reading, writing, talking and even loving. The resistant dissenter of Atwood’s critical dystopia is a handmaid, Offred, named after the Commander

Fred with whom she is assigned to have regular sexual intercourses to breed a child. Offred violates the rules of the Gilead by having secret liaisons with the Commander, setting an emotional bond with Nick and, more importantly, secretly reading and keeping a diary.

Although most parts of the novel appear to be proceeding like a transcendent dystopia, the novel foregrounds its transgressive stance most prominently through its ending. Whereas the earlier dystopias all culminate in the destruction of the protagonists that rebel against the authority, Atwood's dystopia ends in ambiguity: Offred, scheming an escape plan with her lover Nick, steps in the van of the Eyes, wondering whether she has been betrayed and reported to the Gilead by Nick or she has just taken the first step to her new life of freedom. As Moylan and Baccolini remark, "by rejecting the traditional subjugation of the individual at the end of the novel, the critical dystopia opens a space of contestation and opposition for those collective 'ex-centric' subjects whose class, gender, race, sexuality, and other positions are not empowered by hegemonic rule" (7). Likewise, Atwood introduces a positive impulse into her dystopian vision by not condemning her hero to a tragic defeat and instead by opting for a vague ending. The vagueness of the novel is even more intensified with the addition of historical notes following the ending. The historical documents confirm that the Gilead regime is now over and Offred's recordings are a subject of study; yet, what is problematic is that these historians are all male and they are all inclined to interpret and reconstruct the manuscript presumably from a patriarchal point of view. However transgressive the novel is in its striving to disturb the authority of patriarchal discourse and the binarism of the previous dystopias, it still falls into the trap of transcendence with its problematic ending. To be more precise, much as this dystopian vision preserves an impulse of hope to a certain extent, the ending "may not be so optimistic after all" (Booker *Dystopian Impulse* 83).

2.2.3. Immanent Dystopia

Obviously, no matter how intentionally and self-reflexively dystopian writers of the 1970s sought to break free from the chains of transcendence, the actual release could only be achieved in the new century characterised by late capitalism and globalisation. This break from closure-orientation in favour of *process-orientation* and from future-orientation in favour of transformation in and for the *here-and-now* paved the way for the emergence of contemporary dystopia as a new constellation of dystopia. Contemporary dystopia is assumed to be employing the same strategies with the transcendent dystopia of the twentieth century, i.e. portraying an alternate worse society set in the future. But nevertheless it does not always share the same motives with the earlier instances of the genre. This difference, first of all, derives from the fact that the alternate societies depicted in these newly-emerging dystopia of the age are not imaginary representations of *a possible future* that is *worse* than the present, but imaginary *re-presentations of the present* that apparently could not get worse. Contemporary dystopian writers defamiliarise the present to break the automatic perception of the people who have become unable to see the grim reality of the present society. This is because they are probably of the opinion that one cannot escape the prison if one does not realise he is in one. To clarify the point, it might be useful to draw an analogy with Baudrillard's well-known illustration of Disneyland. Baudrillard, in his *Simulation and Simulacra* (1981), refers to Disneyland as both a fantasy world, wherein people enjoy themselves like children, and as the real world and the real life experience of the Americans who have become obedient slaves of consumerist capitalism. Baudrillard exemplifies Disneyland as the third order of simulation, that is, as a sign concealing the absence of the reality: "Disneyland exists in order to hide that it is the 'real' country, all of 'real' America that is Disneyland (a bit like prisons are there to hide that it is the social in its entirety, in its banal omnipresence, that is carceral). Disneyland is presented as imaginary in order to make us believe that the rest is real" (12). Since people cannot differentiate the dystopian reality of Disneyland (of the present society) from its

utopian and fantastic pretences, contemporary dystopias *exist in order to highlight that it is the 'real' country, all of the 'real' world that is a dystopia*. Just as Disneyland is a microcosm of real America, contemporary dystopia can be regarded as a microcosm of the present.

Since contemporary dystopia has now become only a critique of and resistance to the present society rather than a warning for the future, the orientation unavoidably shifts from the future to the here-and-now, necessitating a transformative action in and for the present. Faced with the dystopian vision already existing in the present society, contemporary dystopian writers do not have the motivation to save the future by creating changes in their societies. Nor do they dream of a better society as an alternative to the present one. On the contrary, what they dream of is merely to create a transformative action both individually and collectively in order to save the present. The dystopian texts written in this new millennium, thus, no longer foreground a progressive movement towards a future ideal; rather they stand out with their process-orientation and effectivity in making people aware of their potential and the forces of life to challenge, change and create new ways of living in the present itself. These new ways of living are, however, distant from the binaristic alternatives inherent in transcendent dystopia and from ambiguous attempts observed in transgressive dystopia. These alternatives are multiple, undefined and yet affirmative. To be more precise, they have abandoned their totalising tendencies by offering multiple modes of existence and ways of resistance rather than dictating either/or choices. These alternative modes are not pre-determined in the sense that they do not gesture towards a transcendent ideal. This not only prevents them from once again falling into the trap of totalitarianism but also makes them relatively more convenient in terms of dystopia's attempt to create a change in the present. In this respect, the project behind contemporary dystopia is no longer based on the idea of telos but on the here-and-now function and affirmative process of transformation. This emphasis on the process and the here-and-now not only eliminates the idea of a transcendent telos but also abolishes linear temporality that the earlier forms of dystopia could not avoid. The increasing

emphasis on the present and the disappearance of the future from dystopian scenes resolve the strict segmentation between the past, present and future, bringing about instead a fully potential present that manifests in itself both the past and the future.

These changes in closure-orientation and linear temporality undoubtedly underpin changes in the plot devices and the endings of contemporary dystopian narratives. First of all, dystopian writers no longer feel the urge to locate dystopian societies in a remote future. Dystopian societies are often observed to be located in the present. Even if some writers tend to follow the convention to locate them in the future, they do not strongly underline time reference. Secondly, the rebellious protagonists of transcendent dystopia almost always end up with a total defeat by the totalitarian nation-states, and this grim pessimism that allows for no possibility of victory, in return, results in the perception of these dystopias as *anti-utopian dystopia*. Departing from the tragic ends of the previous dystopian examples, transgressive dystopia tends to have ambiguous and open endings, which gives a small hint of hope; however, this ambiguity can become problematic. Most of the time, these narratives end in the middle of the protagonists' attempt to explore alternative ways of escape from the dystopian world they are stuck in. Although they do not condemn their attempts to unavoidable defeat and, instead, do give voice to their resistance, these novels leave it vague whether the protagonists really manage to escape and find happiness in their alternative lives. Even if there seems to be a promise of victory and emancipation in these transgressive dystopias, this victory is not one gained *within* the totalitarian system: the glimpse of victory in these dystopias, rather than allowing for the possibility of change and transformation in the dystopian society, only stands for the exploration of transcendent alternatives against and outside the existing one. This is indeed the main point in which the endings of contemporary dystopias become distinct from those of the earlier instances. Contemporary dystopia is mostly inclined to enable protagonists to succeed in their resistance. Their resistance is not, however, confined to secret rebellious acts or clandestine escape plans; instead, they resist by finding means of fight and

flight within and against the present system and by exploring the ways to destroy it. Contemporary dystopia is written to make people realise that they are living in dystopia itself and should take action to change their current society. For the betterment of the society contemporary dystopia does not suggest pre-determined and fixed schemas or alternatives but instead it functions to raise people's awareness of their *own* capacity and of the potentiality of life to transform and create. This function is only achieved by showing people the glimpses of transformation, successful resistance and new creations in dystopian worlds.

Suzanne Collins' *The Hunger Games* (2008) series could be given as an example to clarify contemporary dystopia's break from transcendent dystopia in terms of its process-orientation and its emphasis on the present. In Collins' first novel, the gap between the present society and the dystopian future is not as huge as it is in Orwell's *1984*. Whereas Orwell depicts a prophetic vision that is likely to happen in the near future, Collins bluntly portrays a defamiliarised version of the present. In *Hunger Games*, a future society is presented without a specific time reference under the control of the Capitol, in which citizens become the victims and puppets of a reality show based on violent competition. The Capitol organising the hunger games selects a male and a female teenager from all of its 12 regions to attend a reality contest. These teenagers are sent to a remote forest wherein they have to fight with one another to be the only survivor of the death game. The lives of these children, now turned into a game, are broadcast to the whole world. Physical beauty, prettiness and charm become crucial to attract the attention of the rich, to get sponsorships and to extend their time of survival in the hunger games. Much as Collins has situated this imaginary world on a different space in a remote future, what is depicted in this dystopian world is indeed an imaginary re-presentation of the present. It is undeniably true that today's reality shows choose ordinary people for the entertainment of the masses, exploit their lives and ruin their privacy, and people even volunteer to appear on screens at the cost of being the puppets of media. Apparently there is no agenda designed for the future in *Hunger Games* series; instead, there is an agenda for transformation in the present, which is illustrated by the protagonist Katniss Everdeen. Katniss

introduces into the dystopia vision of the Capitol new lines of flight and new ways of seeing. She uses the weapon of the reality show against itself without internalising its doctrines. She survives in the hunger games but her survival does not promise an alternative ideal situated in the future but promises a way of flight and of resistance in the present only to cure the present. *The Hunger Games* does not intend to achieve some pre-determined ideals but works to create an awareness in the minds of people, to break their automatic perception to see the dystopia they are literally experiencing and to make them realise that they can find their own ways of resistance and their own lines of flight within the dystopian world itself. Thus, the novel is not future-oriented but is concerned with the potentiality of the present. It is not closed or idealistic in the sense that it does not present a single alternative; on the contrary, it is processual since it glimpses hope for transformation in the *here-and-now* in myriad ways.

Veronica Roth's *Divergent* (2011) is set in a similar context, in future Chicago where the society is separated into rigid fractions, each of which corresponds to a particular virtue: the Erudite for the smart and serious, the Amity for the amicable and cheerful, the Abnegation for the devoted and helpful, the Dauntless for the courageous and bold, the Candor for the decent and truthful. The novel, like *Hunger Games*, disguises the existing predicament of the present society in its portrayal of a highly-striated social structure. The novel sheds light upon the implicit categorisation and control mechanisms prevailing in contemporary societies. The five fractions strictly tested and determined by the government are quite down-to-earth, holding a mirror into today's society where you can see prototypes of each category: the Amities, in the guise of Greenpeacers representing peace and energy in life or those figures on big screens pretending to behave as if everything were safe and sound in the world, the Erudites in the guise of those assuming that they can save the world with their macbook pros, the Abnegation in the guise of those slyly trying to canalise people into their own groups, charities or communities by pretending to be selfless and wholly committed to other people's well-being and happiness, the Dauntless in the guise of soldiers and police officers who, despite their pretension of fidelity to

their society, serve only the government's interests, and the fractionless in the guise of invisible lower-class masses living in poverty. In Roth's dystopian world, the role of the citizens in society is far more privileged than their role in their families, which inevitably eliminates the idea of individuality for the sake of government. The government of this dystopian world prevents its citizens from realising the dreary reality of their situation by breeding a fierce competition and a sick enmity between the fractions. Maintaining the perpetuity of its power by first classifying people and then creating a competition between these classes, the government utilises cruel ways of marginalisation and punishment for those who pose a threat to the authority. The major source of threat in this dystopian society is apparently the ones who resist being categorised and dare to question the underlying system. Those people are labeled as Divergent and condemned to death immediately after they are discovered.

Roth's novel, in its depiction of social segmentation and control mechanisms, seems to bear many resemblances to transcendent and transgressive dystopian examples. Yet the novel departs remarkably from these earlier instances in terms of the disappearance of the wide gap between the present society and the future dystopian society, the means of resistance and its allowance for the victory of alternative ways of resistance. Bridging the gap between the existing society and the dystopian alternative, the novel necessarily avoids the danger of linear temporality which most of the time culminates in the trap of transcendence. Moreover, *Divergent* neither dooms its protagonist to an ultimate failure as in transcendent dystopia nor leaves its ending in ambiguity as in transgressive dystopia. On the contrary, it ends with a promise of hope and liberation, letting its protagonist Beatrice Prior succeed in her resistance against the government. Beatrice Prior is a divergent who refuses to act and think in a certain way determined by one's fraction since her mind flows and moves in multiple ways, which constitutes a huge intimidation for the government, whose power is based on the absolute control of people's thoughts and acts. Being Divergent is a resistance in itself on the grounds that the Divergent do not stand for either/or choices but for the plurality as opposed to the monolithic discourse of the

government. This plurality accommodates a potentiality to break free from the dictated modes of thinking and to revolt against the oppressive authority. Without proposing a transcendent alternative against the existing one, the novel culminates in Beatrice's successful attempt at the demolition of the authority figures. The novel proves to be an immanent dystopia since it both gives voice to the previously unvoiced subjects and allows them to succeed in their attempts from within the dystopian society itself. The most distinguishing asset of this immanent dystopia is, however, the implication that there is still a space for hope and liberation in the dystopian world. This implication of hope and liberation is established only with such an ending in which the resistant dissenter not only explores ways of resistance and lines of flight in the existing system but also achieves to subvert the structures of power and make positive alterations and transformations without trying to escape or seek other power structures to hold on to.

Charlie Brooker's TV series *Black Mirror* (2011-) is among those dystopian pieces that present contemporary phenomena in a defamiliarised context and examine the alternative ways of resistance against the current power structures with a glimpse of hope. One of the groundbreaking episodes of this dystopian series is "Fifteen Million Merits" in which an alternative version of entertainment shows is depicted in a highly sarcastic manner. This dystopian world literally holds a black mirror into the present entertainment world, a world that imprisons the masses to senseless apps at the cost of losing their humanity. In "Fifteen Million Merits," people are to exercise on bikes that power big television screens in order to gain the new currency called Merits. They spend these merits buying processed food and non-existing new apps for their Doubles, namely their computer simulations. The rest of the day is spent by eating lunch and then doing nothing in their cells covered fully by screens. The advertisements are the only thing that interrupt this mundane existence. During their daily activities, these people are forced to watch advertisements of various kinds such as Wraith Babes that promotes porn, Hot Shot that is a kind of talent show and Fattax or Botherguts that are entertainment shows on mocking and ridiculing fat people.

These advertisements cannot be skipped or resumed since those who deny watching them are to pay a penalty fine and lose their credits. Those who cannot regularly pedal bikes, use their merits economically or lose their merits by refusing to watch adverts are called Fatties, labeled as the lowest class of the community and subjected to constant humiliation and abuse. This dystopian society is indeed a horrifying re-presentation of today's working conditions, a portrayal of officers who pursue a mundane existence that is nothing but a vicious circle of coming and going to the office, having lunch, earning money and spending it on unnecessary things, yet wishing to earn and spend more, sleeping, waking up to come and go to the office all over again to earn and spend again.

Among people submissively yielding to the dominant power structure in "Fifteen Million Merits" like Dustin (who enjoys himself with porn adverts and fat-hating entertainment shows,) red-haired man (who loses all his humanity and decision-making capabilities), Bing is the only one who dares to question the system he is immersed in. He is the first to resist the mundane existence the people in this futuristic society are condemned to, and his resistance is acted upon with a glimpse of humanity that is on the verge of disappearance. Hearing Abi Khan's singing in the bathroom, Bing draws his first line of resistance against the system by showing an act of inner conscience. He gives his fifteen million merits which he inherited from his deceased brother to help Abi to join Hot Shot to save herself from the slavish life of cycling. Believing that there is nothing real in this dystopian world to buy with his merits, he wishes to be a part of Abi's dream and liberation by becoming a singer. Upon Abi's yielding to the cruel system by accepting the Hot Shot judges' persuasion to become a porn star and her appearance in porn shows all over the screens, Bing's rage against the system mounts up, leading to his second line of resistance. He saves fifteen million merits by cycling in two months to buy another entry ticket into Hot Shot for revenge. He rages against the dystopian world of entertainment shows, of celebrity-obsession freaks and of consumerist masses with his final burst of speech. For the first time, someone talks about the grim *reality* of buying, consuming and being consumed. This resistant dissenter discloses the very fact that people are

suffocated by the hyper-reality created by the entertainment industry and immersed in increasingly-proliferating shopping mania. The episode ends with a painful note that those people in the dystopian future may not have understood the underlying message in Bing's speech and even this speech of resistance might have been perceived as a kind of commodity to consume. Nevertheless, Bing is not devastated by the cruel consumerist system, either. He utilises the powerful means of the cruel system against itself and succeeds in his attempt. At the end of the episode, he is seen enjoying his natural orange juice, something that he could by no means have attained in his previous slavish life of cycling. This dystopian piece, thus, becomes a powerful stroke in the contemporary reader's mind to see the *reality* destroyed by hyper reality and still deserves to be labeled as an example of an immanent dystopia. It owes its immanence not only to the merging of the past, present and future with its futuristic re-presentation of contemporary phenomena but also to its abandonment of a transcendent ideal proposed as a foil to the present society. Instead, this dystopian work, as in other episodes of *Black Mirror* series, illustrates the possibility of multiple lines of resistance against the system without holding on the fixed reference points. Rather than positing an alternative discourse which is equally closed and restricting, it properly functions to depict how the means of the dominant discourse to maintain power can become the means of resistance.

As illustrated in these examples, contemporary dystopia appears to be departing from previous dystopian examples, which, according to this dissertation, indicates a new phase in the history of dystopia. This newly-emerging genre shatters the relation between the means and ends of dystopia, i.e. between dystopia and the idea of telos. Since the idea of a teleological end or a closure necessarily kills the possibility of openness and heterogeneity, contemporary dystopia breaks away from this trap. It wages a war against all systems of representation, closed power structures and taken-for-granted monolithic discourses, yet this war does not depend on an ideal projection designed for the future. It does not intend to move towards a future destination but effectively functions in the infinite present. Contemporary dystopia does not squeeze and

limit the virtuality of the present with projections for the future; rather, it paves the way for the opening of multifarious alternative spaces of revolution and resistance without privileging any over the other. To be more precise, it serves as a space of diversity where the idea of revolution and resistance is not committed to a fixed reference point which is highly likely to turn into an equally oppressive and monolithic discourse. The future-orientation that presupposes an underlying idyllic model is replaced with process-orientation or eventfulness that underlines the urgency and possibility of transformation in the present dystopian world. Choosing commonplace protagonists rather than heroic figures and enabling their rebellious attempts to come off, this newly-emerging genre promises a glimpse of hope for a change in the here-and-now. This glimpse of hope is, however, not grounded upon its transcendence. It is there only to create a powerful influence and affect on the contemporary reader to break their automatisations preventing them from realising the real nature of the present society and to take an individual action to change their present society. It no longer has anything to do with end, means, design or program; it now constitutes the diverse movements of the infinite. Divorcing itself from the trap of closure and linear temporality, contemporary dystopia finally breaks free from its transcendence that locks the possibility of a change into the future realm and hence it becomes a transformative process in itself. To be more precise, liberation from the chains of transcendence marks a move towards the plane of immanence and turns contemporary dystopia into an integral part of the moment of change in the here-and-now. This is why this dissertation calls it immanent dystopia, which will be clarified in detail in the following section.

2.3. Towards a Deleuzian Definition of Contemporary Dystopia

This dissertation argues that traditional conceptions of dystopia fall short in defining contemporary dystopia and addressing its distinct features, and that a new working definition may be made in the light of Deleuzian philosophy. Deleuze and Guattari's works appear to be a good fit for a novel definition,

considering their emphasis on the notions of *immanence* and *the virtual present*. Deleuze and Guattari do not probe into the concept of dystopia in their philosophical framework but briefly note their opinions regarding the perception of utopia in their book entitled *What is Philosophy?*. This dissertation utilises these ideas in its delineation of the concept of dystopia, seeing that utopia and dystopia are already close siblings and can even be used interchangeably due to their common tendencies and characteristics, as discussed in the previous sections. This section of the dissertation will elaborate Deleuze's and Guattari's comments on the concept of utopia, and shed light upon the theoretical background of the distinction between transcendent and immanent dystopia within the context of Deleuzian philosophy. The first sub-section, accordingly, will give us the principles of what Deleuze and Guattari call the plane of transcendence and the plane of immanence, and discuss how there has been a shift between these planes in the history of dystopia. This theoretical discussion will be followed by another sub-section which suggests a new concept, "dysterritory", that foregrounds the role of deterritorialisation in the passage from the plane of transcendence to the plane of immanence. The introduction of the concept of deterritorialisation into the concept of dystopia brings to the fore the idea that contemporary dystopia can be a new phase in the history of dystopia, a revolutionary enterprise which can create affective happenings on the dystopian societies. Then, contemporary dystopia could be interpreted as a "resistance to the present" in a Deleuzian sense, considering Deleuze's tantalising remarks on the immediacy of political and social action in the here-and-now. To this end, the third sub-section will reflect on the ways in which contemporary dystopia manifests in itself a potential to resist the present and create a "people to come" to find a way out through the here-and-now dystopia. The idea of resistance to the present and a "people to come" might be regarded as a manifestation of minoritarian politics drawn against majoritarian practices. The projection of such minoritarian politics in contemporary dystopia is highly reminiscent of minor literature. Thus, the fourth sub-section will explore the dynamic between contemporary dystopia and minoritarian politics and the question of whether contemporary dystopia could be considered a minor literature

in its tendency towards minoritarian politics. If contemporary dystopia functions as a minor literature which is basically defined by its political immediacy, collective value and deterritorialising mission, its political, collective and revolutionary dimension requires a new understanding of the contemporary dystopian writer: the dystopian writer not as a passive foreseer of a future dystopia but an active healer of the here-and-now dystopia. In this regard, the last subsection of this chapter will delve into the idea of the contemporary dystopian writer as a clinician of the society, portraying a figure of a writer that not only unveils the shortcomings of the society but also offers positive cures for these shortcomings.

2.3.1. Dystopia's Move Towards the Plane of Immanence

In *What is Philosophy?* (1994), Deleuze and Guattari draw attention to the constant “risk of a restoration, and sometimes a proud affirmation, of transcendence” in the concept of utopia and dystopia and hence distinguish “between authoritarian utopias, or utopias of transcendence, and immanent, revolutionary, libertarian utopias” (100). As they suggest, an orientation towards the future and a pre-determined end in the traditional concept of utopia and dystopia runs the risk of transcendence and closure whilst the shift towards the present and process-orientation in the contemporary dystopia promises the glimpse of revolution and the plane of immanence. The concepts of immanence and transcendence loom large in Deleuzian philosophy. Transcendence could be considered in relation to its common usage in Western metaphysics, suggesting the existence of a centre, logocentrism and binarism. The plane of transcendence is, for Deleuze and Guattari, where one creates a foundation or a fixed reference point for his image of thought. Any ground or origin that comes along with binarism hints at transcendence since it is the plane of transcendence that always produces the illusion of a distinction between body and mind, interior and exterior, inside and outside. Transcendence reduces the multiplicity and virtuality of life into closed forms and organisations and imposes limits on its infinity.

Deleuze and Guattari thus remark that “[t]ranscendence enters as soon as movement of the infinite is stopped” (*What is Philosophy?* 47). Life, for them, is in essence imbued with infinite flows, movements, diversities and chaos, and hence is not suited to closed forms and organisms. The chaotic nature of life as the infinite is forced to be shaped, organised and moved towards the plane of transcendence. “Transcendence”, as Todd May points out, “freezes living, makes it coagulate and lose its flow; it seeks to capture the vital difference that outruns all thought and submit it to the judgment of a single perspective, a perspective that stands outside difference and gathers it into manageable categories. Transcendence substitutes knowledge for thought” (27). Due to this tendency towards categorising and organising, the plane of transcendence is also called the plane of organisation by Deleuze and Guattari.

Unlike transcendence, however, immanence could be said to be corresponding to life itself, which is, as Deleuze underlines, “the immanence of immanence, absolute immanence: it is complete power, complete bliss” (*Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life* 27). Immanence is then a kind of force that is capable of addressing the nature of life and hence as powerful, infinite, creative, transformative and affirmative as life itself. The plane of immanence is thus what breaks free from the tyranny of transcendence which organises and squeezes the cherishable chaos of the infinite into singular categories and organisms. It is “no longer a teleological plane, a design, but a geometrical plane, an abstract drawing, which is like the section of all the various forms, whatever their dimensions” (Deleuze *Dialogues* 93-94). The plane of immanence lets the flow of difference run in all directions and enables rhizomatic and endless connections with all speeds. Yet these connections do not hold on to any fixed point, foundation or a rigid system of relations. There is a constant jump from one connection to another, from one assemblage to another, which ceaselessly creates new relations. In the plane of immanence, “there are always many infinite movements caught within each other, each folded in the others, so that the return of one instantaneously relaunches another in such a way that the plane of immanence is ceaselessly being woven, like a gigantic shuttle” (Deleuze and Guattari, *WP* 38). It is always in

movement, diversity and variation just like life itself. The plane of immanence designates the rejection of singularity for the sake of multiplicity, the rejection of forms for the sake of connections, the rejection of the idea of telos for the sake of process, and the rejection of binaristic either/or choices for the sake of endless and...and...ands. It is indeed “[t]hinking with AND, instead of thinking IS, instead of thinking for IS” (Deleuze *Dialogues* 57) since the “and” in the plane of immanence is what abandons the hegemony of Being and One in favour of the infinite path of rhizomatic relations.

What invites contemporary dystopia to the plane of immanence and makes it immanent is first of all these texts’ novel adoption of time; to be more precise, the emphasis on the here-and-now. Immanent dystopia’s focus on the present represents the full potentiality of the forces inherent in the present, yet the present that is mentioned in this context is not a slice of linear temporality as it is assumed to be in earlier examples, but an intensity of multiple durations. This misrecognition of time as linear temporality, and of the present and the future as separated slices of this temporality is one of the reasons why Deleuze and Guattari reject the traditional conception of utopia and dystopia. In Deleuzian philosophy, as Ronald Bogue puts it, “utopia is a bad concept because it posits a pre-formed blueprint of the future, whereas a genuinely creative future has no predetermined shape” (*Deleuze on Literature* 77). What Deleuze and Guattari mean by “creative future” is “not a historical future, not even a utopian history, [but] the infinite Now, the *nun* that Plato already distinguished from every present: the Intensive or Untimely, not an instant but a becoming” (*What is Philosophy?* 112). Such a perception of the future signals how different time zones can simultaneously exist, which is indeed a radical break from linear succession and segmentation: the past, the present and the future are not sequential but co-existent. Time has no origin or no end; it exists in the present with its power to produce new relations. For Deleuze and Guattari, it is always the present which is a dynamic interpenetration of the past and the future and is full of multiplicities and intensities while the future always remains unpredictable. As such, unlike their predecessors, today’s dystopia tends to hinge upon the notion of the *Now* not only by presenting a

defamiliarised re-presentation of the present society but also by preserving the hope of transformation not for the future but for the present since it is the present that bears within itself all the creative power and that requires a creative transformation. More accurately, the present, in a Deleuzian sense, is beyond the present.

The weaker emphasis on the future in immanent dystopia foregrounds another characteristic that brings it closer to the plane of immanence, which is “process-orientation” replacing “telos-orientation”. The process-orientation of immanent dystopia corresponds to the creation of affects or the idea of eventfulness in a Deleuzian sense. The aim of literature and art is, for Deleuze, to create affects, percepts and blocs of sensation on the reader to initiate an immanent transformation. “Affect” is an intensity, a mode of becoming or an affirmative energy that transgresses boundaries of all kinds and triggers new creations, new modes of existence and new possibilities. It is not a singular configuration but a rhizomatic multiplicity of inner experiences that is innately felt and is immanently working. It is the change itself, a change that is not towards a pre-determined schema but towards undetermined and unshaped possibilities. As Deleuze and Guattari note, affects are more than feelings and sensations; they are “*beings* whose validity lies in themselves and exceeds any lived” (*What is Philosophy?* 164). Exceeding itself and any other sensual experience, affect disrupts the taken-for-granted notions, beliefs and habits and instead paves the way for a multiplicity of perspectives and possibilities of life. Affect, in Deleuzian sense, “operates as a dynamic of desire within any assemblage to manipulate meaning and relations, inform and fabricate desire, and generate intensity – yielding different affects in any given situation or event. Perception is a non-passive continual moulding, driven and given by affect” (Colman 13). It is a state of becoming which promises a loosening from the chains of the Cartesian understanding of subjectivity, language and time, betraying binaristic relations, subverting fixed meaning, moving away from the perception of time as a sequence and releasing desire from the ties of idealism. It can also be considered as “*varieties*” that the writers draw from chaos and that constitute a reproduction of

the sensory in the organ but set up a being of the sensory, a being of sensation, on an anorganic plane of composition that is able to restore the infinite” (Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?* 202-203).

The notion of affect evidently conflicts with the notion of telos in the conventional understanding of utopia and dystopia. As such, Deleuze and Guattari underline the fact that “[u]topia is not a good concept because even when opposed to History it is still subject to it and lodged within it as an ideal or motivation” (*What is Philosophy?* 110). Instead of a transcendent contingency upon an ideal or an end, immanent dystopia might be characterised in terms of its emphasis on the process and the creation of affects and new rhizomatic possibilities. What matters in this new conception of dystopia is then not a restricted “desire for a better way of living and being” as Levitas suggests, but a free-flowing desire, proliferating in all directions without a determinate destination as Deleuze and Guattari suggest. This brings to the fore the idea that transcendent dystopia blocks and limits the flow of desire since desire is here only for a particular telos. In Deleuzian philosophy, however, desire is immanent and infinite just as life itself and cannot be reduced into binaristic choices. The notion of telos is against the nature of desire: in transcendent dystopia desire stands for the telos of pleasure, yet it is indeed desire itself that manifests all intensities of pleasure. As Constantin V. Boundas avers, “[a] process without telos, intensity without intention, desire [...] has its ‘specific perfection’ in itself” (16). It is undeniable that transcendent dystopia is a manifestation of desire as Levitas’ famous definition also suggests, yet it tends to kill its creative energy by reducing it into a closed form and freezes its free flow by repressing and canalising it towards an idyllic model. Thus, the ‘specific perfection’ of desire comes out only in immanent dystopia which allows it to flow in its all potentialities rather than robbing it of its power and fascizing its intensities. More precisely, immanent dystopia does not suggest fixed points, forms and schemas and push desire into these organisational structure; it rather frees desire from its transcendental chains and releases its affirmative energy to change, transform and create new lines of becoming.

Rather than creating diverse forms of life, transcendent dystopia relies upon an arborescent system that squeezes its whole energy into binaristic compositions. The arborescent system is modelled on a tree, suggesting the existence of a root, a centre or a foundation from which all the existing modes of thoughts are derived. The notion of a centre immediately brings the notion of margins or the notion of the other to the fore since the existence of the centre is predicated upon the existence of margins. This existential reliance culminates not only in the formulation of binary oppositions such as white/non-white, male/ female, good/evil but in the establishment of a hierarchy between these binary pairs. Deleuze and Guattari clarify the tree-like, binaristic and hierarchical model of the arborescent system as follows:

The tree and root inspire a sad image of thought that is forever imitating the multiple on the basis of a centred or segmented higher unity. If we consider the set, branches-roots, the trunk plays the role of *opposed segment* for one of the subsets running from bottom to top: this kind of segment is a 'link dipole,' in contrast to the 'unit dipoles' formed by spokes radiating from a single centre. Even if the links themselves proliferate, as in the radicle system, one can never get beyond the One-Two, and fake multiplicities. Regenerations, reproductions, returns, hydras, and medusas do not get us any further. Arborescent systems are hierarchical systems with centres of significance and subjectification. (*Thousand Plateaus* 16)

Transcendent dystopia as a manifestation of the arborescent system could be said to be proceeding through such One-Two dichotomies. The major dichotomy in transcendent dystopia is the one between the future dystopian world and its grand alternative. Although the early dystopian writers seem to be drawing a portrait of a future dystopian world –which they fear their present world will soon turn into– with the traces of the present, they yearn for an opposite portrait: a non-totalitarian, non-oppressive, non-patriarchal, non-dystopian (namely a utopian) world. This ideal at the back of their minds leaves no space for their protagonists to resist and succeed in the future dystopian worlds. Hope, bliss and peace become beholden to an either/or choice: you either dream and strive for the grand

alternative and find happiness, or you are doomed to fail in the future dystopian world.

Contrary to the dangerous metaphysics implied in transcendent dystopia, immanent dystopia finds itself on the plane of immanence due to its adoption of a rhizomatic system⁵. Rhizomatic system is not grounded upon a tree-root structure but is modelled on a network of infinite connections. It does not point at a binaristic system of thought, a beginning, an end, a cause or an effect. A rhizome constantly establishes new connections: it does not assume a point or a position since the only position or point it can embody is a line of connection and of multiplicity. In a rhizomatic system, there is no fixed centre that organises these connections; rather they proliferate in multiple directions. Immanent dystopia's potential to produce infinite new possibilities of life lies in its rhizomatic system. Unlike the either/or mandate dictated in transcendent dystopia, immanent dystopia offers endless and-and options. Abandoning the hold on binary oppositions, it does not restrict its protagonists to two poles; rather, it allows for a multiplicity of choices. Yet these choices are not pre-determined. The new dystopia produced in the contemporary era no longer hides an underlying agenda against the dystopian world since the existence of such an agenda would necessarily suggest an orientation towards the plane of transcendence. Just like Deleuze and Guattari's own approach in their philosophy, immanent dystopia is not concerned with the restoration of a metaphysics. It does not portray and impose the necessity of a grand alternative they yearn for. To the contrary, it re-presents the present community to which it resists and offers multiple ways of resistance and alternative modes of life. Thus, the protagonists in immanent dystopia are given the chance to draw their own lines of flight from the norms and prescriptions of the dystopian system.

⁵ The concept of "rhizome" will be clarified in more detail in its relation to the capitalist social machine on the upcoming pages.

2.3.2. Dysterritory of Immanent Dystopia

The potential of a dystopia to create affect in a Deleuzian sense depends on its potential of deterritorialisation. Deterritorialisation is a term Deleuze and Guattari use first in their mutual work, *Anti-Oedipus* (1972). Since Deleuze and Guattari use the term in several ways in terms of its functions, it would be more reasonable to clarify how it functions rather than explicating what it means, which could also be a path to follow in the explanation of other terms employed by these philosophers in this study. In its broadest sense, the process of deterritorialisation is a process of dethroning fixed points of views, perceptions, freeing subjects, objects, bodies or relations from the trap of organisation, going beyond binary oppositions, undoing constructed forms and organisms, liberating desire to move in all the flows and paving the way for creative assemblages and revolutionary lines of flight. In the conclusion part of *A Thousand Plateaus* where Deleuze and Guattari clear up the basic concepts crucial to the understanding of their philosophy, deterritorialisation is treated as a process or movement by which one departs from a particular territory (508). The concept of “territory”, in this context, does not refer to a tangible and sedentary place, but it stands for a mutable site. It does often have an organising principle that makes it hold on to a specific time, space, objects and objectives. To preserve its organising centre, it may often draw strict boundaries and construct fixed subjectivities, representations and significations. That is, territory basically forms a rigid system or an organisation which could be linguistic, social, political, conceptual and even corporeal. Nevertheless, this is not to say that a territory cannot abandon or switch its organising centre and gravitate towards other formations. It is the act of deterritorialisation that makes it abandon its organising centre or enables one to escape a particular territory. In this respect, deterritorialisation is, in its most general sense, a movement that brings about change.

To understand how and why the act of deterritorialisation functions, it is crucial to initially know about its nature. Deterritorialisation could be thought of as the forces of dissolution and dislocation in any territory. Since every territory is

exposed to a certain set of arborescent structures and codes on the level of subjectivity, space, language, conception and so on, the act of deterritorialisation suggests a movement away from these codes and structures from within. This movement is *from within* primarily because its forces are omnipresent in any territory as a potential to go beyond or renew itself. In this sense, as Deleuze and Guattari stress out, the act of deterritorialisation is “identical to the earth itself” (*Thousand Plateaus* 143). Just like the earth which has the full potential of recovering itself, the act of deterritorialisation is capable of resuming the flow of energy and creativity that is congealed in any territory. Put succinctly, it turns the territory, which has become a site of fixity and immobility, into a site of possibilities. It is thus what Deleuze and Guattari call an “operation of the line of flight” (*Thousand Plateaus* 593), a process of “coming undone” (*Anti-Oedipus* 367) and “a line of escape by which it escapes itself and makes its enunciations or its expressions take flight and disarticulate” (*Kafka* 86).

Deleuze and Guattari do not provide a fixed schema to explicate the steps of deterritorialisation, yet they lay out two different tendencies in deterritorialisation: relative and absolute deterritorialisation. Even though the function of deterritorialisation is a movement, a rupture or an escape from fixed forms and norms, it always has the risk of being followed by a reterritorialisation, that is, a process of the restructuring of a deterritorialised territory. Reterritorialisation does not necessarily mean a return to the previous territory. It rather suggests the reconstitution of the territory in a different form for different purposes that could be either affirmative or negative. At this point, it should be underlined that it is not the line of deterritorialisation that induces to reterritorialisation. Deterritorialisation is not the one to blame. It only clears the blocked pores on the plane of organisation by decoding and prepares an unstructured territory. This new unstructured territory is vulnerable to other reproductions, reterritorialisations and stratifications. With this in mind, if the act of deterritorialisation destratifies the territory from the coded stratas only to be reterritorialised again or is followed by a reterritorialisation (as in the case of late capitalism), it is perceived as relative deterritorialisation. As Deleuze and Guattari

point out, it is relative “whatever its quantity and speed, when it relates a body considered as *One* to a striated space through which it moves, and which it measures with straight lines, if only virtual” (*Thousand Plateaus* 592). What makes it relative is then not its speed or quantity but its nature, a nature that yields to the charges of transcendence and trammels all the lines of escape from it. It moves towards a centre, allows for dualistic frameworks to be reconstituted and operates only on the molar zones. In other words, it carries the territory back to the plane of organisation. On the contrary, absolute deterritorialisation bears no attachment or fidelity to transcendence: “It expresses only a type of movement qualitatively different from relative movement. A movement is absolute when, whatever its quantity and speed, it relates ‘a’ body considered as multiple to a smooth space that it and occupies in the manner of a vortex” (592). Whether deterritorialisation is absolute then depends on whether it tolerates spontaneous jumps from one singularity to another, escapes from striated spaces and drifts in the flows of life and desire. Deterritorialisation corresponds to the abandonment of strata in favour of destratification, the abandonment of codes in favour of decoding, the abandonment of sedentary life in favour of pure nomadism and the abandonment of being in favour of incessant becoming.

In this regard, Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of deterritorialisation is directly linked to their understanding of affirmative resistance which is for them “the connection of flows, the composition of nondenumerable aggregates, the becoming-minoritarian of everybody/everything” (*Thousand Plateaus* 473). It is then an “absolute deterritorialisation even to the point where this calls for a new earth, a new people” (Deleuze *What is Philosophy?* 101). If the function of deterritorialisation is to call for resistance to the present and to draw a revolutionary path towards the creation of new possibilities of life and being, then the potential of immanent dystopia to resist and transform the present lies in this very notion of deterritorialisation. Only when a dystopia can set free the potential of life from its molar and striated segmentations, can it create an affect and draw a revolutionary path.

To clarify this, it is necessary to remember Deleuze and Guattari's few remarks on the function of utopia and dystopia. In *Anti-Oedipus*, they point out that utopia and dystopia should function "not as ideal model but as group fantasies—that is, as agents of the real productivity of desire, making it possible to disinvest the current social field, to 'deinstitutionalise' it, to further the revolutionary institution of desire itself" (*Anti-Oedipus* 30-1). Abandoning the hold on the ideal or the predetermined structures planned for the future, they seem to be concerned with the potentiality of deterritorialisation in the concept of utopia and dystopia. In *What is Philosophy?*, similarly, they argue that etymologically utopia and dystopia denote absolute deterritorialisation and remain "always at the critical point at which it is connected with the present relative milieu, and especially with the forces stifled by this milieu" (100). But they look for another term to replace it since the term utopia or dystopia falls short of standing for its full potentiality and its affiliation with political philosophy and concept-creation, noting that "in view of the mutilated meaning public opinion has given to it, perhaps utopia is not the best word" (100). This dissertation, in this regard, suggests an alternative concept that would both escape the dangers of -topia and promise to manifest in itself all potentialities and political affiliations mentioned so far in order to describe the nature of both immanent dystopia and the contemporary world: dysterritory. This new concept would be helpful in distinguishing not only immanent dystopia from transcendent dystopia but also contemporary world from the previous eras with regard to their capacity "to posit revolution as plane of immanence, infinite movement and absolute survey, but to the extent that these features connect up with what is real here-and-now in the struggle against capitalism, relaunching new struggles whenever the earlier one is betrayed" (*What is Philosophy?* 100). "Dysterritory" is a concept created out of the combination of the term "dystopia/n" and the notion of "decoding" or "deterritorialisation". It discloses the kind of territory depicted in immanent dystopia that is double-edged. First, it stands for "dystopian territory", a territory that is subject to striating, Oedipalising and molar forces and hence frozen into closed and rigid structures. Second, it suggests a "disterritory" where the act of

deterritorialisation is always at work to free the dystopian territory of its established codes, systems of thought, forms and practices. Therefore, it is “distopian” in the sense that its dystopian dimension is exposed to negation. It is then a space where there is a constant struggle between the forces of deterritorialisation and the forces of reterritorialisation, a space that reminds one of the very mechanism of late capitalism as it would be clarified in the next chapter. Yet, it is at the same time a space which is, by its nature, open to the creation of new affirmative possibilities. To be more precise, dysterritory could be argued to be what Deleuze and Guattari call “the Infinite Now” (*What is Philosophy?* 112), the now which, despite its dystopian aspects, holds an endless potential to go beyond itself and to create the new.

2.3.3. An Invention of a People to Come in Immanent Dystopia

In *What is Philosophy?*, Deleuze and Guattari cry out that “[w]e lack creation. We lack resistance to the present” (108). This call for resistance has been heard in the contemporary era and immanent dystopia has been a blunt manifestation of a resistance to the present. All forms of dystopia have found their sources primarily in the shortcomings of the times in which they are produced, but none has been more capable of resisting the present than immanent dystopia. Since the changing dynamics in the contemporary world have been the major motivation of the contemporary writers, immanent dystopia has been basically formulated as a reaction to all the existing stratified social structures of the present. The present constitutes what Deleuze and Guattari call “the intolerable”, that is, “a lived actuality that at the same time testifies to the impossibility of living in such conditions” (Smith *Introduction* xliii). Immanent dystopia thus addresses the intolerable not by presuming an imaginative future dystopian society but by re-presenting the here-and-now dystopia of the age. The future-setting, if any, becomes only a defamiliarising means of its resistance to the present. Its immanence lies in the very fact that it does not posit a worse alternative world but depicts and resists *what is real here-and-now*.

Resistance to the present cannot be actualised merely by presenting a critique of the present social milieu; it actually suggests an “absolute deterritorialisation even to the point where this calls for a new earth, a new people” (101). With this in mind, for Deleuze, literature has the mission of “inventing a people who are missing” (*Critical and Clinical* 4). His call for a people to come or a new earth, however, neither promises a particular form of a future community nor advocates a transcendent ideal. On the contrary, as Ronald Bogue underlines, “newness need not to be ideal, simply better than what we have at present” (“The Future of Politics” 87). So this newness rather implies a need to push the present to its limits so far as to disclose its virtual potentials and missing people. People are missing not because they are not present in the present, but because they are forced to reside in the margins, to be unseen and to be unheard due to their revolutionary potentials. Their creativity is dulled. As Deleuze reiterates in his *Essays: Critical and Clinical*, “[t]his is not exactly a people called upon to dominate the world. It is a minor people, eternally minor, taken up in a becoming-revolutionary. Perhaps it exists only in the atoms of the writer, a bastard people, inferior, dominated, always in becoming, always incomplete” (4). Deleuze does not provide a standard notion of who those missing “people to come” are; he merely acknowledges that they are a collectivity that does not reside in the state of Being but fluctuates in the slippery ground of becoming.

In its simplest understanding, then, a “people to come” stands for a mode of becoming. Deleuze and Guattari challenge the world of molar binary oppositions with the notion of “becoming”. With the touch of the peculiar finger of metaphysics, human life is rigidified by certain categories that are constructed according to power dynamics. These categories are structured upon binary pairs such as man/woman, human/animal, white/black and so on, and fixated on the idea that one leg of each binary pair stands for the dominant while the other represents the dominated. This taxonomy of power and domination is essential to every single category, not only establishing a striated social system but also sustaining the stability of each stratum in its own position in the hierarchy. The notion of becoming here appears to unfix the hierarchical power relations, to resist

molar aggregations and to go beyond the binaristic thought system. Becoming functions like a line having no origin and destination and hence is freed from roots and destinations: “A line of becoming is not defined by points that it connects, or by points that compose it; on the contrary, it passes *between* points, it comes up through the middle, it runs perpendicular to the points first perceived, transversally to the localisable relation to distant or contiguous points. [...] A line of becoming has only a middle. [...] A becoming is always in the middle; one can only get it by the middle” (*Thousand Plateaus* 293). Having no point of departure and/or arrival, becoming stands for pure movement between the points. Yet this is not to say that becoming serves as a passage from one point to another or as a transition from one position to another. As Deleuze and Guattari underline, “it is the in-between, the border or line of flight or descent running perpendicular to both. [...] it constitutes a zone of proximity and indiscernibility, a no-man’s-land, a nonlocalisable relation sweeping up the two distant or contiguous points, carrying one into the proximity of the other—and the border-proximity is indifferent to both contiguity and to distance” (293). Rather than functioning as an intermediary between two categories, it functions to produce constant change in these categories by blurring their boundaries, merging and mutating them. What is essential to a becoming is then to create something new through its movement between the points. It is, in this sense, a process of constant variation and a continual production of difference.

Considering that human life is structured upon the plane of organisation which stands by hierarchies, binaries, organisms, fixed identities, representations and subjectivisations, it is becoming that allows for a line of flight from those molar striated spaces by deterritorialising them. As Deleuze and Guattari also note, “[b]ecoming is the movement by which the line frees itself from the point, and renders points indiscernible: the rhizome, the opposite of arborescence; break away from arborescence” (*Thousand Plateaus* 294). Residing on the molecular zone, it initiates a deterritorialising mission against all the arborescent structures. It liberates from the molar in favour of the molecular, from binarism in favour of multiplicity, from finality in favour of process, from stability in favour of change.

Becoming is, thus, always minoritarian in the sense that the minoritarian position, though located under majoritarian dominance, strives to deconstruct and dethrone all the majoritarian forces from within. This is one of the reasons why “all becomings begin with and pass through becoming-woman” (*Thousand Plateaus* 277). Since man occupies the foremost majoritarian position and becomes the first quantum of molar binaries, becoming-woman necessarily becomes the initial phase in becoming minoritarian. Becoming-woman, no matter how it sounds, does not suggest an imitation of woman or an assumption of feminine features; rather it means the carving of minoritarian space within majoritarian dominance. Since man is fixed in his molar identity, becoming-woman is simply becoming-other than the molar and majoritarian male. Becoming-animal, likewise, does not refer to a resemblance to an animal, but rather it is a shift from the molar zone to the molecular zone. Since each becoming comes into existence only through a mutation that the previous being or becoming undergoes, it always culminates in multiplicity. Thus, becoming can be assumed to be equal to multiplicity. Regarding that each becoming follows another becoming and hence functions more and more productively, Deleuze and Guattari ask: “[i]f becoming-woman is the first quantum, or molecular segment, with the becomings-animal that link up with it coming next, what are they all rushing toward?” (*Thousand Plateaus* 279). Undoubtedly, all becomings end in becoming-imperceptible, which is pure immanence.

With this in mind, a people to come is, then, a minority that is without teleological ends, binaries and striated spaces and that retains an affirmative energy to bring forth alternative modes of thinking and living. As a mode of becoming, it is an attempt to excess the present and molar aggregates of the present social systems not by simply presenting what life is or by yielding to its either/or choices but by *creating* what it could be and opening a space for endless possibilities and infinite connections. Thus, the first principle of resistance to the present lies in the very act of creation: the creation of a new earth, a new people, a new possibility of life. Accordingly, immanent dystopia entails an engagement with this new possibility of life born out of resistance to the present and “the

diagnosis of becomings in every passing present” (*What is Philosophy?* 113; emphasis in original). It hosts characters who trigger the reproduction of multiplicities, shatter the very dynamism of power relations and constitute sites of resistance against the present molar practices and paradigms of identity. These characters, namely “a people to come” in Deleuzian terms, initiate minoritarian politics within majoritarian systems of power and draw a creative line of flight from the plane of organisation into the plane of consistency. A line of flight is, for Deleuze, “to leave, to leave, to escape...to cross the horizon, enter into another life” (*Dialogues* 36). Nevertheless, this is not to say that to flee is to move between points but rather it is to search for new tools to resist the present and for new modes of existence to replace the present molar ones. Thus, it is principally an act of deterritorialisation.

This may apply to immanent dystopia which invents a new people in the dystopian present that is organised upon fixed territories, attributes, codes and definitions. The new people of immanent dystopia perpetually endeavours to deterritorialise all the striated social organisations on the molar zone of the present dystopian society and, opens it for new compositions. The invention of a people to come, however, does not suggest that immanent dystopia seeks to create a better future alternative. On the contrary, the lines of flight drawn by a people to come are, by their nature, at variance with the idea of transcendental monism. For Deleuze and Guattari, as Ronald Bogue remarks, “to invent something new is necessarily to invent something whose shape cannot be foreseen. The new emerges through a process of metamorphosis whose outcome is unpredictable. If writers find existing configurations of social relations unacceptable, their only option is to induce a metamorphosis of the established forms of the social field” (*Deleuze on Literature* 110). Nevertheless, this metamorphosis does not come into existence as a fixed and pre-determined alternative. To offer a fixed, determined alternative to the present molar system would be to substitute B for A, which would be equally binaristic and hence undoubtedly culminate in molar organisations. The function of immanent dystopia is likewise to “[s]ubstitute the AND for IS. [...] The AND is not even a specific relation or conjunction, it is that

which subtends all relations, the path of all relations, which makes relations shoot outside their terms and outside the set of their terms, and outside everything which could be determined as Being, One, or Whole. The AND as extra-being, inter-being” (Deleuze and Parnet, *Dialogues* 57). Accordingly, a people to come in immanent dystopia thinks, acts and resists with ANDs rather than serving for IS. In other words, it is perpetually in fight with the present, endeavoring to excess it, disclose its potentials and create new molecular lives in it. This constant act of advancing and attacking the long-established forms, boundaries, spinoffs and thickenings and this act of producing new relations in the present thus become a testament to immanent dystopia’s being on the plane of consistency.

2.3.4. Immanent Dystopia as a Minor Literature

Deleuze and Guattari’s discrimination between “minoritarian” and “majoritarian” first appears in their book *Kafka: Toward A Minor Literature* (1975) and then in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987), where they underline the fact that minoritarian or majoritarian does not stem from a quantitative measure as minority or majority; rather, they are defined so by their capacity to become, as an alternative to being, and to create lines of flight. In this sense, minoritarian is that which is open to transformation and inclined to push all kinds of closed organisations to their limits and to set free molar striated milieus into immanence, while majoritarian stands for an opposite tendency to put a closure, to dominate, to organise, to authorise and to striate the free-flowing desire. Accordingly, minor literature, as they suggest, is a kind of literature that embraces such minoritarian politics. The motivation for minor literature lies not in an attempt to produce a literature of marginalised groups, but in an attempt to create a literature that minorises dominant systems of power.

For minor writers, the present society and its molar social order constitute the intolerable against which they assign themselves with the role of resisting and disrupting. Minor writers, by means of their art, escape from all the restrictions of majoritarian politics by digging them from within. In minor literature, as a

blueprint of resistance “expression must break forms, mark new ruptures and branchings. A form being broken, reconstruct the content that will necessarily be in rupture with the order of things” (Deleuze and Guattari *Kafka* 28). In this respect, minor literature has a revolutionary function in and against majoritarian politics, which could be said to bring it closer to immanent dystopia. Immanent dystopia engages itself with minor literature in the sense that it is equipped with the same revolutionary mission. Immanent dystopia seeks to reconfigure the present social milieu by interrupting its smooth running through binaristic and hierarchical forms. These forms are specifically targeted in immanent dystopia and moved from molar zones towards molecular zones. They are subjected to deterritorialisation and opened to new relations that are presumably not majoritarian at all. Thus, the revolutionary line drawn in immanent dystopia may be said to have the same function with the revolutionary line offered in minor literature. But how does immanent dystopia or minor literature escape from the trap of majoritarian social systems? For Deleuze and Guattari, minor literature owes its capability in drawing a revolutionary line of flight to its following practices: “the deterritorialisation of language, the connection of the individual to a political immediacy, and the collective assemblage of enunciation” (18), all of which will be clarified in the following paragraphs. For the purpose of convenience, the political immediacy and collective value will be discussed first and language aspect will be explored afterwards.

For Deleuze and Guattari, minor literature is essentially political since “its cramped space forces each individual intrigue to connect immediately to politics. The individual concern thus becomes all the more necessary, indispensable, magnified, because a whole other story is vibrating within it” (*Kafka* 17). It is first of all a political action to radically defy all the existing power structures and grind them from within. Since the minor writer is attracted to the unmaking of the present system, writing becomes a political act of resistance and creation in order to question the existing order and its power dynamics, wreck all the long-established hierarchies and instead offer greater possibilities for life. Thus, minor literature is not merely a political activity of resisting the present, but also a

political affirmation of new possibilities of life. The presence of such a political tendency is so governing in minor literature that the characters are only secondary to its political context whereas the political and social forces serve only as a background to characters' individual concerns in majoritarian literature. This means that there is an undeniable tie knotted between politics and minor literature, which is for Deleuze and Guattari best illustrated in Franz Kafka. Kafka as a German-speaking Jewish writer in Czech society sheds light upon the political dynamics of the small communities within majoritarian politics, regarding literature as a kind of political action. Individual dilemmas are hence necessarily connected to politics as in the case of Josef K.'s passing through all the political, judicial and bureaucratic segments of the society in *The Trial*. K. wanders through winding streets and buildings in order to reach the Court that has charged him with an unknown crime, yet his striving to receive information about his supposed crime only leads him further into an endless and labyrinthine path. In K.'s path, every single room continuously opens to another and every single individual detail leads to another political triangle. Minor literature, in a similar fashion, offers rooms that open up profoundly political horizons.

This immediate political nature of minor literature can be argued to be the major common denominator with immanent dystopia. In immanent dystopia, there is often no space reserved for the individual concerns, feelings and thoughts of the characters. Every individual issue is unquestionably related to its minoritarian politics and serves as a tool either to depict the bigger picture of degenerating politics, to present a critique of unapproved political practices or to find ways to subvert them. In Deleuzian terms, immanent dystopia's function can be said "to produce the real, to create life, to find a weapon" (Deleuze and Parnet *Dialogues* 49). For Booker, the political tendency in dystopian fiction derives from dystopian writers' discontent with the present political and social affairs. Throughout his book *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature* (1994), he directs his major focus to the political function of dystopian fiction and relates "the literary history of dystopian fiction more closely to the social and political history of the modern world" (20). In the conclusion of his book, he blatantly states that "if this study

serves as a defense of dystopian fiction, it is a defense more of the political engagement of that fiction than of its literary merit” (174). Immanent dystopia’s critical and resistant stance towards the existing system is sufficient to be testament to its political immediacy. As Bertolt Brecht, a writer who is most conscious about the political aspect of art, notes, “for art to be ‘unpolitical’ means only to ally itself with the ‘ruling’ group” (196). Thus, if immanent dystopia shares a common ground with what Deleuze and Guattari call minor literature, it is primarily due to its political aspect emerging from the way it addresses the predicament of the present system, which is mostly neglected in major literatures.

Since the political dimension has tainted each and every statement, minor literature has essentially a collective value. As Deleuze and Guattari remark, “what each author says individually already constitutes a common action, and what he says or does is necessarily political, even if others aren’t in agreement” (*Kafka* 17). The political aspect of minor literature, by its nature, brings about the collective nature of the minor writer. The minor writer is endowed with the mission of shedding light upon the problematic configuration of the present system, which makes minor literature a “collective assemblage of enunciation”. What Deleuze and Guattari mean by this feature is that each utterance in minor literature is collective rather than individual since the minor writer is primarily a politicised being who becomes the voice of the community. Representing a collective voice, then, the minor writer not merely expostulates the closed molar systems but fractures their very boundaries and opens them to novel connections and becomings. This collectivity foregrounds minor literature’s potential for revolution and solidarity:

because collective or national consciousness is ‘often inactive in external life and always in the process of break-down,’ literature finds itself positively charged with the role and function of collective, and even revolutionary, enunciation. It is literature that produces an active solidarity in spite of skepticism; and if the writer is in the margins or completely outside his or her fragile community, this situation allows the writer all the more the possibility to express another possible

community and to forge the means for another consciousness and another sensibility. (17)

The major problem for the minor writer is that the present social system is not satisfactory in view of its restrictive, oppressive and monolithic tendencies and a new collectivity is required to resist it. It is the minor writer that strives to create new alternatives through his minoritarian writings. Nevertheless, this is not to say that the minor writer offers a single community that would constitute a binaristic dualism with the existing one. Rather, the invention of a new community in minor literature is an attempt to create ruptures and breakdowns in the dominant power structures. To be more precise, what is meant by “forg[ing] the means for another consciousness and another sensibility” is indeed the creation of a new people to come. No doubt, a people to come in minor literature is not pre-determined, fully formed and fixated upon molar formulations. It is thoroughly a political means to pave the way for an affirmative multiplicity, fresh insights, and new modes of existence in the society.

In this respect, what a minor writer actually does is not so different from what a contemporary dystopian writer does: “to extract from social representations assemblages of enunciation and machinic assemblages and to dismantle these assemblages [...] [to draw] lines of escape [...], [to make] the social representation take flight in a much more effective way than a critique would have done and [to bring] about a deterritorialisation of the world that is itself political” (46-47). Immanent dystopia, as such, displays such a collective value in the sense that it poses a critique of the present social assemblages and proposes new alternatives by means of its introduction of a people to come. In quite a similar fashion to minor literature, the alternative collectivity in immanent dystopia does not suggest a transcendental counterpart against the existing one since such a collectivity would hinge upon majoritarian power structures that the dystopian writer finds intolerable in the first place. Likewise, a people to come in immanent dystopia should not be considered to “designate a collective of individuals bound together in the imagined community of a nation. Instead of being an imagined community, the people to come, progeny of fabulation, is both

the object and subject of a collective utterance” (Dowd 201). That is, the society depicted in immanent dystopia is not an imagined society created as a warning against the present community, but it is the here-and-now community, and “the people” stands for both the actual people in the dystopian society and a virtual collectivity having a potential to go beyond restrictive impositions and striated spaces of the present. Thus, immanent dystopia is principally “*the people's concern*” (Deleuze and Guattari *Kafka* 18; emphasis in original), which adds to its collective value and contributes to its being a revolutionary literary machine.

Considering that minor literature is a political program to minorise the dominant power structures, the deterritorialisation of language is notably significant in the definition of a minor literature. The reason why language is targeted in minor literature lies in its contribution to the perpetuity of power structures. In the traditional understanding of language, it is assumed that there is a discrimination between the word and the world and language is only there to represent the outside reality. Language is not so innocent a tool utilised only to depict what is here-and-now, nonetheless. It inherently contains within itself all the dominant power structures and functions to create dualism (particularly between the signifier and the signified), categorise, code and impose fixed formulations upon these linguistically constructed categorisations and codifications. Digging a hole in language would thus mean digging a hole in this whole system of power. To function as a revolutionary machine-to-come, accordingly, minor literature relies upon the deterritorialisation of language. In *Kafka: A Minor Literature*, Deleuze and Guattari delineate the deterritorialisation of language as a minor use of majoritarian language. But how can one minorise a majoritarian language or how can one become a foreigner in his own mother tongue? This can be achieved primarily by detaching language from its representative function because once language quits its assumed role to represent the outside reality, it becomes available to utilise without paying regard to its binaristic and hierarchical categorisations and codifications. Stripping language of its representative power and shattering the relation between the signifier and the signified would then be a minorisation of a major language. In minor literature,

thus, as Deleuze and Guattari note, “[l]anguage stops being representative in order to now move toward its extremities or its limits” (23; emphasis in original).

The minorisation of language also designates being a foreigner in one’s own mother tongue as a political action. It is “[t]o make use of the polylingualism of one’s own language, to make a minor or intensive use of it, to oppose the oppressed quality of this language to its oppressive quality, to find points of non-culture or underdevelopment, linguistic Third World zones by which a language can escape, an animal enters into things, an assemblage comes into play” (*Kafka* 26-27). They clarify the notion of being a foreigner in one’s own language by providing examples from Kafka’s position in German language. In Kafka’s language, they find the deterritorialised Prague German, the language of a Prague Jew which is taken “to a greater degree of intensity, but in the direction of a new sobriety, a new and unexpected modification, a pitiless rectification, a straightening of the head” (25-26). Kafka makes German language take a line of flight by impoverishing its vocabulary, corrupting the unproblematic relation between the signifier and the signified and hence expanding words’ limits so far as to denote different meanings and functions. Kafka’s minor usage of majoritarian German then adds to German a deep intensity and inventiveness and stretches its linguistic boundaries. Likewise, they refer to Antonin Artaud’s “French-cries, gasps” and Louis-Ferdinand Céline’s pushing French “to the highest degree” as other instances of stuttering majoritarian language (Deleuze and Guattari, *Kafka* 26). Such minor uses of the major languages, however, do not suggest that these writers mix other languages with their own languages; but rather they invent a new non-existing language within their own languages. In Deleuze and Guattari’s words, they make “the language itself scream, stutter, stammer, or murmur” (*Clinical and Critical* 110). To be a stammerer of language is then to make language take a line of flight from its limits and embrace a new intensive and affective dimension. The language is so stretched that it exceeds its frame and generates a new language. This new language, for them, “is not external to the initial language, the asyntactic limit is not external to language as a whole: it is *the outside* of language, but is not outside it” (112; emphasis added).

Thus, the stuttering of language is not outside the language, but the limit of language. It is the inverted language functioning to invert the power structures inherent within the major language.

This mission of inverting dominant power structures by deterritorialising language may be said to be shared by immanent dystopia which has its own political agenda to fight the representatives of power. Language in dystopia, in its most general terms, is considered to be both a tool for oppression and a weapon for resistance. Dystopian writers, who are principally informed about the power structures prevalent in language, adopt a critical position towards the use of language. They canalise their focus to the use of language in dystopia “not only because it is a potentially powerful tool with which to control and manipulate their subjects but also because language may harbour powerfully subversive energies that [dystopian] governments would like to suppress” (Booker, *Dystopian Literature* 19). Informed by the power of language both to suppress and to resist, they carve out a resistant space within dystopian worlds by deterritorialising language by tearing it from within. Compared to modernist texts like Kafka’s through which Deleuze illustrates his point, immanent dystopia could be argued to be making less use of linguistic deterritorialisation. However, language in immanent dystopia can still be regarded as effectively minorised to disclose its transformative, emancipatory and revolutionary power. It evolves into a language of resistance. The language of resistance is, for Deleuze and Guattari, “neither another language nor a rediscovered patois, but a becoming-other of language [...], a delirium that carries it off, a witch's line that escapes the dominant system” (*Clinical and Critical* 15). Accordingly, the reappropriation of language in immanent dystopia positively culminates in a multiplicity of perspectives and voices. Accordingly, much as immanent dystopia does not seem to lend itself to a tense syntactic subversion of majoritarian language as easily as in the examples of Kafka, Beckett and Woolf, it is still prone to reflecting a minor use particularly in their nomadic subjects’ refusal to stay within the boundaries of the language of the authorities, and in their attempts to push this majoritarian language to its limits and to embrace its minor uses as an act of resistance.

The minor use of majoritarian language is often accompanied by the use of free indirect discourse in immanent dystopia. Free indirect discourse, a term coined by the Swiss linguist Charles Bally, is the embedding of the character's speech or thought into a third-person narration without using any quotation marks or making clear to whom the speech or thought belongs, which is why some scholars prefer calling it "narrated monologue" (Cohn 103) or "represented perception" (Banfield 199). Free indirect discourse is a widely used technique in the novel and it allows this genre to simultaneously represent a variety of voices by avoiding hierarchisation. Representing the existence of a dual voice, both the voice of the narrator and the voice of the character, it is seen as "an intertwining of objective and subjective statement, of narratorial account" (Pascal 107). This speech act that is often found in many of the canonical Victorian novels and modernist texts, according to Rimmon-Kenan, has several significant functions such as drawing attention to "'deviant' linguistic practices", enhancing "the bivocality or polyvocality" and "the semantic density of the text", and "representing stream of consciousness" (117). These functions necessarily make free indirect speech a very important stylistic element in immanent dystopia enabling the text to deterritorialise majoritarian language. This is primarily because it is always more than the dual voice it represents. It is indeed an opaque mixture of two different consciousnesses which calls forth a new collectivity and an affirmative heterogeneity in language. The use of free indirect discourse opens up a zone where the "I" of the narrator or the character is no longer available, which creates a zone of indiscernibility between different consciousnesses. In other words, it becomes a pure speech act that is "neither an impersonal myth nor a personal fiction but a collective utterance, an utterance that actually expresses the impossibility of living under domination" (Smith xlv). Yet this collectivity, no matter how it sounds, does not suggest a homogeneity. On the contrary, it promises a kind of heterogeneity that is missing in majoritarian language. While majoritarian language tends to create homogenised systems on everything it touches, particularly on the subjectivity, the use of free indirect discourse takes language back to its natural form which is diverse, heterogenous and impersonal.

In this respect, as Daniel Smith underlines, it “thereby constitutes an act of resistance, and functions as the prefiguration of the people-to-come” (xliv). Considering that the people-to-come has no voice in majoritarian language, accordingly, immanent dystopia employs free indirect discourse to deterritorialise it from within and to produce a minoritarian language in it.

2.3.5. Contemporary Dystopian Writers as Cultural Clinicians

Life is immanent in the sense that it stands for boundless creative energy, affirmative forces, affects and percepts. Yet, the immanence of life is pinned down to molar categorisations, organisms, forms and structures; in other words, life is plagued with an illness that blocks its passages and flows of energy. There appears literature as a creative force that revitalises such a stamina to heal life and free it from its chains. Deleuze highlights this healing power of literature in his *Essays: Clinical and Critical*, calling literature “an enterprise of health”, a health that “would be sufficient to liberate life wherever it is imprisoned by and within man, by and within organisms and genera” (3) The health literature brings about does not take its source primarily from the health of the writer since literature is often not an individual affair but a collective assemblage of enunciation. In a parallel fashion, the writer is not necessarily in good health, but rather he has a feeble nature that makes him too sensitive to life’s illnesses: “[he] possesses an irresistible and delicate health that stems from what he has seen and heard of things too big for him, too strong for him, suffocating things whose passage exhausts him, while at the same time giving him the becomings that a dominant and substantial health would render impossible. The writer returns from what he has seen and heard with bloodshot eyes and pierced eardrums” (3). Nevertheless, the fragility of the writer does not make him a patient, but a physician of the world. He writes to liberate life from its molar zones, releases its creative energy and move life towards the plane of immanence. To be more precise, the ultimate end in his writing is the creation of health, namely a possibility of immanent life.

The Deleuzian understanding of the writer as clinician and symptomatologist is elaborated first in *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (1962) and then in *Masochism: An Interpretation of Coldness and Cruelty* (1967) and *The Logic of Sense* (1969). This view, which draws a link between literature and medicine, derives from the Nietzschean notion of critique. Much as Nietzsche is often construed to be defending a negative philosophy, Deleuze praises his *critique* as positive and affirmative, interpreting the philosophy of the “will to power”⁶ as a “joyous message: to will= to create, will= joy” (*Nietzsche and Philosophy* 84). For Deleuze, it is a misconception to perceive Nietzsche’s notion of the will to power as desire to attain power for domination. On the contrary, the Nietzschean will-to-power is a generative force that promises a play of difference, multiplicity and creation abounding in life. He interprets the problematic understanding of the will-to-power as a destructive force as the illness of negativity. Since negativity is a disease that pervades all human history and philosophy, Deleuze argues, the philosopher must be a physician that both interprets the symptoms of the disease and offers a cure as Nietzsche himself suggests in his selected letters and books like *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks* (1873) and *The Gay Science* (1882). In Deleuze’s understanding, Nietzsche’s notion of the cultural physician designates “not simply an interpreter of signs, but also an artist who joyfully eradicates cultural pathogens and invents new values that promote and enhance life” (Bogue *Deleuze on Literature* 2). That is to say, writers, like clinicians, can be great symptomatologists who not merely interpret the signs of sicknesses in society but find solutions and alternatives to eliminate these sicknesses. They are concerned less with the causes of the sicknesses of civilisation and more with the ways of affirming life by curing the symptoms and creating affects since it is the work of art itself that provides them with the means.

The Deleuzian understanding of the writer as a symptomatologist of the sicknesses of civilisation is highly applicable to contemporary dystopian writers since they present a cultural and political critique of the present society they are

⁶ The term was first coined in Nietzsche’s book *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* in 1883.

living in, look for ways to overcome the sicknesses they suffer from and often open new possibilities for life. Life has never abounded more in symptoms of sicknesses than it is now. The new century severely suffers from globalisation, terrorism, human trafficking, war, overpopulation, corporatism, environmental issues, and all the other problems arising with the advent of late capitalism. At this point, contemporary dystopian writers take on the task of clinicians not merely to display a symptomatology of contemporary life and its sickness but also to heal the society by purging life of its boundaries and releasing its virtual energy. These diagnoses, however, do not stem from these writers' personal involvements; in contrast, they are impersonal accounts of the blockages, pauses and breakdowns in the flow of life's virtual energy. Likewise, the solutions to remove these blockages are not pre-determined and fixed formulas but harbingers of infinite possibilities of a collective life. These writers as clinicians display an affirmative will-to-power to metamorphose and transform the society by first deterritorialising it and then inventing a new earth and a people to come. Only in this way can they introduce new ways of resisting, thinking and living. As Deleuze himself notes, "it is the measure of health when it invokes this oppressed bastard race [a people to come] that ceaselessly stirs beneath dominations, resisting everything that crushes and imprisons, a race that is outlined in relief in literature as process", and a new earth beyond all the molar compositions (*Clinical and Critical* 4).

CHAPTER 3

A DELEUZIAN INQUIRY INTO THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

A new conception of contemporary dystopia necessarily signals a new world order as a background to it. At this point, the term “dysterritory” helps not merely to trace the new dynamics in the nature of contemporary dystopia, but also to trace the new dynamics in the sociopolitical structure of contemporary societies that pave the way to such changes in the first place. As stated in the previous chapter, dysterritory corresponds to two opposite yet somehow interrelated poles of the contemporary world. The first pole is the dystopian one, where there is always a tendency towards transcendence within its immanence and where each act of deterritorialisation is followed by an act of reterritorialisation. The other is the distopian, where there is always a possibility of turning the act of deterritorialisation against itself and making it revolutionary in its function. The contemporary world could then be considered as a poison that is capable of producing its own antidote. In other words, what turns it into a dystopia is at the same time what allows it to draw a line of flight from it. If one asked what makes this bizarre relation possible, the answer would be late capitalism. Late capitalism is the most recent configuration of capitalism that underpins a paradigm shift coming along with certain changes in social, political, economic and even cultural structures.

Deleuze interprets this paradigm shift as a passage from sovereign power to a kind of biopower. The emergence of a new modality of power and of politics paves the way for a shift from the Foucauldian disciplinary societies to the global societies of control, which in turn corresponds to a shift observed in the history of dystopia from the plane of transcendence to the plane of immanence. Thus, the first section of this chapter will bring a critical insight into the Deleuzian

understanding of societies of control and their differences from what Foucault called disciplinary societies. Deleuze, as an observer of world economy, politics and society, relates this shift to changes in capitalism. Disciplinary societies went through the advent of capitalism in the nineteenth century and hence are relatable to the Marxist understanding of capitalism and capitalist mode of production. Societies of control are under the influence of a much more complex form of capitalism which began to take its most mature form in the late twentieth century. This relation between the emergence of control societies and the transformation of capitalism from its Marxist understanding to its current form leads this study to delve into late capitalism in relation to the notion of “dysterritory”. To this end, the second section will present a Deleuzian understanding of late capitalism at length, justifying the fact that the Marxist understanding of capitalism falls short in describing the current dynamics in today’s capitalist world. One of the reasons why this dissertation does not adopt a Marxist inquiry into today’s capitalist world is that late capitalism is an immanent and axiomatic social machine. What is suggested by the immanence and the axiomatic of capitalism is that it works not through a reductive relation between base and superstructure but through a close affinity between desire and the social. That is, it achieves the endless and changing circulation of capital through its regulation of desire and the social. Capitalism’s regulation of desire for the sake of the control of the social is, for Deleuze and Guattari, an outcome of its collaboration with psychoanalysis. It is psychoanalysis that channels and restrains the flows of desire so as to invest the social production. In this respect, the third section of this chapter is reserved to display how psychoanalysis functions in the service of late capitalism. In this section, it is revealed that capitalism with the help of psychoanalysis operates by organising molar sites of control beginning primarily in the nuclear family. The major site of capitalist organisation is apparently human subjectivity. Capitalism and psychoanalysis connive to create submissive subjects to reinforce the smooth running and circulation of capital. Those who yield to the systems of control are, for Deleuze and Guattari, the paranoiac whilst those who draw lines of flight from capitalist social machine and its suffocating forms are the schizophrenic. The

distinction between these two forms of subjectivity in effect stems from the very nature of capitalism: capitalism is a social machine that vacillates between two opposite poles as the paranoiac and/or fascizing pole and the schizophrenic and/or revolutionary pole, and owes its durability to a proper oscillation between these poles. In this regard, the fourth section will focus not merely on the types of subjectivity in capitalism but on the types of desire that trigger the formation of these subjectivities.

3.1 Mapping the Societies of Control

In his brief essay “Postscript on the Societies of Control” (1992), Deleuze argues that the contemporary era has witnessed a significant paradigm shift. The political and socioeconomic regime changes from the disciplinary mode to the control mode. This makes it hard to call contemporary society a disciplinary society in a Foucauldian sense. In disciplinary societies, as Foucault elaborates in his *Discipline and Punish* (1975), there is a static relationship between power and the individual, a relationship that is based on the disciplinary regulation of power on the individual, the subject’s fixation within and by institutions as a functioning and non-resistant member of the society. Foucault’s understanding of disciplinary societies, thus, resonates with the existence of sovereign dictatorship or a kind of totalitarianism. Yet according to Deleuze, such an understanding can be claimed to be underestimating the rapid pace of globalisation and the rise of late capitalism. Apparently, globalisation crosses the national boundaries, and biopower cannot be reduced merely to regulatory power.

Deleuze associates the Foucauldian notion of disciplinary societies with *enclosure*, asserting that in disciplinary societies the individual constantly passes through “spaces of enclosure”: “from one closed environment to another, each having its own laws: first, the family; then the school (“you are no longer in your family”); then the barracks (“you are no longer at school”); then the factory; from time to time the hospital; possibly the prison, the preeminent instance of the enclosed environment” (“Postscript” 3). What is meant by the principle of

enclosure is that the subjects are restricted and shaped in disciplining spaces like schools, hospitals, family, military, factories and so on. These disciplining spaces purport to make the subjects internalise the very dynamics of power and act in accordance with dominant norms and beliefs. Those who go against the norms are partitioned. The practices of enclosure, regulation and partitioning then imply a striving to turn heterogeneous masses into homogeneous groups. Thus, disciplinary societies suggest the monopoly of power by nation-states to impose their regulatory practices on the subjects in order to capture them in environments of enclosure by means of ideological and repressive state apparatuses. However, power in the age of globalisation extends far across national boundaries and gains a global dimension. In a world of transnational corporations collaborating with financial, technological and political powers, Deleuze argues, one can no longer speak of disciplinary societies and nation-states but of societies of control and late capitalist social structures.

This means that power is no longer engrossed by individual nation-states and their disciplinary institutions, but instead it is integrated into every single aspect of life and effectuates a huge web of interconnected networks. While disciplinary powers “mold” the acts and movements of these subjects, rhizomatic networks of control “modulate” their interactions. As Deleuze underlines, “[e]nclosures are *molds*, distinct castings, but controls are a *modulation*, like a self-deforming cast that will continuously change from one moment to the other, or like a sieve whose mesh will transmute from point to point” (“Postscript” 4). Unlike rigid and immobile *molds*, modulation corresponds to a state of constant variation. Deleuze clarifies the principle of modulation with the flow of money in late capitalism. In a disciplinary society, factories operate through a fixed system of wages that is often inversely proportional to the production ratio; no matter how high the production ratio is, the labourers are given the lowest wages possible. In a society of control, however, states in collaboration with corporations abandon this balance between the highest possible production and the lowest possible wages, and instead bring about a “modulation” of wages. That is, the labourers are subjected to constant challenges, rivalry, training and performance

evaluation which determine the amount of their wages. This modality of power, as in the case of “salary according to merit” (4), has an immanent effect upon other constitutions like national education: “just as the corporation replaces the factory, *perpetual training* tends to replace the *school*, and continuous control to replace the examination” (4).

Societies of control, unlike disciplinary societies operating upon spaces of enclosure, operate upon open-ended and rhizomatic networks, opening new relationships and new milieus. “In disciplinary societies”, as Deleuze points out, “one was always starting again (from school to the barracks, from the barracks to the factory), while in the societies of control one is never finished with anything – the corporation, the educational system, the armed services being metastable states” (“Postscript” 5). Disciplinary power creates striated social spaces and the subject moves through these striations of the social milieu like the movement of a mole. He is assigned with a single identity or duty in a single circumstance. For example, once a child leaves his house, the disciplinary space of family, he enters into another disciplinary space, that of school. He can move only between the points determined by the dominant power. For Deleuze, however, the metaphor of the human subject as a mole no longer holds true for societies of control. In societies of control, there are no longer “the burrows of a molehill” but “the coils of a serpent” (7). To be more precise, whereas disciplinary forces striate social spaces and segregate the subjects to these striations, forces in societies of control emit smooth spaces that are characterised not by enclosure but by freedom. However, this does not necessarily mean that there are no striating forces activated in the societies of control. On the contrary, these societies are equally exposed to striations but nonetheless it is not the striating forces but smoothing forces that take the lead in those societies. This is primarily because societies of control under the reign of late capitalism are structured upon the continuous circulation of capital in different disguises, and the constant creation of smooth spaces only to be striated again is what enables the perpetuity of this circulation. With this in mind, in the smooth spaces of the societies of control, the movement of the individual is like the unpredictable and flexible movement of a serpent

rather than the structured passages of a mole: he can simultaneously attain many identities and float in a constant flux of networks. This is because the societies of control set forth a global power that trespasses national, cultural and social boundaries. This cancerous power and its free-floating control work in a “gaseous” state as corporations themselves, turning the disciplinary man who is “a discontinuous producer of energy” into a man of control who is “undulatory, in orbit, in a continuous network” (6).

Disciplinary power locates the individual in two poles: one is “the signature that designates the *individual*” and the other is “the number or administrative numeration that indicates his or her position within a *mass*” (5). That is, disciplinary power simultaneously both individualises and masses the subject under the surveillance of regulatory institutions. In societies of control, however, the subject is not given a signature or a number but a code: “the code is a *password*, [...] The numerical language of control is made of codes that mark access to information, or reject it. We no longer find ourselves dealing with the mass/individual pair. Individuals have become ‘*dividuals*,’ and masses, samples, data, markets, or ‘*banks*’” (5). Deleuze expresses this difference between signature and code with the control of money: while the computation of money is based upon gold as a numerical standard in disciplinary societies, control societies work through the floating rates of exchange.

In the light of these differences, it can be argued that disciplinary societies are structured upon the notion of power that creates and preserves the fixed and permanent segregations, striations and boundaries in the social milieu, and the striated space of disciplinary societies suggests that they reside upon the plane of transcendence. Disciplinary societies rely upon a transcendent centre of power, be it God, a king or a political leader. They regulate and shape the subjects within the boundaries of their disciplinary institutions. Unlike disciplinary societies tending towards transcendence, however, the societies of control constitute smooth spaces characterised by the principle of modulation, variation and flexibility. They are no longer fixated upon a transcendent centre of power; on the contrary, they are grounded upon a control mechanism that creates temporary striations, which

enables its rapid and continuous expansion. Power is no longer granted to individual nation-states or sovereigns but it is now global, transgressing territorial, striated boundaries and functioning immanently. Thus, the societies of control operate upon the plane of immanence. Networks of relations are accordingly rhizomatic, complex, oscillatory and emitted on different directions. Yet this is not to deny the existence of a dominant power. On the contrary, there is still a kind of dominant power that keeps its segregating, polarising activity. But there is no longer a single centre to represent this power, that which is now of a dynamic form. This is why such societies do not function merely through a set of fixed norms and rules determined by and for a transcendent centre of power, but rather the rules and norms are now immanent to the principle of modulation. In other words, these rules and norms are there only to be emptied of their transcendental ties, deterritorialised and prepared for other uses and functions.

In this respect, the transition from transcendent disciplinary societies to immanent societies of control supports this dissertation's main argument that there has been a shift from transcendent dystopia to immanent dystopia in the contemporary era. To present a critique of disciplinary societies, transcendent dystopia portrays future dystopian nation-states that monopolise power to regulate and enclose their subjects through their ideological and repressive state apparatuses. Transcendent dystopia, despite its critique of disciplinary societies, still demands a transcendent power in the sense that it does not allow for a possibility of creativity and a people. Resistant protagonists in transcendent dystopia do not promise a creative function of a people to come since they are doomed to fail in their attempts to fight against the dominant power structure. Transcendent dystopia brings forth an either/or choice, i.e. a binaristic agenda: one is the future dystopian (disciplinary) society; the other is its opposite, an idealistic (a would-be disciplinary) society. Once the transcendent centre of power is a dystopian one rather than its idealistic opposite, then one is inevitably destined to fail. This is because the disciplinary man is now imprisoned in the enclosure of disciplining institutions of a sovereign nation-state; the only movement he can make in this disciplinary society is the burrows of a mole, a

passage from one enclosure to another. Nonetheless, this is not to say that the disciplinary man does not strive to carve out a resistant space for himself: he actually does. However, since the enclosure of a particular institution begins even before one enters it, disciplinary man cannot find himself a space for resistance during his passage through the spaces of enclosure. When disciplinary man attempts to break down the individual/mass pair in society and transgress the fixed social striations, this culminates in a discontinuity in the production of energy and maintenance of dominant power. Such a cessation is not tolerated in disciplinary societies. Thereby, the moment he sets out his path for resistance, he is captured, regulated and molded into his previous passive/submissive state by disciplinary forces.

Immanent dystopia is indeed a reflection of the societies of control that reside on the plane of immanence. Immanent dystopia no longer desires a transcendent centre of power since power is no longer accumulated in a single place so as to feed its institutions that will guarantee its perpetuation. It is now endlessly circulating through a web of multiple networks. The oppressive sovereignty is replaced with a new conception of control. The new dystopia emerging in the wake of the 21st century, accordingly, does not portray a future dystopian nation-state operating through its disciplinary institutions but a global society run through immanent control mechanisms. As Deleuze himself underlines, “these institutions are finished, whatever the length of their expiration periods. It’s only a matter of administering their last rites and of keeping people employed until the installation of the new forces knocking at the door” (4). What Deleuze calls new forces are the new forms of free-floating control, acting not upon the principle of enclosure but upon the principle of constant modulation “like a self-deforming cast that will continuously change from one moment to the other, or like a sieve whose mesh will transmute from point to point” (4). These changes purport to convert the spaces of enclosure into more liberative yet still controlling spaces, the principle of discipline into the principle of modulation, the

imposition of singularity into a productive multiplicity⁷. Deleuze observes these changes as follows:

In the *prison system*: the attempt to find penalties of 'substitution,' at least for petty crimes, and the use of electronic collars that force the convicted person to stay at home during certain hours. For the *school system*: continuous forms of control, and the effect on the school of perpetual training, the corresponding abandonment of all university research, the introduction of the 'corporation' at all levels of schooling. For the *hospital system*: the new medicine "without doctor or patient" that singles out potential sick people and subjects at risk, which in no way attests to individuation –as they say– but substitutes for the individual or numerical body the code of a 'dividual' material to be controlled. In the *corporate system*: new ways of handling money, profits, and humans that no longer pass through the old factory form. (7)

These statements suggest that the strict walls of disciplinary institutions have broken down and these institutions have abandoned their reliance upon a transcendent centre of power. Yet there is an important point missing in Deleuze's understanding of the societies of control, where this dissertation departs from Deleuze. Despite the implications of a disappearance of sovereignty of disciplinary institutions, one should be aware of the fact that they are not entirely eliminated even in the societies of control but have now undergone a new configuration, becoming seemingly much less enclosing, restrictive and limiting

⁷ Deleuze in his "Postscript" presents a critique of contemporary society which he tends to perceive differently from disciplinary societies. Observing the shift in the ways of control in contemporary societies, he argues that individuals could find relatively more room for dissent and resistance in the societies of control, compared to disciplinary societies. This is not merely about the changing control mechanisms embodied but also about the capitalist social machine deep-seated in these new societies. Along with the new control mechanisms, capitalism, by its very nature, manifests within itself two types of desire: paranoiac which is restrictive and schizophrenic which is revolutionary. This revolutionary type of desire is indeed what paves the way for revolutionary actions in the societies of control. Thus, it would be wrong to consider Deleuze's arguments on the differences between the disciplinary societies and the societies of control as a positive attitude towards this new society: in a similar fashion to the previous philosophers like Marx and Foucault, he merely observes and presents a critique of the newly-emerging society. Although it is an undeniable fact that he is considerably more optimistic about the possibility of resistance to the present than the previous philosophers, this optimism in no way means that he cherishes the societies of control over the disciplinary societies.

yet still there and still very powerful. In line with this point underestimated in Deleuze's postscript, these changes Deleuze observes in the prison, school and corporate system do not suggest the emergence of entirely new tools of control but indeed current modifications of old disciplining methods. In other words, rather than disappearing, they reappear with major alterations in the societies of control.

These modifications exerted upon the old disciplinary apparatuses have also culminated in a passage from an utterly striated space to a smooth space in the societies of control. Along with strict striations that allow only for the limited movement of a mole, the societies of control have a smooth space defined by its amorphous and heterogeneous nature. The smooth spaces suggest not merely the blurring of the social striations but also the gradual elimination of national boundaries. This is because the new world order, for Deleuze, necessitates the remarkable decline in nation-states and the foundation of a global society. Thus, what Deleuze means by the societies of control is not dominant nation-states governed by individual sovereigns but a global society under the reign of late capitalism. In Michael Hardt's and Antonio Negri's words, "[t]he establishment of a global society of control that smooths over the striae of national boundaries goes hand in hand with the realisation of the world market and the real subsumptions of global society under capital" (*Empire* 332).

These alterations that mark the passage from the plane of transcendence to the plane of immanence are most observable in immanent dystopia. Immanent dystopia portrays the present global society in its abandonment of national-boundaries, the smoothing of space and the disciplinary institutions's evolving into immanent control mechanisms. Thus, the protagonists in these dystopias are no longer exposed to a severe confinement in the spaces of enclosure. Protagonists of immanent dystopia are considered to be what Deleuze perceives as the man of control that can pass "from one animal to the other, from the mole to the serpent, in the system under which we live, but also in our manner of living and in our relations with others" (*Postscript* 5). Unlike the disciplinary man of transcendent dystopia whose movement cannot go beyond the structured "burrows of a mole", the man of control in global dystopian societies is capable of the infinite swinging

of a serpent. Societies of control require the immanent formation of subjectivity; to be more precise, they need the man of control as a subject that is “undulatory, in orbit, in a continuous network” (6). Rigid subject positions fall short in meeting the needs of societies of control for the continual circulation of energy and the smooth flow of the world market. The flexibility and mobility observed in the smooth space of global society is required in the man of control, as well. Thus, while the disciplinary man in transcendent dystopia can attain a single identity in a single circumstance, the man of control in immanent dystopia can transgress such previous confinements and limitations and embrace a hybrid subjectivity. He is “factory worker outside the factory, student outside school, inmate outside prison, insane outside the asylum—all at the same time. It belongs to no identity and all of them—outside the institutions” (Hardt and Negri *Empire* 331-332). This amorphous nature of the man of control, however, cannot be claimed to be merely contributing to the running of the global society and the world market; it may indeed enable him to resist and find alternative modes of existence in the dystopian here-and-now. Whenever global society deterritorialises the striations or blockages on the flow of energy so as to reterritorialise them for its own purposes, the man of control can draw a line of flight from subsequent reterritorialisations. This is why protagonists of immanent dystopia are given the chance to pan out in their resistance. While the resistance of the disciplinary man is counteracted by disciplinary forces, the man of control is more likely to succeed. Moreover, the resistance of the man of control is not fixed or pre-determined since the success of his resistance lies in its potential to use the means of control against itself and escape the trap of transcendence which feeds upon fixity and immobility.

3.2. Dysterritory of Late Capitalism

The shift in power and politics from the disciplinary mode to the control mode crystallises a conjuncture where the newly emerging societies, despite their increasing means of control, meet the means of resistance born out of their very

nature. The societies of control, in this sense, become the metonymic embodiment of dysterritory, i.e. the actual dystopian reality that installs within itself a virtual possibility of resistance. The emergence of late capitalism leads to the emergence of the notion of control and the notion of resistance as two opposite sides of the same coin in the contemporary era. A brief detour into the advent of late capitalism and its internal dynamics is thus necessary to fully grasp the idea of dysterritory in Deleuzian context.

With globalisation and developments in technology, the dialectic between capital and state has changed and been molded into a different form. Whereas capitalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries worked within national boundaries through individual nation-states' monopolised sovereignty over capital and their societies, capitalism in the last decades of the twentieth century has undergone a divergent configuration, passing in the control of capital to corporations. Although many of the corporations have emerged in nation-states, they have gradually trespassed national boundaries, attained a transnational dimension and gained strength in the global sphere. Their impact has become global and they have quickly appropriated biopower and used it to take the helm of the entire world, of the global market and of the population of all world countries from the West to the East. As Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri point out in their book on political theory titled *Empire* (2000), "large transnational corporations have effectively surpassed the jurisdiction and authority of nation-states. It would seem, then, that this centuries-long dialectic has come to an end: *the state has been defeated and corporations now rule the earth!*" (306).

The hand-over of capital from nation-states to corporations or corporate-driven governments has not only propagated the impact of capitalism on the global market, but also changed its workings. Late capitalism, therefore, no longer functions merely as in Marx's famous formula MCM (Money-Capital-Money). In Marx's general formula of capital, money is assumed to be the capital itself. The first phase of this formula is the transformation of money into a commodity, the second is the transformation of a commodity into money and the last is the exchange of money for money. MC phase stands for material accumulation which

is achieved through the purchase of raw materials and their conversion into commodities, and CM phase accordingly designates financial expansion which is accomplished through the act of sale (Marx 248). In this respect, the MC phase as an input-output combination is concrete and finite whilst the CM phase as an expansion is abstract, flexible and infinite. Although late capitalism seems to be operating basically upon this formula, the MCM model has undergone a new configuration: it is now “a capitalism of higher-order production. It no longer buys raw materials and no longer sells the finished products: it buys the finished products or assembles parts. What it wants to sell is services and what it wants to buy is stocks” (Deleuze “Postscript” 6). Late capitalism, thus, moves from the MC phase into a terminal CM phase, heading towards constant growing and circulation of money. Put succinctly, it simply demands that money beget money without the input-output combination, i.e. the production of commodity.

It is clear that Deleuze and Guattari agree partially with Marx in that the MCM formula depicts the underlying logic of capitalism, illustrating its flexible and mobile circulation. Yet Marxism wedded to the proposition between base and superstructure cannot be claimed to be entirely adopted in Deleuzian philosophy. For Marx, the base, namely the mode of production, of a society determines its superstructure that includes its social, political, ideological, legal, religious and even artistic forms. This Marxist thesis suggests that all social and political formations and relations are, by their very nature, economic. Deleuze and Guattari find this thesis rather problematic, arguing that social forms are irreducible to the mode of production. For them, “[i]t is not the State that pre-supposes a mode of production; quite the opposite, it is the State that makes production a ‘mode’” (*Thousand Plateaus* 429). It is not the mode of production that enables social production but desire itself that allows for any production including mode of production as well. Thus, the mode of production is nothing but simply one of the desiring-productions. The generative power of desire⁸ underlined by Deleuze and Guattari is indeed what characterises today’s late capitalism.

⁸ The notion of desire in capitalism will be delineated in detail on the upcoming pages.

Deleuze and Guattari rightly revisit the relation between state and power, and capital and politics, considering the shift from eighteenth and nineteenth century capitalism to its latest configuration. Their revision, thus, reveals that although Marx provides an undeniable contribution to the understanding of capitalism with the idea of the circulation of money (the CM phase), there are certain points in late capitalism that require a closer scrutiny other than that of Marx. In the light of this necessity, it could be argued that the major difference between the capitalism of the previous centuries and late capitalism is that the former rests on what Deleuze calls transcendence whilst the latter relies on immanence. To be more precise, while the former operates on a transcendent power which could be that of the capitalist, of the nation-state or of the dictator, late capitalism operates on the plane of immanence through the organisation of desire, not the mode of production. Capital as an abstract power achieves its circulation in the global sphere by relying on flexibility and perpetual reconfigurations and establishing rhizomatic networks that cut across all national boundaries and reach even the remotest places on earth. Late capitalism, therefore, requires an examination not through a Marxist lens but through a Deleuzian lens.

Deleuze and Guattari view late capitalism as an immanent system (*Anti-Oedipus* 261). Immanence hallmarking late capitalism is defined uniquely by variation, movement and multiplicities rather than forms, structures and hierarchies. It is the opposite of the plane of transcendence where the transcendent centre organises, binarises and immobilises entities, objects and relations. Immanence is that which is against the very idea of a centre, hence cuts across all the subjectivisations, significations, organisations revolving around a single centre, dismantles all the previously-established relations and brings everything, even the centre itself, into play. In this respect, it is a plane that disengages itself from transcendent law, a system of trees and roots. Deleuze and Guattari accordingly clarify the notion of “immanence” in the second volume of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* as follows:

There are no longer any forms or developments of forms; nor are there subjects or the formation of subjects. There is no structure any more than there is

genesis. There are only relations of movement and rest, speed and slowness between unformed elements, or at least between elements that are relatively unformed, molecules and particles of all kinds. There are only haecceities, affects, subjectless individuations that constitute collective assemblages... We call this plane, which knows only longitudes and latitudes, speeds and haecceities, the plane of consistency or composition (as opposed to the plan(e) of organisation or development). It is necessarily a plane of immanence and univocality. We therefore call it the plane of Nature, although nature has nothing to do with it, since on this plane there is no distinction between the natural and the artificial. However many dimensions it may have, it never has a supplementary dimension to that which transpires upon it. That alone makes it natural and immanent. (*Thousand Plateaus* 266)

Considering these aspects of immanence, then, it can be said that late capitalism having an immanent criterion works through movements, interconnections, flows and fluxes. Capital is now able to take different forms and shapes on different scales in all parts of the world from the first world to the third. It perpetually surpasses not only its own limits but also national and social boundaries, which enables its rapid and all-encompassing expansion. What enables late capitalism to obtain this liquidity and flexibility is its abandonment of the reliance upon arborescent roots and holds, and instead its embracement of differences and multiplicities only to use and abuse them for its own interests. Thus, it is no longer characterised by a hierarchy positioning the nation-state at the top but by “longitudes and latitudes, speeds and haecceities” (266) in global sphere. There is no longer an organising principle, namely a transcendent centre of power, but a continual flow and movement of power and desire.

Hardt and Negri accordingly remark that capital “demands not a transcendent power but a mechanism of control that resides on the plane of immanence. Through the social development of capital, the mechanisms of modern sovereignty—the processes of coding, overcoding, and recoding that imposed a transcendent order over a bounded and segmented social terrain—are progressively replaced by an *axiomatic*” (326). As Hardt and Negri elucidate, late

capitalism functions through axiomatic means, or axioms. The axiomatic is for Deleuze and Guattari “not the invention of capitalism, since it is identical with capital itself. On the contrary, capitalism is its offspring. Capitalism merely ensures the regulation of the axiomatic” (*Anti-Oedipus* 252). The axiomatic could be understood as the process of constant decoding and recoding of laws, codes, conducts, flows of desire and territories in order to help capital adapt itself to new circumstances. Before probing into the notion of the axiomatic, however, it would be more helpful to refer to three social machines (which are primitive-territorial, barbaric-despotic and civilised-capitalist) since Deleuze and Guattari use the axiomatic to underline the differences between the capitalist social machine and the other two machines.

For Deleuze and Guattari, each of these social organisations has a different mode of social-production, anti-production, a different socius and a system of coding or inscription. Social-production is the organisation and regulation of life forces and energies on the social milieu. Social production is used by Deleuze and Guattari in tandem with desiring-production. The reason for this parallelism lies in the assumption that the social field is invested purely with desire and is indeed the product of desire, and accordingly all social-production comes into being in social organisations through the regulation of desire. Although most critics including Marx tend to separate social-production from desiring-production, for Deleuze and Guattari “[t]here is no such thing as the social production of reality on the one hand, and a desiring-production that is mere fantasy on the other [...] *social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions*” (*Anti-Oedipus* 28-29; emphasis in original). Each social regulation is indeed a regulation implemented not merely upon the social terrain but also upon libidinal energies. All social life is then nothing but desire and social-production. Forms of social-production are accompanied by anti-production in order to pursue the continuous flow of production. Anti-production is a liberative force that releases social production from its capture on the plane of organisation, empties it of its codes, turns into a tabula rasa for further recodings. This reveals that each social organisation is generated as an outcome of a process of coding, decoding

and recoding. Yet, systems of coding and decoding differ significantly in each social organisation because each is organised upon a different socius and operates through different forms of debt. Socius is then the terrain of coding, decoding and recoding to perpetuate the circulation of production or the surface on which all forms of social-production and anti-production (*Anti-Oedipus* 33).

The first social machine emerging long before the advent of capitalism is the primitive-territorial machine in which the socius is the earth. Primitive social organisation is practiced through inscriptions on the body of the earth: “The earth is the primitive, savage unity of desire and production. For the earth is not merely the multiple and divided object of labour, it is also the unique, indivisible entity, the full body that falls back on the forces of production and appropriates them for its own as the natural or divine precondition” (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* 140). Thus, the earth becomes the surface on which territorialisation or social and economic inscription is implemented, and it becomes determinant in assigning social and economic status. It is territory itself that determines who you are and which tribe you belong to. The individuals’ social identities are identified with the tribal marks and inscriptions on their bodies. The primitive bodies are literally marked by tattoos or scars. These marks are basically grounded upon a system of “cruelty” (184). The codes on the bodies, in a sense, legitimise the individuals’ affiliations or alliances. The primitive social machine, in this respect, codes the flows of desire, owns organs and marks bodies in its system of cruelty. Since man is inscribed and his organs are now “hewn into the socius”, he now “ceases to be a biological organism and becomes a full body, an earth, to which his organs become attached, where they are attracted, repelled, miraculated, following the requirements of a socius” (144). This means that the primitive social machine turns individuals into social beings through its codifications, investments and markings.

Social, political and economic relations rest upon affiliations and alliances in line with territorial affinity and neighbourhood of tribes. The primitive-territorial machine accordingly codes desire and organises kinship relations for political and economic investments (Seem xxi). It establishes a set of traditions to

govern the kinship and marriage relations. These traditions mostly determine whom one can or cannot marry since marriage-alliances, just like blood-lineages, function as powerful means of establishing or reinforcing filial ties and of boosting financial collaborations. Desire is severely repressed in the primitive-territorial machine; coded desires are allowed for the maintenance of the political and economic perpetuation. The only uncoded desire in this savage social system is incest. Incest is prohibited mainly because it does not contribute to the establishment of affiliations and alliances between different tribes and to the perpetuation of material production and exchange. Regarding this social machine's coding of the flows of desire, it is obvious that social-production proceeds in parallel with desiring-production.

In the second social machine, namely the barbaric-despotic, the socius is the despot's body. The despot's body stands for a transcendent centre to which all power belongs and everything is owed. The despot in barbaric societies identifies himself with the deity, preserves all territories and capital for himself since everyone is assumed to owe to him, need him and relate to him. In Eugene Holland's words, "whereas savage anti-production ensured the sharing of fruits of labor, imperial anti-production enforces the extraction of tribute from its subject-peoples for the sake of glorious expenditure (*dépense*) on the part of the despot" (74). The despot is regarded as the reflection of god on earth and all production is carried out for and thanks to him. Even the bodies of the people belong to this monotheistic deity on earth. The despotic machine works through a new alliance and direct filiation. To be more precise, "[t]he despot challenges the lateral alliances and the extended filiations of the old community. He imposes a new alliance system and places himself in direct filiation with the deity: the people must follow" (182). Thus, the territorial machine is replaced by a state regime establishing a new hierarchy at the top of which the despot is situated. To maintain this hierarchy in both the political and the economic terrain, the despot introduces gold or money as standard, imposes infinite debt and taxation on his peoples to keep them under control and to prevent the flows of money without his consent: "the debt becomes a *debt of existence*, a debt of the existence of the

subjects themselves” (197). It is the body of the despot which the existence of all the subjects depends on and the flow of all money stems from and ultimately leads to.

While the primitive machine establishes its unit by coding, inscribing and recording the desiring-production, the despotic machine does it by overcoding and appropriating to such an extent that there is no single flow in this new machine that can escape the overcoding, regulation and organisation. Overcoding is, for Deleuze and Guattari, “the operation that constitutes the essence of the State, and that measures both its continuity and its break with the previous formations: the dread of flows of desire that would resist coding, but also the establishment of a new inscription that overcodes, and that makes desire into the property of the sovereign, even though he be the death instinct itself” (198). The primitive codes of alliance and affiliation still remain, yet these codes and forms of social-production are overcoded and appropriated by the transcendent centre of power, namely the despot himself. The despot maintains the previous territories and alliances by making them a functional part of the new social machine. This is achieved either through the inclusion of the old affiliations and alliances into the new machine or through the novel inscriptions upon them to make them fit for the new social relations. The flows of desire are also overcoded in the despotic-barbarian social machine, which guarantees the authority of the despot over his subjects and the subjects’ infinite debt to the despot. Therefore, an imperial order functioning through a new hierarchy and a new system of oppression is established and its maintenance is assured through the operation of overcoding.

Although the previous social machines operate through the regimes of codes and overcodings, the civilised-capitalist social machine rests upon the decoding of all flows of social-production, but this is a kind of decoding only to recode these flows in line with capitalist interests. As Ian Buchanan clarifies, “[c]apitalist decoding evacuates the meaning out of all codes, that is to say all the rules, regulations, laws, codes of conduct, and so forth, rendering them completely arbitrary, or rather purely functional. Decoding in this context doesn't mean interpretation or deciphering, it literally means taking the code away. Taking their

place is the axiomatic” (112). Decoding, or what Deleuze and Guattari often call deterritorialisation, is then a positive process in the capitalist machine and contributes to the continuous flow of capital and its circulation in the entire world. It frees the desiring-production from fixed codes and opens it up to multiple other usages and to other recodings. In this regard, decoding or deterritorialisation and recoding or reterritorialisation can be considered as two cooperating devices of capitalism. While decoding works to liberate the flows of desire and deterritorialise stable territorialisations, recoding works to recapture and organise these flows into production and to reterritorialise the deterritorialised territories.

“The capitalist system of inscription”, as Holland remarks, “derives from the dynamics of axiomatisation: from deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation, decoding and recoding” (81). This brings us back to the notion of the axiomatic. The axiomatic could then be said to be a determining factor that separates the capitalist machine from other social machines and makes it an immanent system. Deleuze and Guattari draw attention to the capitalist social machine’s axiomatic ability for constant growth and expansion by calling it “the limit of all societies, insofar as it brings about the decoding of the flows that the other social formations coded and overcoded. But it is the *relative* limit of every society; it effects *relative* breaks, because it substitutes for the codes an extremely rigorous axiomatic that maintains the energy of the flows in a bound state on the body of capital as a socius that is deterritorialised (*Anti-Oedipus* 245-246). What gives late capitalism its potential to push its limits and to become the limit of all societies is its axiomatic. It is the axiomatic that makes it move to different territories without being confiscated in any and to accommodate itself to the different economic, social and political circumstances of these new territories. As Deleuze and Guattari themselves underline, “[t]he strength of capitalism indeed resides in the fact that its axiomatic is never saturated, that it is always capable of adding a new axiom to the previous ones. Capitalism defines a field of immanence and never ceases to fully occupy this field” (250).

Unlike the earlier social machines that code and overcode the flows of desire and social-production, the capitalist axiomatic liberates the flows, yet this is

not an infinite liberation. Under certain circumstances, it imposes its own limits. Despite these impositions and limitations, however, the capitalist axiomatic, by its nature, always tends to extend its limits by producing new axioms. It establishes new relations between the deterritorialised flows, which enables the continuity of constant production. In this regard, axiomatisation could be said to be the organiser of the decoded flows and hence the backbone of the productivity. In the capitalist social machine, therefore, there are no longer any old codings, but decodings. To be more precise, the codes of the primitive and despotic machines are replaced with “an axiomatic of abstract quantities” (33) in the form of money. Money stands for an abstract quantity as opposed to the literal marks and gold standard. The flow of capital stands for the abstract and virtual form of money, that is, financing.

As such, the socius in the capitalist machine is capital itself. The capital is not the literal money in the pockets of the capitalist but “the fluid and petrified substance of money” (10). It is produced, reproduced, changes hands and reaches the remotest places in the universe, which is why it is called a body without organs by Deleuze and Guattari. “Body without organs” does not refer to a body stripped of its organs but, as other Deleuzian coinages, to a process that is always in becoming and is resisting organisation, completion, fixation, signification, stratification and territorialisation. It suggests a continual process and movement that has no determinant destination and does not aim at ending with organ-machines or organisms. “In order to resist organ-machines,” Deleuze and Guattari aver, “the body without organs presents its smooth, slippery, opaque, taut surface as a barrier. In order to resist linked, connected, and interrupted flows, it sets up a counterflow of amorphous, undifferentiated fluid” (2). Despite its resistance, however, it cannot always totally escape the organism or the system that is founded upon signification, stratification and territorialisation. This is firstly because it exists within this system, secondly because it serves as a tabula rasa or “as a surface for the recording of the entire process of the production of desire, so that desiring-machines seem to emanate from it in the apparent objective movement that establishes a relationship between the machines and the body

without organs” (10). To put it simply, the body without organs is a deterritorialised field that comes into being when the axiomatic decodes the socius and opens the floodgates for the flows of desire yet only to recode and reterritorialise them in different configurations later. It is, in Deleuze’s and Guattari’s words, “the ultimate residuum of a deterritorialised socius” (33).

Late capitalism’s tendency to convert the socius that is fixated in the primitive and despotic machines into the body without organs provides it with the opportunity to operate on transnational networks, which brings to the fore another defining characteristic: its rhizomatic nature. Deleuze and Guattari refer to the notion of the rhizome in *A Thousand Plateaus* as a kind of map that has multiple entryways, tends to clear away all fixed codes on bodies without organs and hence is always open to connections in all its dimensions (12). As an alternative to the arborescent structure which is based on hierarchy, organisation and transcendence, the rhizome is characterised by its openness to connections and networks, its heterogeneity and its multiplicity. According to the principle of connection, “[a]ny point of a rhizome”, unlike a tree or root structure, “can be connected to anything other, and must be”; as for the principle of heterogeneity co-working with the previous principle, a rhizome “ceaselessly establishes connections between semiotic chains, organisations of power, and circumstances relative to the arts, sciences, and social struggles” (7); finally it stands for a multiplicity that “has neither subject nor object, only determinations, magnitudes, and dimensions that cannot increase in number without the multiplicity changing in nature” (8). Accordingly, the axiomatic of late capitalism, namely its decoding of the flows of desire and deterritorialisation of the socius, makes it utterly rhizomatic since the socius that has now become a body without organs can create diverse networks and multiplicities, move in all directions, accommodate itself to all places and all circumstances and extend its lines of flight. Just like a rhizome that “may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but [...] will start up again on one of its old line, or on new lines” (9), capital may also be stratified, recoded or territorialised but it will definitely continue to escape the stratified lines, fixity and organisation by creating lines of flight and lines of deterritorialisation.

In the light of these conceptions, it could be briefly said that late capitalism is defined by its rhizomatic, axiomatic and immanent criteria. It is rhizomatic since it crosses the boundaries of nation-states and expands into the entire world. It not only takes the helm of global economy but also controls people's lives, the way they live, the way they dress, the way they eat. It is also rhizomatically connected to politics, industry and even culture and open to establish infinite new connections. It has its axiomatic which renders the everchanging, everincreasing and evergrowing production possible with its potential to decode and recode, deterritorialise and reterritorialise. It is immanent because it does not rest upon a transcendent centre; rather, biopower is either appropriated by one corporation (that is still not alone since it always has political alliances) or shared by many corporations. It is then these three criteria that make late capitalism come into existence, expand its span infinitely and penetrate each and every facet of life. To establish a connection between this discussion and dystopia, it can be said that it is these three criteria that constitute the here-and-now dystopia. It is at the same time these three criteria that can turn the very logic of late capitalism against itself. Thus, it is these three criteria that simultaneously make contemporary world and contemporary dystopia a dysterritory.

3.3. Tracing Oedipal Lines in the Capitalist Social Machine

If late capitalism has the potential both to create a dystopian reality and to become its own enemy, the next question to be posed should be how it manages to keep possible lines of flight under control. This is, for Deleuze and Guattari, achieved by a collaboration between the capitalist social machine and psychoanalysis, as it is suggested in the title of their joint book *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Arguing that capitalism owes the smooth running of its immanent, axiomatic and rhizomatic system to its collaboration with psychoanalysis, they attempt to rewrite psychoanalytic interpretations of desire, the tripartite family model (mommy-daddy-child) and the Oedipus complex with regard to the capitalist logic behind them. The psychoanalytic hermeneutics of

desire is the first thing that Deleuze and Guattari problematise. They conceptualise desire as the actual force of all production: it is what gives life its energy and productivity and enables life to endlessly flow. Since desire manifests in itself all the positive, creative, productive and liberative potentials, it is the ultimate stimulus for all actions. It always wishes to connect more and more networks and assemblages. Deleuze and Guattari furthermore define desire simply as the producer of reality: “If desire produces, its product is real. If desire is productive, it can be productive only in the real world and can produce only reality [...] The objective being of desire is the Real in and of itself” (*Anti-Oedipus* 26-27). Desire that has neither a subject nor an object is only about production. It is plugged in all aspects of the social field, which means that each and every investment of desire is necessarily social. Such an understanding testifies that Deleuze and Guattari indeed orientate themselves on the notion of desire as the social production.

The reason why Deleuze and Guattari are concerned with the socialisation of desire is primarily because they draw a link between the social milieu and the libidinal milieu. Accordingly, they argue that capitalism is the decoding of the flows of desire and each social-production stands for desiring-production on the grounds that it is the creative force of desire that ultimately triggers any productive activity in the social milieu. Thus, social production should be thought in relation to desiring-production. Desiring-production is, in this context, a term invented to forge the kinship between libido and labor in the actual mechanism of the capitalist social machine. In the capitalist social machine, “the social field is immediately invested by desire, [...] it is the historically determined product of desire, and [...] libido has no need of any mediation or sublimation, any psychic operation, any transformation, in order to invade and invest the productive forces and the relations of production. *There is only desire and the social, and nothing else*” (36; emphasis in original).

This close affinity between desire and the social is, however, strictly rejected in the capitalist system. Late capitalism pretends to be organising merely the social and political sphere. No matter how sinuously it attempts to present

both as separate spheres, it is indeed a social machine that basically functions through its regulation of desire. The incessant social-production emanates only after the capitalist social machine engineers the flows of desire. Desire and the social are hence like the two sides of the same coin: “There is no such thing as the social production of reality on the one hand, and a desiring-production that is mere fantasy on the other. [...] The truth of the matter is that *social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions*” (*Anti-Oedipus* 28-29; emphasis in original). Rather than acknowledging this affinity, however, late capitalism proposes a deliberate enterprise to separate socio-political economy from libidinal economy. Such a separation, for Deleuze and Guattari, derives from the fact that it regards desire as a revolutionary potential which poses a threat for the maintenance of its power. Desire contains within itself a groundbreaking force and could overthrow all the boundaries and subvert all the binaries capitalism relies upon. This potential definitely intimidates the capitalist social machine. Thus, it organises its whole mechanism upon the organisation of desire. By regulating desire, it simultaneously regulates the social sphere. The repression of desire implicitly stands for the repression of the society and its subjects. Despite the mutual dependence between the social and the private sphere, however, capitalism alienates desire and reduces it merely to the private sphere of the family. At this point, Deleuze and Guattari claim that although it is late capitalism itself that creates such a segregation between desire and the social in the first place, psychoanalysis is the one that interprets, reinforces and represses it (*Anti-Oedipus* 24-50-78-87-119).

The psychoanalytic notion of desire as lack is one of the enterprises to make desire succumb to capitalist ends. For Deleuze and Guattari, this assumption dates back to Plato; Plato, labelling desire as the opposite of reason/mind and characterising it as something to be controlled, lays the foundations of the Western traditional logic of desire in negative terms. In *The Republic*, he blatantly accuses desire as a trammel on reason, culture and civilisation, and argues that man should abandon his desires interfering with his reason in order to reach perfection and complete his Being. He thus apparently strips desire of all its

positivity and productivity. In Platonic philosophy, desire is not merely removed from the realm of production; it is also pushed to the realm of idealism, which can be perceived as the first attempt in Western philosophy to negate desire. As Deleuze and Guattari remark, “the Platonic logic of desire forces us to take, making us choose between *production* and *acquisition*. From the moment that we place desire on the side of acquisition, we make desire an idealistic (dialectical, nihilistic) conception, which causes us to look upon it as primarily a lack: a lack of an object, a lack of the real object” (25). Desire, moved from the side of production to the side of acquisition, is associated with a transcendental ideal that is missing. This necessarily results in two misassumptions about desire; one is the assumption that desire is what is lacking, the other is that the ultimate end of desire is satisfaction, satisfaction that comes out of reaching the ideal.

Deleuze and Guattari regard this understanding of desire as a lack as a misrepresentation. This misrepresentation proceeds up to Lacan. Lacan, seeing desire as lack, is another thinker that forces it into an idealistic conception. In Lacanian psychoanalysis, desire stems from the sense of lack, a lack that will presumably never be filled since it is the lack of the perfect dyadic unity with the mother, which is lost at birth (Lacan, *The Seminar*, Book VI). This notion of desire is, according to Deleuze and Guattari, limiting the investments of desire, inhibiting its flows and reducing its potential to negativity. In contrast to psychoanalytic assumptions, however, desire has an affirmative power which triggers all social production. Deleuze and Guattari thus situate desire on the plane of immanence where it is in a constant flow. To negate and block this productive flow, psychoanalysis, insidiously collaborating with late capitalism, creates the illusion that it is a lack. In this regard, Deleuze and Guattari underline that “[l]ack (*manque*)* is created, planned, and organised in and through social production” (*Anti-Oedipus* 28; emphasis in original):

The deliberate creation of lack as a function of market economy is the art of a dominant class. This involves deliberately organising wants and needs (*manque*) amid an abundance of production; making all of desire teeter and fall victim to the great fear of not having one's needs satisfied; and making the object dependent

upon a real production that is supposedly exterior to desire (the demands of rationality), while at the same time the production of desire is categorised as fantasy and nothing but fantasy. (28)

In Lacanian psychoanalysis, desire is linked as a lack to the Real. The Real is one of the three registers that Lacan proposes to delineate the phases in the formation of human subjectivity in his *Seminars*. Among them, the Imaginary corresponds to the phase in which the infant considers itself as a fragmented entity and associates its ego with the imago of its mother that it sees in the mirror. Thus, this register is indeed a state of illusions and images since the formation of the infant's ego is based upon a false identification. As for the Symbolic, it is the phase in which the infant begins to speak. The moment the infant enters in the realm of language, which is for Lacan equal to the Symbolic register, it is castrated by language and becomes a submissive subject of the dominant ideology. While these two registers stand for concrete and observable phases of human subjectivity, the Real is impossible to reach and revitalise in concrete terms. This is primarily because it corresponds to anything beyond language. The dismissal of the Real from the Symbolic stems from the idea of castration. Once the infant is castrated by the name-of-the-father, namely the phallus/language, it represses the feelings, experiences and drives that belong to the pre-Oedipal phase into its unconscious. The Real is, in this regard, the sum of all the repressed desires beyond the reach of the subject and language (Lacan *The Seminar*, Book VII, 191-207). Relating the notion of desire with the Real can thus be understood as an attempt to relate the notion of desire with fantasy. Deleuze and Guattari find this perception problematic in the sense that desire, despite its overflow of productive and creative energy, is reduced to an impossible fantasy. They oppose the assumption of desire as mere fantasy but nonetheless they do not entirely abandon the Lacanian notion of the Real. Instead, they bring new insights into the Real by releasing it from the repression of language and disclosing the flows of desire it embodies. They attempt to “renew, on the level of the Real, the tie between the analytic machine, desire, and production” (*Anti-Oedipus* 53). To be more precise, unlike Lacan, they associate desire with the Real in positive terms, foregrounding

its affirmative potential. As opposed to the Lacanian assumption that the Real is impossible to reach and bear, it is the realm in which production takes place: “desire is to produce, to produce within the realm of the real. The Real is not impossible; on the contrary, within the real everything is possible, everything becomes possible. Desire does not express a molar lack within the subject; rather, the molar organisation deprives desire of its objective being” (27). Thus, it is not because of the very nature of the Real that desire is negated and forced to be unproductive, but because of the trammels of the Symbolic.

As Deleuze and Guattari argue in their groundbreaking book, desire is not merely identified with a lack but also strictly repressed and organised by the Oedipus complex in psychoanalysis. The Oedipus complex lies at the heart of Freud’s theory on the development of human psychology and sexuality⁹. Human sexual development undergoes several specific phases before the human subject acquires his heterosexual identity. Drawing attention to the polymorphous nature of the infant, Freud argues that the infant abandons his instinctual and perverse drives and his biological sex conforms with his social gender only after he experiences the Oedipal complex. The Oedipus complex occurs in the phallic stage in which the infant who enters into a mother-father-child triangle begins to see the parent of the same sex as his rival since he bears sexual tendencies towards the parent of the opposite sex. What makes the infant abandon his feelings towards his parent is the Oedipal fear: the fear of being castrated by the father who represents the phallus. Freud interprets the Oedipal resolution with regard to the male infant’s sexual development (*Infantile* 142-145). While the male infant severs his sexual ties with his mother upon the fear of castration, the female infant undergoes a reverse process: she assumes the absence of a penis in her mother as a failure and turns away from her. Since she conceives her father as a figure of

⁹ Freud discovered this phenomenon, which he would later coin the Oedipus Complex, first in the course of his self-analysis in 1897. After his first discovery, he came up with the idea of Oedipus Complex in *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, assuming it as a universal phenomenon (*Three Essays* 226). The complete theory of the Oedipus Complex, however, appeared in his later works and essays including *The Ego and the Id*, “The Infantile Genital Organisation”, “The dissolution of the Oedipus complex”, “Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction between the Sexes” .

authority, she wishes to identify herself with the father's law and sees her mother as a rival. In either case, the Oedipus complex makes the infant assume phallic authority and succumb to its laws.

Through the Oedipal law, according to Deleuze and Guattari, desire is identified with prohibition because what is assumed to be lacking is what is supposed to be prohibited. In Freudian psychoanalysis, what is prohibited and desired is the unity with the mother: "The law tells us: You will not marry your mother, and you will not kill your father. And we docile subjects say to ourselves: so *that's* what I wanted" (*Anti-Oedipus* 114). However, both this notion of desire for something prohibited and the notion of the law that imposes the prohibition are equally fictitious and aiming at injecting repression into the unconscious of people. Both aim at repressing desire and keeping its liberative potential under control: The infant should go through the Oedipus resolution to be a functioning member of the society; otherwise, he will be a pervert or a psychotic. The Oedipus complex can thus be considered as a disciplinary means of the state rather than a discovery of psychoanalysis. It helps to turn individuals into obedient, healthy and normal subjects in the social terrain. Thus, no matter how ferociously late capitalism defends the opposite, social repression indeed goes hand in hand with psychic repression. Oedipalisation is indeed the modern version of social repression: it kills the productivity of desire by reducing it merely to familial sexual desires. Once the human subject is oedipalised, he begins to perceive his desires merely in negative terms as unhealthy drives that should be driven into his unconscious. Despite the flow of powerful productive desires he inherits, he now becomes the subject in lack.

For Deleuze and Guattari, this psychic and social repression of desire is fundamentally rooted in the mommy-daddy-child model, which automatically means that the nuclear family is a means of repression. The Oedipus complex is not a result of the infant's unacceptable desires for the mother within a single family but actually a carefully designed product of late capitalism: "The family is the agent of Oedipalisation, but not the cause. It creates the necessary conditions for Oedipalisation and ensures their perpetuation. The family is a stimulus, but it

is ‘qualitatively indifferent, an inductor that is neither an organiser nor a disorganiser’” (88). It is the nuclear family where the social production is privatised as private reproduction with the help of the Oedipus Complex. By introducing the nuclear family into the production of desire, late capitalism attempts to exercise social repression at the very beginning of the subjects’ lives. It needs the “holy family” to guarantee the strangulation of the flows of desire and their entrapment into molar forms as well as the formation of capitalist subjectivity. Capitalist subjectivity, in this context, quintessentially corresponds to Oedipal subjectivity, both of which are simultaneously created within the nuclear family. Each individual member of the family can be considered a social subject in the first place on the grounds that the nuclear family is the microcosm of the social field. Each individual is then nothing but the subject constructed by the capitalist social machine. As Deleuze and Guattari specify, “[f]ather, mother, and child thus become the simulacrum of the images of capital [...], with the result that these images are no longer recognised at all in the desire that is determined to invest only their simulacrum. The familial determinations become the application of the social axiomatic” (264).

Thus, no matter how the capitalist social machine segregates the nuclear family from the social terrain, the fictitious fear of castration and prohibition, which is assumed to be experienced in the private realm of the family, actually proliferates in each and every aspect of social life. This is because the nuclear family enacts the very impositions of late capitalism on its subjects. The Oedipal resolution is like an infectious disease spreading far and wide, hindering the subjects from realising the productive potential of desire by associating it with prohibition. In his introduction to *Anti-Oedipus*, Mark Seem clarifies the domination of the Oedipus complex over the social terrain as follows:

depression does not just come about one fine day, [...], nor does Oedipus appear one day in the Family and feel secure in remaining there. Depression and Oedipus are agencies of the State, agencies of paranoia, agencies of power, long before being delegated to the family. Oedipus is the figure of power as such, just as neurosis is the result of power on individuals. Oedipus

is everywhere. [...] it is what gives us faith as it robs us of power, it is what teaches us to desire our own repression. Everybody has been oedipalised and neuroticised at home, at school, at work. (xx)

Once the Oedipus complex is introduced into the family, late capitalism simultaneously lays its foundations in the society. Thus, it is not the sovereignty of the phallic father but the sovereignty of the capital that castrates the subject and dominates his whole life by dominating his desire. The capitalist social machine under the guise of the nuclear family reduces the revolutionary potential of social desire to familial desire which is prohibited by the idea of castration, diverts flows and flattens them onto fixed and controlled forms and hence sustains the formation and maintenance of its workings. It works to create obedient subjects, blind consumers and passive labourers. Those who reject going through Oedipalisation/capitalist subject formation are cast aside and labeled as the abnormal who need to be exposed to psychoanalytic cure, a cure which is nothing but taming one's ego until he becomes a non-resistant member of the capitalist society.

Therefore, it is understandable why Deleuze and Guattari bear hostility towards psychoanalysis in their critique of late capitalism. Psychoanalysis discovers desire and its capability of production through Freud's inquiry into the unconscious. However, once it introduces the Oedipus complex into the scene, this discovery is moved into a transcendent pole. As Deleuze and Guattari remark, "a classical theatre was substituted for the unconscious as a factory; representation was substituted for the units of production of the unconscious; and an unconscious that was capable of nothing but expressing itself—in myth, tragedy, dreams—was substituted for the productive unconscious" (*Anti-Oedipus* 24). That is, desire is repressed by the idea of lack; the unconscious is captured in representation where it loses its productivity and is forced to believe in the Oedipal lie. The circulations of both desire and the unconscious are systematically controlled. This, for Deleuze and Guattari, turns psychoanalysis into a private theatre under capitalism in which fictitious myths and tragedies are acted out. It is private because it is restricted to the realm of the family, and it still performs like a theatre because it functions to

substitute the line of production according to the requirements of representation. Theatre hence becomes the model of production; desiring-production is reduced to a representational space where it is not handled in its originality and actual nature but is taken for its substitutes.

In the theatre model, everything is necessarily taken back to a transcendent signifier, namely the transcendent law in Freudian psychoanalysis and the name-of-the-Father in its Lacanian reinterpretation. It is through the domination of such a transcendent signifier that psychoanalysis connives with the capitalist social machine. Whenever late capitalism sees desire or the unconscious as a threat to its authority or working mechanism, it falls back on their psychoanalytic interpretations. The psychoanalytic interpretations suggest an obvious metaphysics due to their reliance upon transcendent and illegitimate uses of desire and the unconscious. Desire is interpreted as a prohibition/lack introduced by either Oedipus or the name-of-the-Father. The unconscious is alike interpreted as the natural offspring of the mommy-daddy-child relation and squeezed into the depths not to interrupt the healthy Being in the Symbolic. Both are repressed and subjected to the orders of representation, and the possibility of rejecting these interpretations is strictly condemned. The idea of representation behind psychoanalysis, thus, becomes a repressive apparatus used for capitalist ends. It imposes its theatrical laws upon the notions of desire and the unconscious as universal metaphors, and draws impassable limits to drive the human subjects. For Deleuze and Guattari, however, these laws do not bear any universal relations; in contrast, they are merely fictitious products of late capitalism. Therefore, desire is neither relatable to the prohibitive Oedipus complex, nor to the primordial lack; it is any flow or flux beyond these limits. It is the very edge of the capitalist social machine. Likewise, the unconscious is neither bound by the mommy-daddy-child triangle, nor by a theatre of the unreachable but it is an orphan stripped of its parents and a factory where all productive and affirmative assemblages come into being.

3.4. Breakdown or Breakthrough

In late capitalism, as previously discussed, it is not the disciplinary powers of enclosure but perpetual deterritorialising and reterritorialising acts that are at work in organising not only space, social structure, economy and politics but also human subjects. Subjects under the capitalist social machine are torn between two directions; either to submit to new codes or reterritorialisations or to find themselves lines of flight and create absolute deterritorialisations beyond capitalism's relative limits. As Deleuze and Guattari accentuate, "[t]hey vacillate between two poles: the paranoid despotic sign, the sign-signifier of the despot that they try to revive as a unit of code; and the sign-figure of the schizo as a unit of decoded flux, a schiz, a point-sign or flow-break. They try to hold on to the one, but they pour or flow out through the other. They are continually behind or ahead of themselves" (*Anti-Oedipus* 260). These two poles actually mark two different investments of desire in late capitalism: paranoid and schizoid. First, the paranoid type designates the fascizing pole that imprisons all the creative potential of desire into molar segregations. It appears to have first emerged in the despotic social machine where everything is overcoded and fixated upon the despot's body. Late capitalism, which is built upon the acts of decoding and recoding, borrows the paranoid despotic sign to establish its own sovereignty (*Anti-Oedipus* 260-263). It is the paranoid despotic sign that enables capitalism to invest arborescent structures that operate merely through binaristic systems. The Oedipus complex is, for instance, such a paranoid investment that reduces all libidinal drives to molar aggregates in the form of familial romance. It functions to organise and engineer the masses by canalising their flows of desire towards a transcendental signifier. The paranoid type is by its nature sedentary; it reterritorialises the deterritorialised territories on the body without organs and totalises all the molecular forces by attaching them to an organising principle and turning them into organisms.

Unlike the paranoid type that has totalising effects on the flows of desire and social organisations, the schizophrenic type stands for the revolutionary

tendency that creates lines of flight from the molar aggregates, deterritorialises the territorialised assemblages, overthrows any kind of organisms and hierarchies and frees desire from the constraints of late capitalism. For Deleuze and Guattari this type is unique only to the capitalist social machine. This is because, unlike previous ones, the capitalist social machine does not entirely rely upon fixity and stability; it needs to decode the previously-established codes so that it can forge new connections and enable the circulation and maintenance of its socius. The schizophrenic type, arising out of the act of deterritorialisation, makes molecular investments on the socius (280-282). It revitalises all the creative potentials of desire by clearing the blockages on its flows. The flows of desire are hence reactivated through the dismantling of normed forms and structures in which they are imprisoned. In opposition to the sedentary and fascizing enterprises of the other pole, therefore, the schizophrenic pole stands for the nomadic, polyvocal and revolutionary enterprises. It seeks the *absolute limit* of the capitalist social machine and draws lines of flight to go beyond its paranoiac social and libidinal investments (*Anti-Oedipus* 173). Thereby there is no fixed meanings and no limitations on desire but polyvocal meanings and insurmountable flows of desire on the schizophrenic pole.

In the capitalist social machine, paranoia and schizophrenia both break into the body without organs with different practical ends; one organises a fixed form of desire on the body without organs in line with the Oedipus genealogy and stabilises desiring-production within its fictitious boundaries whilst the other frees desiring-production from its Oedipal capture and purges it of its codes and representations (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* 281). The body without organs which is a space for repression in paranoia becomes a space for freedom in schizophrenia¹⁰. In this regard, if late capitalism is assumed to be a limit

¹⁰ It is important to underline the fact that alongside these two possibilities that can occur on the body without organs, there is always a third possibility, that is, the risk of falling into an “empty body without organs” where the subject loses his track and entire stability, feels lost and destroyed by “a too-violent destratification” (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 163). The deterritorialisation and destratification of all the forms and structures could also culminate in the destruction of the subject. It becomes an empty body without organs when it loses its productivity.

implicated upon the body without organs, schizophrenia as an enterprise for freedom is then said to be an occurrence beyond capitalism and its limits: it is, in Deleuze and Guattari's words, "desiring-production, but it is this production as it functions at the end, as the limit of social production determined by the conditions of capitalism" (130). Wherever late capitalism generates its paranoiac pole to build its Oedipal walls, there also hides a schizophrenic potential to go beyond these walls, dismantle their forms and deterritorialise the whole socius. This is why Deleuze and Guattari tend to call late capitalism a relative limit that could be passed through and schizophrenia an absolute limit that surpasses all the taken-for-granted limitations, codes and territorialisations.

The dynamic between the relative and absolute limits of late capitalism culminates in the formation of two types of subject positions: paranoiac and schizo subjects. The paranoiac subject is the subject trapped in the Oedipal genealogy and lost in the fictitious familial romance. He is what Freud would call normal/heterosexual subjectivity on the grounds that he has a healthy ego. The paranoiac subject is assumed to have a properly-functioning ego because he is castrated and has identified his ego with the ego of the phallic father, which makes him an obedient member of the social structure. According to Deleuze and Guattari, the paranoiac subject is indeed the neurotic that is "trapped within the residual or artificial territorialities of our society, and reduces all of them (*les rabat toutes*) to Oedipus as the ultimate territoriality—as reconstructed in the analyst's office and projected upon the full body of the psychoanalyst (yes, my boss is my father, and so is the Chief of State, and so are you, Doctor)" (245; emphasis in original). In other words, the neurotic is a product of capitalism and psychoanalysis. Submitting his desiring-production to the transcendental signifier, the neurotic compliantly yields to the molar organisations on the socius. The transcendental signifier, which is first introduced in the form of the phallic father in the nuclear family, transforms into different roles in the public sphere; it becomes the employer, the government, the officer, and the psychoanalyst. In

In this sense, it is important to distinguish the body without organs in its affirmative sense not only from the cancerous or fascistic body without organs but also from the empty body without organs.

each case, the neurotic, condemning his desire on the grounds that it is a lack, merely desires the desire of the transcendental signifier and hence his desiring-production complies with that of the transcendental signifier, namely the norms and necessities of the social terrain. Therefore, the neurotic is said to be situated at the relative limit of capitalism.

The schizo, however, pushes the limits of desiring-production, the limits of territorialities and the limits of social organisations, which positions him into the absolute limit of the capitalist social machine. The schizo rejects all the fictitious limitations imposed upon the flows of desire. Rather than acceding to either/or choices, he follows the endless ANDs and draws schizophrenic lines of flight from Oedipal theatre, arborescent structures, binaristic systems and molar aggregates. Unlike the paranoiac that is molded into the “normal/heterosexual” norm, the schizo explodes all the taken-for-granted codes by passing through them. He is the one that not only enjoys but also initiates the deterritorialised flows of desire on the body without organs. He is the Deterritorialised that constantly revitalises the acts of deterritorialisation within himself. To be more precise, there is a mutual relationship between the act of deterritorialisation and the schizo subject. He is on the one hand the subject of deterritorialisation since he comes into being when the schizophrenic pole of capitalism is activated to remove the inhibitions on the flows of desire; on the other hand, he carries out the act of deterritorialisation itself. Deleuze and Guattari clarify this mutual interaction as follows:

As for the schizo, continually wandering about, migrating here, there, and everywhere as best he can, he plunges further and further into the realm of deterritorialisation, reaching the furthest limits of the decomposition of the socius on the surface of his own body without organs. It may well be that these peregrinations are the schizo's own particular way of rediscovering the earth. The schizophrenic deliberately seeks out the very limit of capitalism: he is its inherent tendency brought to fulfilment, its surplus product, its proletariat, and its exterminating angel. He scrambles all the codes and is the transmitter of the decoded flows of desire. The real continues to flow. In the schizo, the two aspects of *process* are conjoined: the

metaphysical process that puts us in contact with the 'demoniacal' element in nature or within the heart of the earth, and the historical process of social production that restores the autonomy of desiring-machines in relation to the deterritorialised social machine. (*Anti-Oedipus* 35)

The basic motivation of the schizo is then to move all the social codes to the absolute limit of late capitalism where he stands. There he opens these codes for multiple new connections on the body of the socius.

The schizo, or what Freud would call the pervert to this end, is unoedipalised and daringly resists oedipalisation (78-82). His desires are not absorbed into a lack or mommy-daddy-child triangle since he demolishes the Oedipal genealogy by rejecting to assume his fixed subjectivity in the social machine. He is also unoedipalisable because he releases the flows of desire from the Oedipal trap into the desert and stands beyond all the striated spaces. Defying the restrictions and enforcements of Oedipus, he creates smooth spaces where his unconscious is an orphan and his desire is defined by infinite affirmative potentials. The schizo, thus, does not fit into the norms of normality in the capitalist social machine. On the contrary, he is, in Deleuze and Guattari's words, "a strange subject [...] with no fixed identity, wandering about over the body without organs, but always remaining peripheral to the desiring-machines, being defined by the share of the product it takes for itself, garnering here, there, and everywhere a reward in the form of a becoming or an avatar, being born of the states that it consumes and being reborn with each new state" (18). The schizo, divorcing himself from the molar organisations of the machine, orients towards the myriad possibilities of the molecular zone. He is no longer defined by this or that choice –which, in a sense, guarantees a central and safe position in the structure– but passes through multiple states of becoming: becoming-woman in that for the schizo there is no such thing as either woman or man but only a process of subject formation; becoming-minoritarian in that the schizo assumes all the social, economic, cultural and political forms of minority because of his wilful rejection of majoritarian politics; and becoming-revolutionary in that his resistance can create a transformative and healing effect on the society. The

transition of the schizo through forms of becoming here signals how he simultaneously embodies different potentialities and becomes a multiplicity in himself.

The schizo, as a multiplicity beyond any singularity imposed by a transcendent command, remains at a critical threshold in the capitalist social machine. The threshold where he stands leads him to a constant process of movement and departure. The act of departure that characterises the schizo's position is not, however, a literal movement from one place to another; it is a conceptual departure from striated spaces constructed within any 'structure' into an affirmative intensity which paves the way for the creation of novel alternatives. Put differently, as Deleuze and Guattari argue, "[t]he schizo knows how to leave: he has made departure into something as simple as being born or dying. [...] He does not speak of another world, he is not from another world: even when he is displacing himself in space, his is a journey in intensity, around the desiring-machine that is erected here and remains here" (131). The schizo's departure neither stems from a transcendent origin, nor culminates in a transcendent telos; it is a pure process, a process that rejects being canalised into sedentariness which here implies an orientation towards the building of arborescent structures that create their own hierarchies, binaries and pre-established paths.

Such a movement that orients not towards an ultimate destination but towards unknown possibilities defines the schizo as a nomadic subject. The nomadic subject always moves between different paths, regardless of any destination point, only to trespass the defined territorialities. Unlike the sedentary/paranoiac subject that restrains his movement from A to B by assuming a transcendent point of arrival, the nomadic subject is always in-between, and the in-between is, for Deleuze and Guattari, the one that "[takes on] all the consistency and enjoys both an autonomy and a direction of its own. The life of the nomad is the intermezzo" (*Thousand Plateaus* 380). The nomadic subject is, then, a joyous and free subject since the abandonment of a telos provides one with a liberatory space. This space could also be called a nomadic space which is, by its very nature, a space of affirmative difference and polyvocality. This space born

out of the nomadic subject's line of flight from the taken-for-granted sedentary lines is indeed a configuration of nomos. Nomos essentially corresponds to "the law", "distribution" or "a mode of distribution" where there is no closure, no measure and no boundaries (380). The nomos then stands for a non-structured space that does not hold on to a centre. This makes it a direct opposite of logos which implies the existence of an organising principle which not merely creates a structure but also reinforces its maintenance through its construction of false binaries. While the logos ends up drawing sedentary spaces surrounded by boundaries, walls and territorialities, the nomos is the revolutionary distribution of smooth spaces that resist any enclosure and instead allow for new configurations of subjectivity, new modes of existence and new ways of thinking. This is why the schizo subject is not *logocentric* but *nomadic*: he has "no points, paths, or land, even though [he does] by all appearances" (*Thousand Plateaus* 381). Having no determined point to arrive, no determined paths to follow and no determined land to stay in, the nomadic subject is always on the move and on the act of deterritorialisation.

The type of subjectivity represented by the schizo then problematises traditional identity politics, which have been dominant since Plato and is still dictated by the paranoid pole of late capitalism. Firstly, schizo subjectivity embraced in Deleuzian philosophy abandons the reliance upon the Cartesian cogito, which prioritises the mind over the body and assumes the subject as a fixed, rational, coherent and knowing being, on the grounds that "[t]he cogito is a proceeding that must always be recommenced, haunted by the possibility of betrayal, a deceitful God, and an evil Genius" (128). For Deleuze and Guattari, the subject in totality can be the source of production because of the flows of desire he carries within himself. Desire is capable of overthrowing the linear temporal proceeding that brings about not merely the dichotomy between the mind and the body but also myriad other dichotomies in the social milieu. It is, thus, unreasonable to reduce the subject who himself is a multiplicity to one leg of such dichotomies. Rather than representing the knowing mind/self, the schizo is the simultaneous existence and performance of all kinds of bodily and mental

configurations. Secondly, schizo subjectivity rejects the psychoanalytic assumptions of subjectivity as the healthy ego identified with the ego of the phallic father or the Symbolic father. The schizo, therefore, rejects undergoing Oedipal resolution or linguistic castration. His desire simply surpasses the false claims of lack and prohibition and his unconscious alike discards the familial fantasies and repressions. The inhibition that he will be ostracised from the society as the inappropriate other cannot deter the schizo from his revolutionary path. No matter how the paranoiac forces of the capitalist social machine incessantly operate upon the formation of healthy subjectivity, the schizo chooses to be abnormal or sick. Thus, he becomes pure intensities, assemblages, multiplicities, flows, fluxes and fluids all at once (*Thousand Plateaus* 131).

Considering that contemporary dystopia radically portrays the workings of the capitalist social machine like signification, subject formation and social production in quite a Deleuzian sense, these two types of subjectivity discussed so far could be argued to be resonating in immanent dystopia. The societies of control under late capitalism, as depicted in immanent dystopia, leave the individuals in between paranoia and schizophrenia. In principle, the paranoiac pole uses psychic repression to repress the individuals and creates paranoiac subjects. Paranoiac subjects are then those in immanent dystopia who submissively obey the transcendent laws of the capitalist social machine and follow the lines of segmentation where they are defined and concretised. Schizo subjects are, in contrast, those who can draw themselves lines of flight by going beyond these molar lines. These subjects could be appropriately associated with the notion of “a people to come” in immanent dystopia. Since schizophrenia is initially a natural tendency of late capitalism like paranoia, immanent dystopia necessarily invents a people to resist what is intolerable in the here-and-now. A people to come, as an actor of deterritorialisation, heralds the limits of the capitalist system where the molar bodies are abandoned in favour of molecular possibilities, Oedipal subjectivity in favour of schizo subjectivity, sedentariness in favour of nomadism and normality in favour of delirium. Thereby, the schizophrenic breakdown in immanent dystopia becomes a revolutionary

breakthrough, which signals the passing over of the neurotic normality and rigid identity dictated in late capitalism¹¹.

3.5. From The Clinical and Critical Approach Towards Schizoanalysis

Contemporary dystopian writers question our conception of and relation to the present, depicting a dysterritory where there is an endless oscillation between the dystopian here-and-now and its deterritorialising potential for revolution. Immanent dystopia, at this point, draws a particular attention to the portrayal of dysterritory. On the one hand, it tends to display the paranoiac tendency of desire in late capitalism, criticising how the capitalist social machine seizes the helm of the entire world and produces the neurotic subjects with its Oedipal myth. Thereby dysterritory is depicted in all its negativity: life is no longer a process filled with pure intensities and creative energies but a restricted mode of existence. It becomes sick with the fascizing workings of late capitalism. On the other hand, when life gets sick, contemporary dystopian writers appear as great clinicians and immanent dystopia as an activity of health. “[W]hat constitutes the health” in literature is, as Daniel Smith underlines, “precisely its capacity to construct such lines of flight, to affirm the power of life, to transform itself depending on the forces it encounters (the ‘ethical’ vision of the world)” (lii). Immanent dystopia accordingly releases the schizophrenic pole of desire from its capture by capitalism and invents a new people to come and a new earth, both of which signal the positivity of dysterritory, becoming the harbingers of possible

¹¹ This is not to say that the schizophrenic people to come in corporate dystopia always stands for the absolute deterritorialisation, or what Deleuze calls “revolution”. Although the lines drawn by the schizo are by their very nature revolutionary and heading towards the plane of immanence, these lines are inevitably in danger of molar blockages due to the relentless oscillation between deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation in the capitalist social machine. The schizo subjects are alike in constant danger of Oedipalisation and molar segmentarity. No matter where these lines drawn by the schizophrenic people to come lead to, bearing also in mind that the schizophrenic lines do not have a transcendent agenda to follow, what is noteworthy in this study is not the individual beings but the process itself. As Deleuze and Guattari themselves point out, “[t]he schizo is not the revolutionary, but the schizophrenic process – in terms of which the schizo is merely the interruption, or the continuation in the void – is the potential for revolution” (*Anti-Oedipus* 341).

lines of flight from the here-and-now dystopia and the vectors of deterritorialisation.

Immanent dystopia, as an enterprise of health, seems to be in need of a theoretical approach that can pay regard to this close link between literature and health and the workings of the capitalist social machine allied with psychoanalysis. In this regard, a critical and clinical approach could be a good fit for the analyses of contemporary dystopian works at hand. The critical and clinical project, proposed in Deleuze's last book *Essays: Clinical and Critical* (1993), relies upon the argument that the writer is a profound symptomatologist of civilisation. The writer reads the symptoms of the sicknesses of the society and offers positive cures for it and hence literature becomes a health which is supposed to be scrutinised not only critically but also clinically (3-5). The clinical aspect of Deleuzian literary analysis traces how paths of life are blocked and repressed and make life sick, how lines of flight are drawn from the arborescent structures, striated spaces and Oedipal myths that clog the fluxes and flows of unbound desire inherent in life, and how these schizo lines create positive cures against life's sicknesses. Departing from the traditional notions of literary interpretation, the critical aspect engages with how these clinical symptoms and positive cures are integral to literary techniques and authorial style embraced in literary works. Gregg Lambert outlines Deleuze's critical and clinical approach to literature in three aspects:

First, certain writers have invented concrete semiotic practices that may prove more effective than psychoanalytic discourse in diagnosing the constellation of mute forces that both accompany life and threaten it from within. Second, as a result of this diagnostic and critical function, certain literary works can be understood to produce a kind of 'symptomatology' that may prove to be more effective than political or ideological critique in discerning the signs that correspond to the new arrangements of 'language, labour, and life' [...] Finally, third, [...] writers can offer us a manner of diagramming the potential forms of resistance, or 'lines of flight', which may be virtual to these new arrangements. (135)

This approach apparently fashions an affirmative enterprise in the sense that the critique is no longer limited to mere interpretation but becomes a clinical case which either creates and transforms or sheds light upon new creations. It owes its affirmative nature primarily to its departure from the discourse of psychoanalysis. This departure from psychoanalysis brings to the fore the idea that Deleuze's critical and clinical project must have been evolved from his notion of "schizoanalysis" which first appeared in *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Schizoanalysis, which Deleuze and Guattari call "universal clinical theory" (*Anti-Oedipus* 281), is indeed a powerful critique of psychoanalysis which takes into account the previously-neglected social and political aspects of repression. It condemns psychoanalysis for being a negative and transcendent representation that hides the fact that social repression is essentially a psychic repression in the same manner that social production is a desiring-production. At this critical point, schizoanalysis sets out to create a health in which the Oedipal myth is entirely dysfunctionalised and the unconscious is orphaned. As Deleuze and Guattari stress, "[i]t is not the purpose of schizoanalysis to resolve Oedipus, it does not intend to resolve it better than Oedipal psychoanalysis does. Its aim is to de-oedipalise the unconscious in order to reach the real problems" (81-82). The real problem suggested by Deleuze and Guattari is indeed the collaboration between psychoanalysis and capitalism under the guise of a "clinical cure". Late capitalism, as a reiteration of the fictitious representation of the unconscious, purports to produce paranoiac subjects, linguistically and psychically castrating their revolutionary desire through the norms of lack and Oedipus complex. Those who, despite their willingness, fail in identifying themselves with the ego of the phallic father and in accommodating themselves to the paranoiac pole of desire and hence suffer from a kind of discord are diagnosed with neurosis and assumed to be in need of a cure. The cure advocated by psychoanalysis is indeed a mission of the reintegration of the neurotic into the society as a conforming and yielding subject. The neurotic becomes a healthy subject only when his unconscious is recaptured by the Oedipus complex and he is psychically and socially castrated. Schizoanalysis, in

contrast, argues that once the unconscious is rescued from its Oedipal capture, the subject is cured. What is proposed by psychoanalysis as the cure is then, for schizoanalysis, what creates the sickness in the first place. Therefore, schizoanalysis attacks psychoanalysis' claim to cure the neurotic on the grounds that its cure is in effect the castration of the subject, the regulation of the ego and the repression of the unconscious. The psychoanalytic cure is, for Deleuze and Guattari, what produces sickness in the first place. This is why, they offer schizoanalysis as an alternative to psychoanalysis, blatantly underlining that "[a] schizophrenic out for a walk is a better model than a neurotic lying on the analyst's couch" (9) and "*the only incurable is the neurotic*" (361; emphasis in original).

Therefore, schizoanalysis appears as a form of reading as an alternative to the symbolic and prohibitive nature of psychoanalysis. It purges itself of any transcendence and hence derives from desire. Desire, as Eugene Holland clarifies, has a polyvocal, amorphous and schizophrenic nature which will get fascized, and its creative and transformative process will be terminated when it is canalised towards a transcendent goal as in psychoanalysis (19-22-38). Schizoanalysis' task is to release desire from any "univocal molar representation" like the Oedipal yoke by denouncing its illegitimate uses¹². This is to say that schizoanalysis generates an immanent and legitimate use of desire with a mission of destruction, the destruction of any transcendental threshold. This transcendental threshold imposed by psychoanalysis could be argued to be the internal relative limits of late capitalism. Schizoanalysis constantly pushes these limits forward by "tirelessly taking apart egos and their presuppositions; liberating the prepersonal singularities they enclose and repress; mobilising the flows they would be capable of transmitting, receiving, or intercepting; establishing always further and more sharply the schizzes and the breaks well below conditions of identity; and

¹² Deleuze and Guattari in *Anti-Oedipus* make a useful distinction between the legitimate and illegitimate uses of desire and the syntheses of the unconscious. By "the illegitimate use", they mean the repression of desire and the annihilation of its schizophrenic pole by exposing it to molar impositions. "The legitimate use", however, denotes the free and endless flux of the flows of desire and the release of its affirmative potential to transform and create.

assembling the desiring-machines that countersect everyone and group everyone with others” (Deleuze and Guattari *Anti-Oedipus* 362).

The task of schizoanalysis is then either to create a new earth and a health which are freed from transcendental positions, representation and molar reterritorialisations or to allow “the schizo’s own particular way of rediscovering the earth” (35). This inherent tendency of schizoanalysis to create, to perceive things in their creativity and cure the psychoanalytic cure itself necessarily makes it a part of Deleuze’s critical and clinical project. Both projects can be considered machines of literary analysis whose revolutionary and affirmative potential depends upon the extent to which they enliven schizophrenia not as a clinical entity but a process. Schizophrenia as process is indeed the real essence of life, that is desire, its desiring-production and its revolutionary capacity (130). It is a healing and productive process capable of converting the pathological breakdowns into revolutionary breakthroughs and of creating alternate modes of life. Likewise, Deleuze’s critical and clinical project is a curative and creative enterprise, “a process and not a goal, a production and not an expression” (*Anti-Oedipus* 133).

The similar motivations behind Deleuze’s schizoanalytic enterprise and his clinical literary method brings to the fore the idea that the clinical and critical project is more than a symptomatological approach. It is indeed an experimental methodology that has no predetermined criteria to follow. This vague and experimental nature of Deleuzian clinical and critical approach and schizoanalysis poses certain problems for this dissertation in terms of its application to immanent dystopia. There are still debates about the applicability of Deleuzian methodology for which he does not provide a certain set of principles or points of reference. This, however should not suggest an imprecision or disorganisation in his philosophy; rather, it stands for the exact way he intends to encourage his readers to adopt. That is to say, Deleuze himself does not transmit his philosophy through definitions, rules and principles but with its practices. It is, thus, more reasonable to approach his philosophy by asking the question of how it functions rather than the question of what it means. To this end, this dissertation will attempt to circumvent the possible stakes Deleuzian methodology could lead to by focusing

on three major points: the deterritorialisation of subjectivity, the deterritorialisation of space and the deterritorialisation of language.

In this respect, this dissertation will delve into the formation of subjectivity in the dysterritory and trace how the subjects do not submit to the compulsions of the Oedipalised unconscious; instead, it will focus on how they shatter traditional conception of Being and take lines of flight from their formalisation and capture in the capitalist world. At this point, late capitalism and dysterritory become a background for the scrutiny of the notion of subjectivity. Capitalism, as examined in detail in previous sections, corresponds to a social machine which is, distinctly from the previous two social formations, structured upon the axiomatic. The axiomatic that capitalism relies upon is what gives it its flexibility and constant modulation through the acts of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation. As in the case with that of every single entity in the capitalist world, the position of the subject is subject to a perpetual oscillation between the act of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation. That is, desire shuttles between the fascizing pole and the schizophrenising pole, and the subject is alike forced to be Oedipalised, molarised and fixated upon a stable and non-threatening position while at the same time encouraged to go beyond this Oedipalisation and fixed position. Due to the very nature of desire, however, the subject can depart from the paranoiac and Oedipalised positions, move towards the realm of becomings and schizos although the fascizing forces continue to pull him back to the plane of organisation, or dysterritory in its negative sense. At this point, this dissertation will trace this movement between two opposite poles and attempt to find out the creation of a people to come and its rhizomatic shifts from the world of dystopian order into the world of affirmative chaos, that is chaosmos¹³.

¹³ Chaos, in Deleuzian philosophy, stands for a kind of formless multiplicity, heterogeneity, potentiality and infinite flows of difference prior to any organisation. Yet this multiplicity or difference may not always necessarily be affirmative. Chaos becomes affirmative only when art, literature or science gives a consistency to its disorder through the creation of concepts and people. In other words, chaos becomes chaosmos through new creations. As Deleuze and Guattari underline in the last chapter of *What is Philosophy?*, art, literature and science “transfor[m] chaotic variability into chaoid variety” (204), which makes chaos affirmative. In this regard, when this study makes references to affirmative chaos, it does not imply simply a chaotic existence of flows

This shift from negative order to affirmative chaos with a degree of consistency is another point of reference that this study aims to draw attention to. Late capitalism simultaneously inholds both smooth spaces and striated spaces. While striated space stands for the closed, structured and limited space, smooth space corresponds to a space free from all the previous taken-for-granted bonds. The embodiment of these two types of space is closely related to the constant act of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation on the socius. Deleuze and Guattari note this coexistence of smooth and striated spaces by saying that “the two spaces in fact exist only in mixture: smooth space is constantly being translated, transversed into a striated space; striated space is constantly being reversed, returned to a smooth space” (*Thousand Plateaus* 474). The simultaneous confrontation between smooth and striated spaces can well be understood through the notion of dysterritory which this dissertation proposes. While striated space denotes dysterritory as a dystopian space of the present, smooth space designates dysterritory as a deterritorialised space. In line with the perpetual movement of the subject from the fascizing pole to the schizophrenic pole of desire, there is also a constant movement from dysterritory as a striated space to dysterritory as a smooth space. In this regard, this study will examine how the dystopian spaces can be constantly turned into deterritorialised spaces despite capitalism’s endless striving to retrieve them back to striated spaces.

Along with the moments of deterritorialisation of subjectivity and space, as Ian Buchanan, Tim Matts and Aidan Tynan argue in their introduction to *Schizoanalysis of Literature*, a Deleuzian reading of text “should be oriented around those ‘pragmatic’ moments –embodied in linguistic blocs, refrains, formulae and so on– when meaning swings over to use, where something ‘occurs’ in the text rather than being signified or narrated” (5). This necessitates an examination into the deterritorialisation of language in immanent dystopia in order to show how the cures suggested by the text could be reflected in its literary style. Language cannot escape deadlocks on the flows of desire. It becomes one of

of difference but takes this degree of consistency in chaos into account without endangering its productivity.

the main fascizing means of the societies of control. In the capitalist social machine, language itself is adorned with the forms and structures dictated for fascizing and reterritorialising effects. Considering the role of language in the creation of paranoid subjects and striated spaces, Deleuze frequently refers back to the use of language and linguistic blocs in literary texts. In his *Essays: Clinical and Critical*, he is concerned with how literary texts submit language to a deterritorialising function. This function is, for Deleuze, to reach and overpass the limit of language which is not “outside language, but the outside of language” (*Clinical and Critical* 5). This is to say that language could be pierced and turned upside down till a new language is created out of its scraps. This new language could be addressed as either “minor language” as he himself does in his *Kafka: A Minor Literature*, “the stuttering of language” as in *Clinical and Critical*, or the deterritorialisation of language as in this study. In each, language no longer harbors the arborescent structures within itself; on the contrary, it falls into a schizophrenic delirium and driven into a flight. Regarding Deleuze’s constant return to language in his works, this dissertation will trace how contemporary dystopian writers become “a stutterer in language” and make the language “stutter: an affective and intensive language, and no longer an affectation of the one who speaks” (107).

CHAPTER 4

MARGARET ATWOOD'S *MADDADDAM* TRILOGY AS AN IMMANENT DYSTOPIA

Margaret Atwood's career as a writer began as early as the 1960s with the publication of her poetry collection, *Double Perspective* (1961), which was followed by her first novel *The Edible Woman* (1969). Her writing skill has its origins in her childhood interest in creating imaginary worlds. Atwood's motive for the invention of alternative worlds from an early age onward may be said to reside in her conception of power and power relations. For Atwood, "[p]ower is our environment. We live surrounded by it: it pervades everything we are and do, invisible and soundless, like air" ("Notes on *Power Politics*" 7). She apparently has an understanding of power which penetrates not merely the political sphere but also the personal sphere, considering that, as she writes, "we all would like to have a private life that is sealed off from the public life and different from it, where there are no rulers and no ruled, no hierarchies, no politicians, only equals, free people" (7). Her focal point here appears to hinge primarily upon a collective desire for a state of living that is stripped of taken-for-granted political binaries and their practices, that is, a desire for betterment. Her disappointment with the present society and her increasing desire for a better way of living and seeing necessarily position her as a political writer who creates narratives of resistance and subversion. Her works very often investigate the existing power structures and social organisations, and offer alternatives that go beyond the dualities and hierarchies such as mind/body, inner/outer and man/woman. This not only makes her an inventor of imaginary worlds and an innovator of traditional forms, plots and characters, but also constitutes a long and astonishing case for theorising the concept of dystopia.

As a subversive creator of new genres, forms and plot, Atwood's conception of dystopia remarkably departs from those critics who approach dystopia and utopia as opposite poles. In one of her essays entitled "Dire Cartographies: the Roads to Utopia", she outlines the relationship between dystopia and utopia as a "yin and yang pattern" and argues that "within each utopia, [there is] a concealed dystopia; within each dystopia, a hidden utopia" (85). Drawing upon such an understanding that is discontented with the traditional definition of dystopia as anti-utopia or negative utopia, Atwood comes up with an alternative coinage of hers: "ustopia" ("Dire Cartographies" 75). "Ustopia" collapses the supposed boundaries between dystopia and utopia, and aligns itself with one of the major arguments of this dissertation, which is that dystopia and utopia are close genres that simultaneously embody each other's horizons and meet on a shared ground. To elaborate upon her neologism and point out its distinguishing features from science fiction as a genre and as a conception, Atwood draws a cartography of dystopia, supposing that ustopia is a "state of mind" that can be "portrayed by a landscape" (75). Atwood's ustopias are "not exactly places, which are anywhere but nowhere, and which are both mappable locations and states of mind" (75). In other words, ustopias are not entirely imaginary places in the distant future but real and locatable places of the present. The mapping of ustopia as unlocated yet somehow locatable landscape offers a new approach to space and temporality in the concept of dystopia. This new understanding of space and temporality is in effect what distinguishes dystopia from science fiction. According to Atwood, writing about what is to come is often assumed to be a concern of dystopia; it is nevertheless the interest of science fiction. Science fiction novels, as she puts it, "can set themselves in parallel imagined realities, or long ago, and/or on planets far away. But all these locations have something in common: they don't exist" ("Burning Bushes" 61). That is to say, science fiction as a genre creates non-existing worlds mostly located in the future. They are non-existent because they are the portraits of what could possibly happen rather than what is happening now. Atwood consciously distances herself and her work from science fiction as a category on the grounds that the future is unattainable but the present can provide

us with traces of the future. Therefore, what awaits exploration for the creation of cautionary tales is not the future but the present itself. She clarifies this new perception of temporality, which she also embraces in her works, as follows: “The future can never be truly predicted because there are too many variables. You can, however, dip into the present, which contains the seeds of what might become the future” (61). Drawing upon this perception that deviates from the linear perception by calling the future unattainable and unpredictable and the present inclusive of the past and the future, Atwood sees her cautionary tales as ustopia, or speculative dystopian fiction, which does not portray things that could possibly happen but things that might have happened or are happening.

Her concept of ustopia could then be conceived in parallel with the concept of immanent dystopia that this dissertation discusses in many aspects. First of all, her reconceptualisation of time in dystopia corresponds to the idea of a non-linear temporality and process-orientation. Dystopia no longer posits a predetermined or foreseen model of the future but re-presents the present as the blueprint of an unpredictable future. This necessarily eliminates the problematic tendency towards closure that often implies the imposition of a single future ideal. Such an imposition would only be the reversal of pre-existing binaries, that is a matter of either/or choice. Atwood is, however, never contented with either/or choices. She instead opts for eliminating all hierarchical binaries. Thus, the goal of writing fiction is for her “[t]o express the unexpressed life of the masses. [...] To show the bastards. [...] To say a new world. To make a new thing. [...] To subvert the establishment. [...] To experiment with new forms of perception” (Atwood, “Introduction: Into the Labyrinth”, xx-xxi). What is emphasised by Atwood and observed in immanent dystopia is then a kind of cautionary writing that promises a revolution. This is a revolution not in the sense that it is only “a revolving, a turn of the wheel of fortune, by which those who were at the bottom mount to the top and assume the choice positions, crushing the former-holders beneath them” (Atwood, “George Orwell”, 143) but in the sense that it is the opening of innumerable ways of struggling against the present until reaching out to pure multiplicity. In this regard, the analogy Atwood draws between ustopia and

landscape could be argued to be matching with the notion of “dysterritory”: dysterritory is indeed an ustopian landscape that stands both for a real space or state of living that is located in the here-and-now and for a state of mind that acknowledges the possibility of such a revolution seeking pure multiplicity.

Atwood develops the concept of ustopia in her 2011 article “Dire Cartographies: The Roads to Ustopia” (75). It is important to underline the fact that all of her dystopian works predating it may not fit into the definition of “ustopia”. As this dissertation discusses in the theoretical framework, Atwood’s early work *Handmaid’s Tale* (1985) still tends to display some transcendent impulses despite its gradual movement towards the plane of immanence. In this study, therefore, it is called not an immanent dystopia or ustopia but a transgressive dystopia, namely, a kind of dystopia which, despite its remarkably subversive stance, still cannot escape a small degree of transcendence. The ustopian aspects that Atwood conceptualises in her article are most felt in her most recent *MaddAddam* trilogy (2003-2013). The trilogy testifies to the connections made between immanent dystopia and ustopia. In an obviously optimistic yet humorous manner, it also addresses the same question that this dissertation has previously posed: Could there be a way out from the here-and-now dystopia? *Oryx and Crake*, the first novel of the trilogy, was published in 2003 as a dystopian novel telling the story of the last survivors of an epidemic that annihilated the entire human race somewhere on the east-coast of the United States. The second novel, *The Year of the Flood* (2009), which came after 6 years, delves into the story of *Oryx and Crake* from a different perspective. These two novels are regarded as “parallel narratives” (Jameson, “Then You are Them”, 7) in the sense that the former portrays the post/pre-catastrophe from the perspective of a male protagonist, Jimmy, while the latter explores the same world through the lenses of two female protagonists, Toby and Ren. Nevertheless, it was only through the publication *MaddAddam* in 2013 that it became possible to perceive the two sibling novels as sequential. To be more precise, these two narratives appear not as prequels or sequels, which is often linked to the model of a tree, in their fullest sense but as two different sections of the same novel that have been

rhizomatically scattered. Accordingly, they do not follow a chronological or linear narrative line but begin in medias res and abound in flashbacks. These two story lines constitute an organic and comprehensible unity only when *MaddAddam* crystallises the events and bridges the gaps.

Apart from its rhizomatic nature, the *MaddAddam* trilogy offers a rich material in style, story and structure to keep critics busy pondering where to locate and how to categorise it. Despite various disagreements on its genre, critics too often agree that the trilogy does not follow a traditional dystopian novel structure. Rather than depicting a foreseen future society, the trilogy describes the dystopian reality of the present, that which is an utterly capitalist world where multinational corporations have taken over the control of the economy, politics, science, technology, and social and individual lives. Even though the story takes place in a not-perfectly-clear-future-setting, the future, as Fredrick Jameson remarks, begins “to dissolve into ever more porous actuality” (“Then You are Them”, 7). The increasing focus on the present reality even problematises its fictionality. Not surprisingly, Atwood who is very conscious about the affinity of her trilogy to reality calls it “fact within fiction” (qtd in “Life After Man”, 40-41), which “does not include any technologies or biobeings that do not already exist, are not under construction, or are not possible in theory” (*MaddAddam*, 475). Thus, the trilogy examines today’s societies under the control of late capitalism aligning with corporatism, bio-engineering, and exposes their hierarchies, arborescent systems and forms of subjectification.

Nevertheless, it is not the portrayal of the here-and-now dystopian reality that makes the trilogy utopian, to use Atwood’s term, and dystopian in a Deleuzian sense, but the glimpses of resistance observed at both individual and collective levels. The *MaddAddam* trilogy not only depicts the working mechanism of late capitalism but also reveals its possible breakdown with the use of its means against itself, namely, its collapse from within. It attempts to redistribute power, reorganise power relations and resist molar organisations by creating leaks within the social structure. It explores how spatial, temporal, subjective and biological boundaries are created in the first place and how they

can be transgressed. Such a notion of resistance, therefore, brings us back to the main goal of this dissertation, which is to examine the ways in which Atwood's comment on the here-and-now complicates and subverts all the binaries on which the capitalist social machine relies. This dystopian work hence appears as "a vector of deterritorialisation" (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 294), whereby the taken-for-granted notions of space, subjectivity and language are questioned and replaced with new alternatives. This chapter will accordingly focus on the process of dethroning these three fields in Atwood's trilogy.

4.1. Smooth Spaces of Resistance: From the Compounds to the Pleeblands

One of the ways in which the *MaddAddam* trilogy achieves to become a revolutionary political enterprise is through its exploration of how the forces of smoothing and striating work within the utopian space. Each of the novels begins in the present, giving insight into a pre-apocalyptic world where a form of late capitalism has taken the helm of each and every domain of life. In this pre-apocalyptic world portrayed from different perspectives in each novel, there is no longer a single centre of power like the state that functions as an organising principle and regulates the society and the individual. Multinational corporations such as HelthWyzer, OrganInc, NooSkins and RejoovenEsence have taken over the rule, and controlled the economy, politics, science, technology, education and even culture.

The society under the control of corporate Compounds is structured as a "striated space", which is strictly organised around fixed points, hierarchies and binaries. For Deleuze and Guattari, it is a space that is "both limited and limiting", "it is limited in its parts, which are assigned constant directions, are oriented in relation to one another, divisible by boundaries, and can interlink; what is limiting (lines or wall, and no longer boundary) is this aggregate in relation to the smooth spaces it 'contains,' whose growth it slows or prevents, and which it restricts or places outside" (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus*, 383). The pre-apocalyptic world of the *MaddAddam* trilogy is accordingly molded through

commodified social and economical norms and practices which compartmentalise and stratify space. This world is captured upon a number of oppositions, most of which derive from the major binary division between the Compounds and the Pleeblands. The Compounds serve as the autonomous and privatised space of corporations where only the Compound people, namely those who work for corporations, and their families can reside. The Pleeblands, on the other hand, stand for the cities outside the Compounds where the majority of the diverse population ranging from the homeless, the sex workers to the immigrants lives. The corporate Compounds and the Pleeblands constitute an inside/outside opposition created and fed by the corporations themselves. The Compounds host the privileged, namely the supposedly superior leg of the social binary, and separate and protect them from the rest of the society through both literal and illusory boundaries. These boundaries literally exist in the sense that the Compounds are closed and gated spaces where noone except their residents is allowed to enter and noone inside is alike allowed to exit without an official permission. However, they are at the same time illusory since the idea that the Compounds are safe and idealistic depends upon the supposition that the Pleeblands are insecure and dangerous. It is assumed that there are “people cruising around in those places who could forge anything and who might be anybody, not to mention the loose change - the addicts, the muggers, the paupers, the crazies. It [is] best for everyone at OrganInc Farms to live all in one place, with foolproof procedures” (*Oryx and Crake*, 32). The Compound people believe in such assumptions even though most of them have not ever been in the Pleeblands before.

In this society structured upon hierarchical modes of categorisation, the Pleeblands appear to be the Other of the Compounds. Throughout the whole trilogy, the place is defined by the Compound people with stock epithets almost implying a colonial discourse: “Accepted wisdom in the Compounds said that nothing of interest went on in the Pleeblands, apart from buying and selling: there was no life of the mind. Buying and selling, plus a lot of criminal activity: but to Jimmy it looked mysterious and exciting, over there on the other side of the safety

barriers. Also dangerous” (*Oryx and Crake* 231). The idea that the Pleeblands are exotic, intimidating and the unknown Other actually discloses the logic behind late capitalism. Late capitalism as a constant process of decoding and recoding for merely economic interests correlates with colonial discourse. In line with this logic, the Pleeblands function as the colonised other which is located at the peripheries of the Compounds. They are the places of “endless dingy-looking streets, countless vehicles of all kinds, some of them with clouds of smoke coming out the back; thousands of people, hurrying, cheering, rioting” (31). In these overpopulated and polluted areas, people struggle with increasing poverty, violence and crime. These people are marginalised and subjugated to the operations of the striation of identity as being labeled as the Other in terms of racial, social and economic background, and strictly forbidden to access the Compounds. It is the Compounds that channel their subjugation and discrimination because they see these places as their waste yard which they do not have any interest in ameliorating other than pursuing their commercialisation and exploitation.

Even though the Compounds are represented as completely oppositional places to the Pleeblands and even interpreted by some critics as “semi-utopia” or “micro-utopia” (Joseph “The Age of Dystopia”, 39; Wagner-Lawlor “With no Guarantees”, 74), they are actually as dystopian as the Pleeblands. Atwood’s portrayal of these two seemingly oppositional spaces both from the centre and from the margins allows us to perceive how social structure is built upon striations and turned into molar assemblages from inside and outside. Thus, all the oppositions through which the pre-apocalyptic world is striated are there to be unveiled and deconstructed via these different perspectives¹⁴. *Oryx and Crake* gives us a picture of the Compounds from within and the Pleeblands from outside,

¹⁴ Atwood’s employment of multiple voices in her trilogy echoes Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia, which is a literary form implementing different perspectives, languages and dialects simultaneously in order to question any authoritative discourse. The inclusion of several different points of view in this trilogy also serves the same end. This dissertation does not focus on this aspect of the trilogy since it would be beyond the scope of this study, yet further studies could elaborate the use and function of heteroglossia in contemporary dystopia in general and in Atwood’s texts in particular.

from the perspective of the centralised, mostly from the perspective of Jimmy. Jimmy, the protagonist of the first novel, is one of the residents of the Compounds whose parents are working for the OrganInc Compound. These corporations are run through a market system, having their own housing estates, schools, security firm and shopping malls. They are not oriented towards a single and transcendental centre of power, but they still depend upon the State apparatus to striate and regulate smooth spaces for their expansion since the essence of capitalism is to capture and appropriate the free flows on smooth surfaces. Thus, even though the Compound people are made to believe that “[o]utside the OrganInc walls and gates and searchlights, things are unpredictable” (*Oryx and Crake*, 31) and inside they are safe and free, they are indeed under incessant control of these corporations. The houses, the pools, the schools, the hospitals and even the Compound people, they all belong to the Compounds. The residents are constantly tracked through their smartphones, their DNAs and fingerprints. They are indeed imprisoned in the closed space of the Compounds under the guise of protection from the Pleeblands and other rival corporations. In contrast to the illusion of freedom and security which make the Compound people feel like “kings and dukes” (32), these Compounds actually mark the essence of sedentary space which is “striated, by walls, enclosures, and roads between enclosures” (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 381). That is why Jimmy’s mother who once worked for these corporations calls them “all artificial”, nothing but a “theme park” (*Oryx and Crake* 31).

Deleuze and Guattari define striated space as a space “that is counted in order to be occupied” (*Thousand Plateaus* 362). In other words, the interest in striating spaces lies in the goal of gaining more and more profit. The Compounds in the *MaddAddam* trilogy, accordingly, tend to striate and reposition all the possibly diverse flows for capitalist interests. They hold the control of every single domain of the society through their collective security firm, the CorpseCorps. The CorpseCorps, the “faceless power centre” (Jameson, “Then You are Them”, 7), are responsible not only for the security and order of the Compounds but also for the regulation of the market flow outside the Compounds.

The capitalist practices of the corporations outside the Compounds become much clearer in *The Year of the Flood*. In this second constellation of the *MaddAddam* trilogy, Atwood presents the same pre-apocalyptic world from the perspective of the pleeblanders Toby and Ren, both of whom have been victimised by the corporate-dominated world. The constitution of the Compounds is mainly based upon their usurpation of the market in the Pleeblands.

The Compounds exert a rhizomatic expansion on the global market at the cost of the elimination of small retailers. Happicupa cafe chains are one of those exploitative companies of the Compounds: HelthWyzer Compound develops a new genetically modified coffee bean called Happicupa and instantly throws small growers like Ren's father out of business since huge machines now replace the labor force needed to plant, hand pick, process and ship coffee beans. At this point, the Corpsecorps appear to help the Compounds run their business and suppress resistant movements against exploitation. Another food chain supported by the Compounds is SecretBurgers which is indeed a simultaneous embodiment of patriarchy and late capitalism. SecretBurgers hires pleeblanders who are mostly banned from working officially like immigrants or escapees from the Compounds, and pays them low wages despite long and exhausting work hours and dire circumstances. What is worse, the female workers of SecretBurgers are sexually assaulted, raped and even murdered by their managers. It is even rumoured that this food chain functions as the dumpsite of the Compounds to grind their corpse disposals, either killed by the Corpsecorps or devastated by organ transplants or science experiments. In return, the Corpsecorps turn a blind eye on SecretBurgers' all abuses, maltreatments and even assassinations, which indeed proves that the real tendency of these capitalist entrepreneurs is only to exchange, extract and exploit.

These Compounds expand their span to all the previously non-commodified territories including the military, social life and politics. Science and technology cannot escape their capture and encapsulation, and serve the interests of capital. These capitalist corporations structure and articulate the domain of science and technology, and turn scientific and technological progress into a flow of

commodities. At this point, while science becomes a tool for the reproduction of commodities rather than improvements designed for the good of the society, scientists become their labourers to increase the economic profitability of the system at the cost of the degradation of human beings and the planet. As stated by Adam in the novel,

They're using their vitamin supplement pills and over-the-counter painkillers as vectors for diseases - ones for which they control the drug treatments. Whatever's in the white ones is in actual deployment. Random distribution, so no one will suspect a specific location of being ground zero. They make money all ways: on the vitamins, then on the drugs, and finally on the hospitalisation when the illness takes firm hold. As it does, because the treatment drugs are loaded too. A very good plan for siphoning the victims' money into Corps pockets. (*MaddAddam*, 308-309)

Obviously, science and technology become striated spaces that “are counted to be occupied” like everything else that is measured by its commodity value and quantity in capitalism. The task of the scientists is then only to produce diseases and their treatments, that is, to create supply and demand. Science, which has now become a new market, brings about a new relation between disease and its treatment. This actually marks the relation between the flow of finance and the flow of personal income, which makes the circulation of capital possible. Likewise, the circulation of capital is enabled through an activity of exploitation run by a collaboration of the corporations with scientists. Hence, the flow of capital is designed to be from the less fortunate to the more, which is clarified in the novel as follows: “‘Axiom: that illness isn't productive. In itself, it generates no commodities and therefore no money. Although it's an excuse for a lot of activity, all it really does money wise is cause wealth to flow from the sick to the well. From patients to doctors, from clients to cure-peddlers. Money osmosis, you might call it [...] ‘So, you'd need more sick people. Or else – and it might be the same thing – more diseases. New and different ones’” (*Oryx and Crake* 246). That is to say, the major motive of science is financial interest. Therefore, it begins to function just like capitalism itself, by deterritorialising the idea of sickness only to

reterritorialise it, namely to create new and different sicknesses. Similarly, the scientists design and develop transgenic pigeons with human-tissue organs that would enable organ-transplants without any possibility of rejection. Each pigeon could grow five or six kidneys and brain tissues at a time. This sounds as if it were a huge scientific progress that would contribute to the good of the society, yet it is nothing but a part of these corporations' profit-seeking motives and practices on the way to becoming a global market. These hybrid pigeons are designed only to allow the transaction of capital "from clients to cure-peddlers" (246).

It is clear that the constitution of the Compounds as a global market brings about several paths of striation. This, however, does not mean that all the paths are eternally blocked to allow for anything but profit motives or that there is no longer a possibility of lines of flight from these striated spaces. For Deleuze and Guattari, no space is perfectly striated or smooth. Even though they make a distinction between striated space as closed, hierarchical, and arboreal and smooth space as open, dynamic and rhizomatic, they acknowledge the inevitable overlap between these two spaces:

Smooth space and striated space—nomad space and sedentary space—the space in which the war machine develops and the space instituted by the State apparatus—are not of the same nature. No sooner do we note a simple opposition between the two kinds of space than we must indicate a much more complex difference by virtue of which the successive terms of the oppositions fail to coincide entirely. And no sooner have we done that than we must remind ourselves that the two spaces in fact exist only in mixture: smooth space is constantly being translated, transversed into a striated space; striated space is constantly being reversed, returned to a smooth space. (*Thousand Plateaus* 474)

Thus, smoothing and striation can occur simultaneously without dissolving into each other entirely. Despite their differences in motive and direction, these two are actually linked, coexist and affect each other. As Deleuze and Guattari further argue, "smooth space allows itself to be striated, and striated space reimparts a smooth space, with potentially very different values, scope, and signs" (486).

This mutual relationship between striated and smooth spaces is indeed quite revealing in disclosing how the idea of resistance becomes possible in this dystopian world depicted throughout the trilogy. Both the Compounds and the Pleeblands are the embodiments of striation of the State apparatus as they are defined by fixed and identifiable points between which only movement is allowed. All the flows of desire are coded and controlled. Yet they simultaneously remain open to smoothing the striated social space and releasing the blocked flows from their capture. Especially at the margins of the Compounds where the pleeblanders reside, the act of the deterritorialisation of space is seen actively at work. As the forces of the Compounds striate space in the Pleeblands, there emerges at the same time some nomadic forces that emanate smooth spaces. Deleuze and Guattari associate smooth space with acts of resistance, calling it “the space in which the war machine develops” (*Thousand Plateaus* 474). The war machine, for Deleuze and Guattari, has nothing to do with war but with revolutionary desire to mobilise and liberate space from its capture. It constitutes an outside to the State apparatus (354) and functions as a force of deterritorialisation that resists striation and forms lines of flight.

The Pleeblands’ position as the other of the Compounds makes this space a site of potential. Despite their control under the Compounds, they are not structured as strictly as the Compounds due to the multiplicity and diversity of their population, the unplanned sprawl and the polyvocality of direction. No matter how much space is subject to severe stratification in order to be manipulated for the Compounds’ economic interests, it is still relatively less organised than the Compounds themselves, which allows smoothing forces to get activated. The openness of the Pleeblands to smoothing and transversal mobility is also observed and admired by the Compound people: “He [Jimmy] glimpsed a couple of trailer parks, thinking about it made him slightly dizzy, as he imagined a desert might, or the sea. Everything in the Pleeblands seemed so boundless, so penetrable, so wide-open. So subject to chance” (*Oryx and Crake* 231). This description of the Pleeblands is very much reminiscent of the description of smooth spaces in *A Thousand Plateaus*. Deleuze and Guattari often use the

analogy of sea and desert to delineate the nature of smooth spaces: “smooth space itself, desert, steppe, sea, or ice, is a multiplicity of this type, non-metric, acentred, directional, etc.” (484). Just like a sea, a desert, smooth space is characterised by its boundlessness, multiplicity and movability. It is occupied by intensities, lines without pre-determined points, speeds and haecceities. It can thus grow boundless and move in all directions. The Pleeblands accordingly allow for the unvoiced to be heard, the differences to be affirmed and the striated spaces to be smoothed. This makes them potentially smooth spaces of resistance.

The Gardeners, a part of the diversity of the Pleeblands, have in this sense a great potential as nomadic war machines that smooth over the striations. They are a revolutionary group which is, to quote Fredric Jameson, “ecological, communitarian, cunningly organised in decentralised units” (“Then You are Them”, 8). They are highly aware of the horrors of the Compounds and hence propose an alternative organisation that favours nature over culture, equality over hierarchy and primitive life over technology. They reject the idea of buying and selling, namely the very foundation of capitalism, which they find responsible not merely for the consumption of nature’s resources but also for breeding the gap between the poor and the rich. Rather than having a commercialised lifestyle that will contribute to the flow of capital from the poor to the rich, they opt for a simplistic one where everyone lives only on nature’s own resources without endangering it. They are at the same time vegetarians who have abandoned eating, hunting or trapping animals as a reaction to the long established binary between man and all the other creatures: “why do we think that everything on Earth belongs to us, while in reality we belong to Everything? We have betrayed the trust of the Animals, and defiled our sacred task of stewardship. [...] How many other Species have we already annihilated? [...]” (*The Year of the Flood* 62). For them, man is neither exceptional nor superior to any other creature, and hence should not disturb them at his own pleasure. Considering their position as a group that is against any kind of hierarchy and prioritisation, it is not surprising that Gardeners consist mostly of those people who are socially or racially marginalised and victimised. Their principles and the profiles of their members make them an

obvious opponent of corporate capitalism. They aim to smooth out the stratified territories of the Compounds through their alternative lifestyle that rejects everything which profit-seeking corporations rely on. As opposed to the closed, hierarchical and confining nature of the Compounds, their organisation occupies a smooth space that is liberating, open and egalitarian. Their impact is boundless in the sense that they not only carve out a revolutionary space over the striations of the State apparatus in the Pleeblands but also expand so fast and rhizomatically in the Compounds themselves. They deterritorialise the striated space of the Compounds by creating leaks in their territory from within. They bring together a diverse multiplicity of people coming from different origins, having different ideologies and different life goals without pledging a hierarchy among them. In this regard, there are several Compound people who get secretly affiliated with this group. Despite their differences, however, what unites them is only their revolutionary desire to go beyond the restrictions and imposition of the Compounds and prevent their exploitation of people and nature.

The Gardeners apparently stand for a smooth space of resistance not only because they rhizomatically work from within the striated to transform and deterritorialise it, but also because they have no ultimate destination whatsoever. In the smooth space of the Gardeners, it is not the point of arrival or the speed of travel but the movement itself that matters. That is, they are only concerned with the act of deterritorialisation as the source of eco-conscious communal lifestyle. In this regard, they do not seem to orient themselves towards a shared transcendent goal but rely upon the revolutionary act of deterritorialisation and the smoothing forces as a part of their survival. This is why this alternative group is tolerated by the CorpseCorps themselves. Even though they remarkably deviate from the striations of the system, they do not indeed actively and directly participate in revolutionary actions that would prevent the flow of capital through the Compounds gates: “They view us as twisted fanatics who combine food extremism with bad fashion sense and a puritanical attitude towards shopping. But we own nothing they want, so we don’t qualify as terrorists” (*The Year of the Flood* 58). In this sense, the degree of smoothness which the Gardeners stand for

is indeed relatively mild when compared to other revolutionary movements within themselves and within the Compounds. This is also particularly deriving from the fact that the Gardeners hold a problematic position in their critical stance towards the idea of logos due to their spiritual grounding. To quote Fredrick Jameson, “our noble savages here do have another defect, a most significant one indeed: they believe in God” (“Then You are Them”, 8). They ground their revolutionary practices on a belief system, having their assigned Adams and Eves, religious sermons and even taboos and restrictions. They even have a Hymnbook that they read during their rituals held at regular intervals. No matter how much they distance themselves from the essentialist notions and dogmas and embrace an egalitarian, purely ecological and subversive stance in their sermons and practices, this religious motivation behind their whole activity brings them to a dubious position where they gradually move from the heterogeneous smoothness towards a slightly arborescent structure. While trying to uproot the Compounds’ roots and principles, they incidentally end up creating their own roots that are grounded on religious faith. However, what still preserves their revolutionary stance is that they do not see and perform religion as an arborescent culture that is strictly centred, hierarchical and limiting; on the contrary, they use religion only as a motivation to unify their members, justify their resistant activities and subversive lifestyle without realising its possible traps and drawbacks.

However, as opposed to their supposition that this eco-conscious religion could bring masses together to resist the capitalist horrors of the Compounds, it is indeed the idea of resistance that gather people under their roof. Among those, Zeb, Pilar, Toby and Crake are the most remarkable ones who, despite their affiliation with the Gardeners and their position among the group members, do not share their spiritual grounding. They not only depart from the Gardeners in terms of their avoidance of religion but also disagree with them in terms of their way of resistance. This indeed makes them a part of another revolutionary movement “Extinctathon” initiated by Crake. Extinctathon is an “interactive biofreak master-lore game” (*Oryx and Crake* 92) that Crake and Jimmy used to play as children. It is a game basically about the names and taxonomy of extinct animals: “*Monitored*

by MaddAddam. Adam names the living animals, MaddAddam names the dead ones” (92). The players in the game are asked to identify extinct species and name them by specifying their characteristics; it is basically based on competition among the players who try to get points by giving correct answers. As the time of challenge extends, the players could get more points and win bonuses for their speed. It is a virtual space which breeds an idea of competition and a desire for gaining more profit. In this respect, Margrit Talpalaru remarks that Extinctathon is a game which strongly resonates with “capitalist conditions, which tout competition as the only type of regulation that a free market needs” and almost becomes a microcosm of the rationale behind the corporate Compounds (250).

The space of online video games can be considered as a rhizome which is almost always open to the process of smoothing. The rhizomatic space of internet on and through which these games are created functions very effectively and extensionally, having no point of transcendent centre, or a pre-determined telos. It is merely about establishing infinite networks, which indeed marks its liberating potential. Accordingly, Extinctathon displays a surface organisation that is strongly reminiscent of multinational corporations’ practices themselves. But it at the same time serves as an underground revolutionary organisation where anti-Compound people called MaddAddamites unite to fight against late capitalism. Its capitalist space has been decoded by Crake, and hence it begins to function as a smooth space of resistance: “Top scientists -gene-splicers who’d bailed out of the Corps and gone underground because they hated what the Corps were doing. [...] We were doing bioform resistance” (*The Year of the Flood* 398-399). The profiles of the MaddAddamites are actually quite revealing in the sense that the process of smoothing is always about movement, a movement through which striations, molar organisations and stabilised identities and positions are escaped. The movement is either from the striated space of the Compounds toward the smooth space of resistance as top scientists like Crake, Pilar and Jimmy’s mother engage in, or from the relatively less smooth space of the Gardeners to the absolute smooth space of Extinctathon as in the case of Toby and Zeb. In either case, however, the movement is not from one point to another, which would otherwise

suggest that smooth space is always there to be discovered and is not very different from the striated space. On the contrary, the movement itself is a smoothing force that is advancing towards smoothing. That is why, the resistant dissenters involved in Extinctathon also keep changing and self-transforming during their voyage towards the smooth space of affirmative alternatives¹⁵.

The whole process working in Extinctathon, in this regard, relies on the act of decoding in a Deleuzian sense. The MaddAddamites not only attempt to shatter the existing dichotomies, arborescent structures and organisations of the Corps from within, but also aim to offer creative alternatives that can replace them. The major motivation in this revolutionary space of this online video game then becomes a part of Crake's "Paradise Project". In this project, Crake intends to draw a line of absolute deterritorialisation at all costs. The MAddAddamites and the other resistant dissenters all struggle against the concrete practices of the Corporations that manipulate science, exploit people, eliminate any subversive voice for the continuous flow of capital. Yet their struggle could be argued to actually stand against the logic behind capitalist practices, that is, the fascizing tendency inherent in capitalism. The fascizing pole of capitalism constitutes the biggest threat for them since it is this tendency that organises and limits desire and its creative potential around molar organisations. Crake perceives this fascizing tendency as "symbolic thinking": "Symbolic thinking of any kind would signal downfall, in Crake's view. Next they'd be inventing idols, and funerals, and grave goods, and the afterlife, and sin, and Linear B, and kings, and then slavery and war" (*Oryx and Crake* 419-420). For Crake, the leader of MaddAddamites, it is this kind of symbolic thinking or fascizing tendency that invests intensities and multiplicities into blockages, and instead forms striations, inscribes in desire a kind of lack and kills its revolutionary potential. It is the source of all existing hierarchies, segmentations, closed forms and structures in this post-apocalyptic world.

¹⁵ It is observed that most of these characters undergo a transformation in terms of their subjectivity, which make them experience a kind of "becoming" on their way of resistance. These characters and their transformations will be discussed on the upcoming pages of this chapter.

This actually makes Crake, the founder of the Paradise Project, realising that smoothing over the sedentarising forces of the Corps would not be enough to entirely eliminate them. He does not undermine the revolutionary potential of the smooth spaces they create, yet he does not believe that their resistance would annihilate all the fascizing tendencies or the symbolic thinking behind the destructive practices of the Corps. This disbelief could be said to be shared by Deleuze and Guattari: “Of course, smooth spaces are not in themselves liberatory. But the struggle is changed or displaced in them, and life reconstitutes its stakes, confronts new obstacles, invents new paces, switches adversaries. Never believe that a smooth space will suffice to save us” (*Thousand Plateaus* 500). In other words, smooth spaces are indeed in constant danger of striation. This is particularly because of what they call “micro-Oedipuses, microformations of power, microfascisms” (205). It is microfascism that tends necessarily to striate smooth spaces of resistance. It is even more effective and stronger than the fascism of the State Apparatus. As Deleuze and Guattari clarify,

Only microfascism provides an answer to the global question: Why does desire desire its own repression, how can it desire its own repression? The masses certainly do not passively submit to power; nor do they ‘want’ to be repressed, in a kind of masochistic hysteria; nor are they tricked by an ideological lure. Desire is never separable from complex assemblages that necessarily tie into molecular levels, from microformations already shaping postures, attitudes, perceptions, expectations, semiotic systems, etc. [...] It’s too easy to be antifascist on the molar level, and not even see the fascist inside you, the fascist you yourself sustain and nourish and cherish with molecules both personal and collective. (215)

Microfascism is indeed a deep sense of heaviness which keeps one from enacting life’s energy, desire and trying out virtual possibilities. It is in this sense a kind of trap that binds one to the idea of impossibility since it is the major obstacle before one’s self. Since killing one’s inner fascist that inhabits him into submission is too hard a deed, it could be argued that Crake sees the absolute deterritorialisation in the creation of an alternative for human race, that which is stripped of all “micro-

Oedipuses, micro formations of power, microfascisms” (205). Thus, he comes up with the Crakers which he calls “the art of possible” against the microfascist sense of impossibility:

It was amazing -said Crake –what once– unimaginable things had been accomplished by the team here. What had been altered was nothing less than the ancient primate brain. Gone were its destructive features, the features responsible for the world’s current illnesses. For instance, racism –or, as they referred to it in Paradise, pseudospeciation– had been eliminated in the model group, merely by switching the bonding mechanism: the Paradise people simply did not register skin color. Hierarchy could not exist among them, because they lacked the neural complexes that would have created it. Since they were neither hunters nor agriculturalists hungry for land, there was no territoriality. (*Oryx and Crake* 358)

This genetically-modified new people of the Paradise Project indeed stands for “the Deterritorialised par excellence” (*Thousand Plateaus* 381), bearing no micro-fascistic tendencies. What makes it problematic is, however, that the idea of absolute deterritorialisation comes at the cost of the annihilation of human race at first sight since the creation of the Crakers is accompanied by a global pandemic that is released through the BlyssPlus pills designed by Crake himself. The idea of wiping out the human race opens the text and the idea of resistance to a variety of critical interpretations. Many critics condemn Crake as “mad-scientist” (DeFalco 150; Bosco 162), “sinister powerful insane scientist” (Gerber 57), “scientist-imperialist” (Bouson 141), drawing an analogy between Crake and Dr. Faustus in terms of their manipulation of science and mischief to human beings. In the last book of the trilogy, the last survivors on earth are faced with a critical question, the question of whether they should opt for a future generation with a human ancestor with all of its flaws or a Craker-human hybrid generation which would be hopefully stripped of transcendent and micro fascistic tendencies. They eventually make their decision in favour of the latter. The ending is hence quite promising in the sense that Crake’s deterritorialisation might not necessarily suggest an end but a beginning which opens up to virtual possibilities of space and subjectivity.

4.2. Alternative Subjectivities in the Trilogy

The force of smoothing becomes a political attitude that entails a dissolution of molar and arborescent structures created by the capitalist system represented by the Compounds. This force indeed implies a conscious act of deterritorialisation as a form of resistance to the present which culminates not merely in the dislocation of striated space but also in a rupture in subjectification. This section of the chapter will focus on the creation of ruptures in the forms of subjectivity created by the capitalist social machine. The nomadic movement from the striated space of the Compounds towards the smooth space of resistance is unavoidably accompanied by a movement towards “nomadism or becoming” in the realm of subjectivity. This is mainly because the transformation of the paranoid subject of capitalism into the schizo subject happens through the transformation of space. Life is in effect full of energies, intensities and flows of desire that could enact virtual possibilities of all kinds, which constitutes it as a threat to capitalism which desires only the flow of capital. Thus, capitalism creates striations on space in order to paralyze the movement of life. It does this by territorialising all the affirmative heterogeneity of space and converting it into fixed and stabilised structures. This territorialisation or striation, however, does not end up with the regulation of space only, it also brings together the constitution of the normative subject. To be more precise, once the movement of life is blocked, the subjects can no longer make new connections, and are evolved into a homogenous whole. As the forces of smoothing unsettle the striations and remove the blockages on the flow of life, the subjects become more and more prone to grasping the depths of life, and hence begin to explore and actualise their potentialities. In this sense, as Deleuze and Guattari demonstrate, smooth space is indeed a space of becoming.

4.2.1. Subjectivity beyond the Oedipal Yoke

It cannot be claimed that the forces of striation are the only regulation on subjectivity and the smoothing of space necessarily culminates in becoming. Late capitalism is the cruelest system whose most-produced commodity is subjectivity.

This mass production of subjectivity begins in the nuclear family through Oedipalisation. The nuclear family is, for Deleuze and Guattari, a capitalist institution where the father implements the paranoid investment under the Oedipal yoke and desire is captured and organised around a sense of unsatisfiable lack. At this point, the father becomes an agent of capitalism responsible for the reproduction of Oedipal subjects, which is meticulously caricatured in Atwood's trilogy through the character the Rev, the father of Adam and Zeb. Unlike his sons who are the pioneers of the revolutionary movements under the name of the Gardeners, the Rev is indeed a metonymic embodiment of late capitalism and its practices. He is the preacher of the Church of PetrOleum that follows a theology only to get him cash, and accordingly he makes prayers to sanctify the holiness of capital: "*Peter* is the Latin word for rock, and therefore the real, true meaning of "Peter" refers to petroleum, or oil that comes from rock. [...] My friends, as we all know, 'oleum' is the Latin word for oil. And indeed, oil is holy throughout the Bible! What else is used for the anointing of priests and prophets and kings? Oil!" (*MaddAddam* 138). The Rev's position both as father and as preacher is quite revealing in the sense that he administers a transcendent use of the unconscious and continually transforms everything into its commodity value: "In the Rev's church –and around the Rev's dinner table too– we didn't pray for forgiveness or even for rain, though God knows we could have used some of each. We prayed for oil. [...] Every time we said grace before meals the Rev would point out that it was oil" (138-139). He functions for the capitalist structuring of desire in his nuclear family where he oppresses his sons, and makes them obey and yield to his way of living and seeing. His abusive and oppressive behaviour makes itself clear in his punitive and inhibitive acts:

But his first tests of that nature had come earlier, one of the Rev's instructive punishments being that those with potty-mouths should be forced to eat the contents of said potty. How not to smell, how not to taste, how not to think: it was like the See No Evil, Hear No Evil, Speak No Evil blind, deaf, and mute monkeys who sat on the miniature oil drum on his mother's dressing table with their paws clamped over their upper orifices, providing a role model for her that she was happy to

follow. Have you been sick? What's that on your chin?
He said, You're a dog, eat your own vomit. He pushed
my head into the... (*MaddAddam* 95)

As well as his cruel treatments of his sons, the Zeb also displays a deep sense of disapproval of and dissatisfaction with his sons whom he calls “[t]he *ungrateful son*” (224; emphasis in original). The same attitude of his is also observable in his church where religion functions only to make money and hence his prayers follow capitalist axiomatisation for materialistic interests and hypocrisy: “The Rev had nailed together a theology to help him rake in the cash. Naturally he had a scriptural foundation for it” (137). Therefore, in both the private and public institutions of capitalism, his role as a father and a preacher remains the same: to squeeze desire into lack through repression, fatally negate it to produce Oedipalised subjects, namely “blind, deaf and mute monkeys” (95) or a “true Petroleum believer” (224). Due to his role as the Oedipal father of capitalism, he is recognised as a part of “the brainwashing team” (143) urging people to yield to capitalist workings. This is in fact reminiscent of Deleuze and Guattari’s famous observation noted in *A Thousand Plateaus*: “Every time desire is betrayed, cursed, uprooted from its field of immanence, a priest is behind it. *The priest* cast the triple curse on desire: the negative law, the extrinsic rule, and the transcendent ideal” (154; emphasis added).

As a critique of late capitalism, the trilogy indeed presents a portrayal of several other configurations of the Oedipal father along with the Rev such as Blanco and Jimmy’s father who both enslave the revolutionary potential desire to a grim passivity and lack, encapsulate the subjects to submissiveness by parenting their unconscious and reduce everything to a kind of commodity conforming to the capitalist system. There also appear several revolutionary movements to resist these Oedipal reterritorialisations of space and subjectivity. Ironically, some of these movements are called “anti-Rev” movement, which actually reveals the fact that a resistance to the Oedipal father is always already a resistance to capitalism. This dual-nature of resistance is exemplified in Adam and Zeb’s nomadic trajectory. Since their early childhood, Adam and Zeb have been forced to be coded into docile subjects of the corporations by the Rev whom they call “Child

torturer? Religious fraudster? Online girl decapitator?” (*MaddAddam* 148), yet they have always had a nomadic consciousness to resist assimilation and homogenisation into the Oedipalised subjects. As opposed to the imposed configurations of subjectivity, their identity is characterised by patterns of sheer movement. The first series of their nomadic movement begins with their escape from home: “In face of the brainwashing team of Trudy and the Rev, Adam and Rev took joint evasive action? What were they evading, apart from punishment? Anything that might lead in the direction of the path of righteousness, the Holy PetrOleum Path, the path the Rev and Trudy were forever urging them to tread” (143).

Their escape does not necessarily suggest an escape only from the established forms of domination and transcendent ideals that bind Adam and Zeb to fixity but also an escape to “look for new weapons” (Deleuze, “Postscript” 4) to destroy them and to create life with all its energies and intensities. This moment of movement accordingly comes with a moment of deterritorialisation which is very much reflective of the new weapons of resistance in the age of late capitalism. In such societies as depicted in Atwood’s preapocalyptic world, control becomes invisible yet rhizomatically dispersed thanks to advanced technology. The whole system works through a constant process of decoding and recoding since capital requires the production of fluid codes that would be adaptable to the incessantly changing environment. This necessarily brings about a search for new ways of resistance conforming to the nature of late capitalism. Hacking is actually one of such new ways of resistance that manipulate these codes and use them against the system itself as it is exemplified in Adam’s and Zeb’s case: “hacking became his [Zeb’s] vocation. In his fantasy world no code would keep him out, no door could shut him in, and fantasy merged into reality the older and more practiced he became” (*Perdido* 143). They slip into the online social media and donation sites of the Church of PetrOleum through the Rev’s account. Hacking his account, they not only divert the flow of money coming from donations to their account and disrupt its flow from the poor to the rich, but also keep a record of the Rev’s secret life, that is his frequent visits to sexually explicit websites. This initial

moment is followed by the murder of the Rev via a fatal poison. Once they have been literally and metaphorically orphaned and de-oedipalised, Adam's and Zeb's lives have become that of a nomadic life which is in constant movement and transition. They have changed their identities several times and constantly moved from one place to another. However, it is not their literal displacement that has made them nomads but their resistance to the idea of stability. Their movement has not oriented towards any fixed destination. The only motivation behind their movement has been their desire to resist the established form of domination and come up with an alternative way of living that is devoid of hierarchy, forced unity and organisation.

Most of the characters including Adam and Zeb push the formations of identity, space and memory to their limits. Although they all attempt to misidentify themselves from the molar organisations of the Oedipalised self and striated spaces to some degree, none of them is able to take this disidentification to the point of becoming as much as Toby and Jimmy do as it will be discussed in detail on the upcoming pages of the chapter. Deleuze and Guattari see becoming as the point where a new notion of subjectivity is created out of the blurring boundaries between the self and the world and paves the way for a moment of imperceptibility. It is an actualisation of an immanent "encounter between two reigns, a short-circuit, the picking-up of a code where each is deterritorialised" (Deleuze *Dialogues* 44). In other words, it suggests an affirmative interaction of two different forms where they evolve into a zone of intensities deterritorialising not merely their existing assemblages and their long-established structures but also their relation to one another and to the world. These new deterritorialised reigns and relations are no longer attributed to any organising principle or roots whatsoever. This means that becoming is indeed a process of transformation from the molar to the molecular, from the arborescent to the rhizomatic consciousness, from fixity to a line of flight. Becoming is in this sense "not phenomena of imitation or assimilation, but of a double capture, of non-parallel evolution, of nuptials between two reigns. Nuptials are always against nature. Nuptials are the opposite of a couple. There are no longer binary machines: question-answer,

masculine-feminine, man-animal, etc.” (2). It is a sheer interconnectedness, a creative merging that pushes the process of deterritorialisation always further.

4.2.2. “Zero Hour”: From Organism To Body Without Organs

The notion of sheer interconnectedness that characterises “becoming” corresponds to the dissolution of the unified subject and the subject’s inhering into a smooth space of resistance but also a non-linear dynamics of temporality. This section will shed light upon the affinity between non-linear temporality and the dissolution of unified subjectivity in the characterization of Jimmy. Time’s supposed linearity would suggest a notion of time that is constantly moving forward towards the future without infusing the past, the present and the future. This is problematic in the sense that this movement is to get a certain point within a hierarchy, a point that would stand for absoluteness. This transcendent treatment of time is indeed highly suggestive of the formation of subjectivity as unified, stable, rational and hence deprived of any affirmative change and difference. As opposed to this traditional notion, time is for Deleuze not simply located in a chronological sequence where it would be defined by divisible moments such as hours, minutes, seconds. On the contrary, it is a dynamic interpenetration of the past, the present and the future, which does not point to an ultimate end, and a flow which is only in correspondence with the flow of life with all its intensities. In this regard, Deleuze’s understanding of time is strongly influenced by Bergsonian notion of duration, which is a subjective time defined by its multiplicity, heterogeneity, continuity and indivisibility (*Bergsonism* 37; 40; 43). In Deleuze’s understanding, the emphasis falls on the potentiality of the present to manifest in itself not merely the lived past and the possible future but also a state of indiscernibility and a productive encounter of forces, which this dissertation calls the affirmative power of “dysterritory”. This perception of duration can only be observed in a “becoming”. Cliff Stagol clarifies this connection between Deleuzian understanding of duration and becoming as follows:

each change or becoming has its own duration, a measure of the relative stability of the construct, and the relationship between forces at work in defining it. Becoming must be conceived neither in terms of a 'deeper' or transcendental time, nor as a kind of 'temporal backdrop' against which change occurs. Becoming-different is its own time, the real time in which changes occur, and in which all changes unfold. [...] Rather it is the time of production, founded in difference and becoming and consequent to relations between internal and external differences. (25)

Duration is indeed the subject's interiority where productive becoming and change occur. Unlike the stable and unified subjectivity that is situated in a predetermined space and temporality, becoming exists with its own duration in an open state to difference and multiplicity.

In Atwood's trilogy what makes Jimmy enter into a zone of indeterminacy, where he moves from his unified subjectivity to an asubjectivity, would be his embracement of such an understanding of duration. Jimmy's transformation is of great significance in terms of revealing Atwood's treatment of late capitalism which is not limited to a critical description but is expanded to an affirmation. Unlike other major characters in the trilogy such as Adam, Zeb, Pilar, Toby and Crake who function as resistant dissenters having nomadic consciousness, Jimmy has never appeared as a person with a critical awareness in the pre-apocalyptic world where the Compounds were in control of the entire socio-political milieu. He seemed to yield to the already established modes of subjectivity and had no individual desire or driving force to go beyond it. He was a "words" person that is secondary to "numbers" people in the hierarchy of social and intellectual status determined by the Compounds, and did not even seek to free himself from this image of identity and rigid model of life: "I'm not a numbers person" (*Oryx and Crake* 85). He submissively agreed to operate within the space and temporality he was situated in. He was so much blinded by the ontological security he had with his recognised position and ground in life that he even found his mother's complaints about the practices of the corporations rather annoying. Even his joining Extinctathon was not an intentional act of resistance but "an elaborate

setup, an invention of Crake's, a practical joke to frighten him" (254); not his dream but a passive involvement in the dream of Crake. To put it shortly, Jimmy willingly allowed his subjectivity to be striated and contained within a predetermined space and temporality where he was expected to evolve from "the raw material, Jimmy in his gloomy form" into "the end product, a happy Jimmy" (223).

In the trilogy, it is not until the destruction of the capitalist investments with Crake's Paradise Project that Jimmy begins to develop a new consciousness to overcome himself, the self that is molar, arborescent and organised around a binaristic thinking system: "A blank face is what it shows him: zero hour. It causes a jolt of terror to run through him, this absence of official time. Nobody nowhere knows what time it is" (*Oryx and Crake* 3). It is apparent that Crake's project creates a rupture in the institutionalised perception of time. In other words, time goes 'out of joint'. Not surprisingly, "zero hour" can be associated with the notion of "zero state". Zero state stands for "nonstratified, unformed, intense matter, the matrix of intensity, intensity = 0; but there is nothing negative about that zero, there are no negative or opposite intensities. Matter equals energy. Production of the real as an intensive magnitude starting at zero" (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 153). Despite all the affirmative connotations of zero state, however, it appears too intimidating for Jimmy's ontological security which is established upon a spatio-temporal unity. As Katherine V. Synder also underlines, temporal disruption in a sense becomes "a hallmark of traumatised consciousness" (472). He feels his unified subjectivity at stake, hence he desperately desires to reexperience time in its sequence. This is because linear temporality provides him with a promise of a *better future*, a progressive movement towards the future. But as, Eleonora Rao also points out, he is now "a state of suspended time [...] He is at a crossroads, suspended in the present, 'up to his neck in the here and now'" (110). To deal with his loop in the present, thus, he strives to measure time with quantities by tracking the movement of nature. He strictly follows the sunrise, the sunset, the moonrise, the movement and sounds of trees and animals, and attempts to adhere to his daily routine in order not to lose

the track of time. However, in the post-apocalyptic world created out of the annihilation of not merely the capitalist system but also the entire humanity, time does not succumb to any measurement or sequence. In such a smooth space, as Elizabeth Grosz underlines,

Time is no longer equivalent to the succession of moments, which mark the object's transition from one position in space to another, the movements by which cosmological bodies travel in circular motion for the Greeks, or the movements by which atomic particles oscillate for the Pre-Socratics. [...] Time is no longer defined by the relations of the movements it measures; rather movement must be defined in relation to time, which conditions it. Succession is now construed as an effect rather than the essential characteristic of time. ("Time out of Joint" 148)

In the smooth space of the post-apocalyptic world which is, as Crake expects, purged of all the diseases of humankind, there is no longer rigid boundaries between the past, the present and the future. On the contrary, the past and the future subsist in the present which now designates a temporal coexistence. This temporal coexistence necessarily means the abandonment of the perception of the future as an end point where a transcendent ideal resides. This replaces an orientation towards a transcendent telos with an affirmative purposelessness. There is now only a present which appears as the opening of a vast virtuality and hence abounds in infinite possibilities.

The sense of purposelessness actually designates a point of indeterminacy which Deleuze relates to his conception of "body without organs". Body without organs is, for Deleuze and Guattari, "the ultimate residuum of a deterritorialised socius" (*Anti-Oedipus* 33). It is the "zero" state where the previously established assemblages of time, space and subjectivity are dismantled. Accordingly, it is a non-organised and non-stratified state beginning from zero intensity where real production occurs. The clearance of the socius from all the predetermined molar aggregates of capitalism hence culminates in Jimmy's withdrawal into a body without organs. Although body without organs does not necessarily imply any negativity, Jimmy's encounter still becomes very traumatic, considering his

secured subject position complying with molar spatial and temporal organisations. The dismantling of the striated space of the Compounds into the smooth space of indeterminacy and of the linear and segmented temporality into an all-encompassing present is not met with joy at all: “Snowman [Jimmy] opens his eyes, shuts them, opens them, keeps them open. He’s had a terrible night. He doesn’t know which is worse, a past he can’t regain or a present that will destroy him if he looks at too clearly. Then there’s the future. Sheer vertigo” (*Oryx and Crake* 173). Some disjunctures already begin to occur in Jimmy’s unified subjectivity. The Cartesian cogito which assumes the human subject as stable, fixed and fully rational no longer applies to body without organs. Once the world gets free from its striations and linear compositions, the long broken link between man and the world begin to be bridged. Accordingly, Jimmy tries to assure his superiority by naming himself the Abominable Snowman in the early days of the disaster. He abandons his name Jimmy and designates himself as Abominable Snowman. He often refers to himself with this name particularly when he is talking to himself and the Crakers. This new name of his not only suggests a kind of supremacy but also evokes a feeling of intimidation and terror. But as he starts to go beyond this hierarchical positioning of the human over other beings in the world, he begins to avoid his new identification. Rather than assuming himself superior to nature and its inhabitants, he now gradually becomes one with the world, which could be regarded as his first step on the way of his “becoming-other”: “The Abominable Snowman-existing and non-existing, flickering at the edges of blizzards, apelike man or manlike ape, stealthy, elusive, known only through rumours and through its backward-pointing footprints. [...] For present purposes, he’s shortened the name. He’s only Snowman. He’s kept the *abominable* to himself, his own secret hair shirt” (8). His abandonment of the capitalised Abominable is indeed an indicator of the fact that he begins to lose his reliance upon the supposition of human as transcendental Subject. The ontological barrier that privileges the subject over the object dissolves into a kind of asubjective, acentred world view that cannot position any being as superior. Therefore, Jimmy is no longer the absolute Subject that marginalises animals and

nature as his object and the other, going beyond the anthropocentric attitude instilled by and within the capitalist system.

However, the elimination of the subject/object barrier on the body without organs does not appear as something very affirmative for Jimmy at first. His position that is now on equal terms with anything in the world does not necessarily mean that he can easily embrace the idea of being in the world and affirming life. On the contrary, he first cannot conceptualise the elimination of this ontological hierarchy and its existing binaries, and interprets it only as a reversal which, for him, positions him as inferior to other beings in the world. Thus, he falls into a grim depression and a deep feeling of inferiority, seeing himself as “a creature of dimness, off the dusk” (7). Jimmy’s undergoing a sense of depression and inferiority could be resulting from two reasons. Firstly, body without organs which is the zone of thresholds, intensities and gradients could be a “harrowing, emotionally overwhelming experience, which brings the schizo as close as possible to matter, to a burning, living centre of matter” (Deleuze and Guattari *Anti-Oedipus* 19). All the stimulus coming from life without any filtering through striations or organisations is apparently too much to bear for Jimmy who still demands to be a unified whole. His subjectivity being constantly liquified comes into collision with his side of being that desires to be stratified. He is thus in a vain search for a centre to direct and organise his disposition. Secondly, the molar aggregates of his past self continue to haunt him, which results in his overindulgence in his memories. As Jimmy himself says, the past is full of “[b]ooby traps” (*Oryx and Crake* 7) that bind him to his memories and prevents him from living the present and actualising its potentialities. In order to overcome himself and acknowledge his becoming-other-than-himself, a degree of forgetting is required, as Nietzsche suggests in his revision of history¹⁶. For Nietzsche, the

¹⁶ The notion of forgetfulness proposed by Nietzsche is actually a part of his revisiting and deconstructing of the Platonian conception of ethics and morality that sees forgetfulness as a moral defect. Platonian approach to forgetfulness suggests a transcendental morality and tends to capitalise the human subject and separates it from nature. Nietzsche therefore comes up with an alternative proposition of ethics that aims to bring man and nature together. Nietzsche’s conception of forgetfulness purports to create an affirmation of life, nature and man’s unification with life and nature rather than suggesting to wipe away one’s memories. Since this dissertation

right amount of forgetfulness is fundamental to affirming life as he underlines in his *Unfashionable Observations*:

All action requires forgetting, just as the existence of all organic things requires not only light, but darkness as well. A human being who wanted to experience things in a thoroughly historical manner would be like someone forced to go without sleep, or like an animal supposed to exist solely by rumination and ever repeated rumination. In other words, it is possible to live almost without memory, indeed, to live happily, as the animals show us; but without forgetting, it is utterly impossible to live at all. Or, to express my theme even more simply: There is a degree of sleeplessness, of rumination, of historical sensibility, that injures and ultimately destroys all living things, whether a human being, a people, or a culture. (89)

Forgetfulness is then one of the key features of man that brings him closer to animality. Being stuck in the past, namely having too much history, is what holds man from enhancing life itself. To affirm life and activate creativity, it is crucial to have a degree of animal forgetfulness and overcome oneself. Deleuze also acknowledges the positive force of forgetting, arguing that to forget paves the way for experimenting with what-is-yet-to-come. Yet this idea of forgetting as affirmation should not be understood as leaving everything past behind. The past as the virtual already exists in the present. What is meant by forgetting is then not “a contingent incapacity separating us from a memory which is itself contingent” but a force “within essential memory as though it were the ‘nth’ power of memory” (Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 140). It is to acknowledge the immanence of life and time by seeing the present all-encompassing of the past and the future and hence as a becoming in the world with the world itself.

It is obvious that Jimmy suffers from too-much-past that imprisons him in reminiscences and keeps him away from his becoming. However, as he spends time with the Crakers, the embodiments of pure body without organs, who are

limits its scope to a Deleuzian reading, this notion put forward by Nietzsche is touched upon only from the perspective of Deleuze although it is still a hot topic debated in Trauma Studies or in Ethics regarding its implications or even misunderstandings.

absolutely purged of all the molar aggregates and impositions of the past, of all essentialist attributes and of man's microfascistic tendencies, he begins to understand the necessity to recognise the infinite vitality of life: "The present's bad enough without the past getting mixed into it. *Live in the moment*. [...] Why chain your body to the clock, you can break the shackles of time, and so on and so forth. [...] So here it is then, the moment, this one, the one he's supposed to be living in" (*Oryx and Crake* 311-312). Once he decides to break free from the linear perception of time and to acknowledge the present as pure potentiality, he at the same time realises the boundaries of his previous unified subjectivity. The realisation of how his subjectivity has been structured and stratified to be molded into a kind of submissiveness so far as to reach the level of ignorance becomes another step on his way to becoming-other. This actually reveals that the affirmative force of forgetting and of the present culminates in an embracement of duration and a self-realisation: "Ignorant, perhaps. Unformed, incite. There had been something willed about it though, his ignorance. Or not willed, exactly: structured. He'd grown up in walled spaces, and then he had become one. He had shut things out" (216). He not only comes to know how his subjectivity is organised and repressed within the striated space of the Compounds, but also realises how he is made to desire his own repression and become "willing" to ignore being stratified, bounded and repressed. This self-realisation bespeaks his transformation from the state of grim pessimism into a kind of vitality that pushes him to willingly dissolve his subjectivity, overcome his microfascistic tendency to *desire his own repression* and become other-than-himself. This is strongly felt when he gradually loses the sense of inferiority and instead feels interconnected not merely with nature and its inhabitants but also with the Crakers. His becoming becomes clear in his animalistic descriptions of himself and his admiration of nonhuman entities. He admires birds "with resentment: everything is fine with them, not a care in the world. Eat, fuck, poop, screech, that's all they do" (*Oryx and Crake* 148); he begins to reek "like a walrus" (7) and laugh "like a hyena" (10). His interconnection with life as a continuous becoming and with the Crakers

as pure becomings finally makes him totally abandon his reliance upon his past and past self:

‘My name is Snowman,’ said Jimmy, who had thought these over. He no longer wanted to be Jimmy, or even Jim, and especially Thickney [his nickname in Extinctathon game]. [...] 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 would do that for him. (406-407)

The fact that he is no longer Jimmy but Snowman marks the shift that occurs in his perception of life, time and self which are all interrelated. He affirms himself as other-than-himself and other-than-human. He is so distanced from his past identity and the idea of human as transcendent Subject that he now feels insecure in the presence of other humans when he learns that he is not the only survivor of the pandemic although he has longed for other human companions. His metamorphosis from human Jimmy into becoming-other-than-himself makes him find human beings even intimidating. Since he embraces an acentred and asubjective perception of life in its own duration, the zero intensity that terrorises him at the very beginning of his narrative now empowers his process of becoming-other. Although his initial reaction to the body without organs was a deep nostalgia for going back to the idea of the human with all transcendent tendencies, this zero intensity finally becomes the plane of consistency, namely, the plane of possibility where he can actualise his potentialities and affirms life as becoming just like his “self”. Thus, it is not surprising that he also affirms “zero hour” at the end of his narrative: “Zero hour, Snowman thinks. Time to go” (433). It is time for Jimmy to go away from the spatial boundaries of being human into unknown possibilities of becoming.

4.2.3. “Animals R us!”: Becoming-Animal in the Anthropocentric Stratum

Toby is another character who moves from the molar boundaries of Oedipal subjectivity into a zone of indeterminacy where she embodies the deterritorialising effect of the processes of becoming, which will be the concern of this section. Unlike Jimmy who begins his life in a relatively more privileged position and is molded into an Oedipal submission in the earlier phases of his childhood, Toby is a pleeblander who is born into a socially and economically underprivileged family. Her family is one of the many victims of multinational corporations. Her father who lives off selling air conditioning loses his job due to the air conditioning corps while her mother falls sick because of the Helthwyzer supplements. Her father, who is just a “small potato” (*Year of the Flood* 30) in the cruel system of the corporate-dominated world, goes bankrupt as he struggles to find himself a space and a job to live on; her mother loses ground with the pills that have actually been designed as vectors for more diseases. As an invisible part of the chain used to enable the flow of capital from patients to doctors, from labourers to corporations, her father ends up committing suicide and her mother dies of disease. This literal orphanage of Toby becomes one of the defining factors in her attaining an orphan consciousness. From the very beginning of her life, although she has been subjected to the Oedipal representatives of late capitalism, she gradually acquires a revolutionary desire to free herself from the Oedipal yoke and all the predetermined ontological categories of human/nonhuman, man/woman. Smoothing over the static subjectivity based on binaristic discrimination, she experiences the life of a nomad, constantly voyaging from one place to another. She first leaves her family house upon the loss of her parents, begins to work first as a furzooter and finds herself a place to stay temporarily in the pleeblands. Then she moves to an apartment above a couture shop and begins to work at Secret Burgers, from which she soon has to escape. Upon her escape, she starts to live with the Gardeners, but later she has to move to the Compounds from the Gardens in the guise of a new person. There is never a

final destination for Toby. In each of these voyages, she constantly deterritorialises and molecularises herself and her environment.

Toby's nomadic voyaging not merely resonates with smoothing forces over the capitalist machine and its byproducts but also implies a "becoming" in a Deleuzian sense. She passes through several layers of becoming in her struggle to escape and resist Oedipal suppression and overcodings. Becoming is, for Deleuze and Guattari, revitalising the *inhuman* in human beings, and "breaking through the wall of the signifier and getting out of the black hole of subjectivity" (*Thousand Plateaus* 188). It follows the acts of deterritorialisation only to wreck molar assemblages of power, the organism of the body, which renders it possible for the subject to find the multiplicity inherent in himself. In Toby's case, she reaches a zone of multiplicity and indiscernibility through her becoming-animal. It can be said that her becoming-animal is initially triggered by both animals' and women's marginalised positions in the pre and post-pandemic world order. In the pre-pandemic corporate-driven system, the Compounds change and manipulate animals' genes and turn them into commodities. Genetically-modified animals are used as multiorganifiers, and once their organs are taken, they are nothing but meat that is served in the Compound cafeterias. The Pleeblands cannot be regarded as an ideal place for animals either, since here too pets, just like the pigeons in the Compounds, end up in someone else's deep fryers.

This meat-animal analogy is also applicable to the position of women in the Pleeblands. In the same vein with animals, women are reduced to a position where they are defined only in terms of flesh and meat, and their female agencies and their bodies' virtuality are repressed and ignored. SecretBurgers in this sense becomes a metonymic embodiment of a kind of cannibalism exerted upon women in the Pleeblands. Blanco, the manager of SecretBurgers, implements exploitative male violence on female workers at his company. Seeing women as nothing but "a sex toy you can eat" (*Year of the Flood* 500), he sexually abuses his workers and perpetrates violence. His treatment of women is described with the verb "to take apart" (42), which is reminiscent of the tropes of meat and flesh. Against his maltreatment, however, the only thing he expects from women is submission: "he

demanded a thank you after every degrading act. He didn't want her to feel pleasure, though: only submission" (*Year of the Flood* 46). Toby shares the same fate with other girls working at SecretBurgers, becoming Blanco's latest sex toy. He kills Toby's female agency and reappropriates her body as the object of sadistic male joy. However, unlike other girls who mostly end up in either murder or suicide, Toby manages to escape from Blanco's oppression with the help of the Gardeners. Toby's escape is not merely an escape from male oppression embodied in the figure of Blanco, but also an escape from the molar assemblages, striated spaces, and oedipalisations. As such, her escape triggers a strong drive in Blanco to bring her to submission, uttering several threats: "Bitch!", "I'll slice off your tits!" (*Year of the Flood* 51), "I see you, stringy-assed bitch!", "You're meat!" (303). These threats of mutilation necessarily suggest that Blanco represents the Oedipal fathers of late capitalism and assumes the role of castration. Along with women's and animals' shared position reduced to meat, Toby's work experience as a furzooter also suggests the initial steps of her experience of inhuman liminality. In the early years of her orphanage, Toby works as a furzooter, wearing fake-fur animal suits. She is frequently harassed by animal fetishists who rub their pelvises against her fur and make strange noises. These molestations which in effect target animals allow her to see and experience life from the inhuman point of view. What makes this experience even more unbearable is that she has to live above a luxury couture shop which sells Halloween costumes made up of endangered-species' skins. She finds it "distasteful dressing up as bears and tigers and lions and other endangered species she could hear being slaughtered on the floor below her" (38).

However, it cannot be claimed that it is her furzooter experience solely that connects Toby to becoming-animal even though it suggests a degree of inhuman experience and empathy towards inhuman entities. Becoming, as Deleuze and Guattari continually underline, "is certainly not imitating, or identifying with something; neither is it regressing-progressing; neither is it corresponding, establishing corresponding relations; neither is it producing, producing a filiation or producing through filiation. Becoming is a verb with a consistency all its own;

it does not reduce to, or lead back to, ‘appearing,’ ‘being,’ ‘equaling,’ or ‘producing’” (*Thousand Plateaus* 239). Becoming-animal accordingly bears no relation to mimicking or resemblance to animals. Thus, Toby’s becoming-animal would definitely differ from her simply wearing animal costumes. Actually, her sufferings and marginalised position constitute the common zone with animals. Within the striated space of this pre-apocalyptic world as she experiences it, both women and animals serve as a kind of commodity used for capitalist interests and fantasies. This exposed vulnerability to patriarchal capitalist practices is what creates a shared proximity between Toby and animals. In her shift into becoming-animal, Toby does not imitate animals, but moves into a molecular contiguity with animals in which her movement designates a line of the flight from the existing norms, anthropocentric attitudes, and Oedipalisations of both humans and animals. She becomes an animal only through overcoming the anthropocentric thinking system that assumes the superiority of humans over all the other creatures. Deterritorialising forces are thus actively at work in Toby’s becoming-animal. She deterritorialises her human self from all the metaphysical and anthropocentric tendencies, raising ontological and ethical questions regarding not merely traditional conceptualisations of her own subjectivity but also conceptualisations of animals and animal agency in anthropocentric world.

The smoothing of the striated space of the pre-apocalyptic world could be argued to contribute to the formation of Toby’s true becoming. This is primarily because “all progress is made by and in striated space, but all becoming occurs in smooth space” (486). In striated spaces, subjects are exposed to order and control to the point of losing their revolutionary desire, and their bodies turn into organisms. This exposure to organisation might even become desirable for the subjects since it offers a sense of ontological security as it is seen in the case of Jimmy. But order and control have never been appealing for Toby who as a female pleeblander has always been doubly marginalised. Even though she has already begun to attain an inhuman consciousness and awareness, the striated space she is imprisoned in does not allow her to actualise her potentialities and her becoming. That is why Toby’s becoming-animal begins to occur in the smooth

space of the Gardeners. The Gardeners' communal, egalitarian and ecological way of living paves the way for Toby to gradually disperse her subjectivity and create a new way of living and being which is defined by fluidity and multiplicity. Much as the Gardeners represent a degree of transcendent tendency in terms of their spiritual grounding, Toby never feels herself fully a part of them, except sharing their revolutionary stance towards anthropocentrism. Rather than canalising herself to the Gardeners' spirituality, she learns how to develop a new molecular relationship with animals and consequently with herself. She drifts into a transition process from the molar organism of being into the molecular possibilities of becoming. As she herself recognises, "[s]he wasn't quite a Gardener, yet she wasn't a pleeblander any more. She was neither the one nor the other" (*Year of the Flood* 116).

Toby's breakthrough with the boundaries between the self and the inhuman other is actually a nomadic voyage which is triggered particularly with her becoming-bee within the smooth space of the Gardeners in the pre-apocalyptic world, and continues with her becoming-minoritarian in the smooth space of the post-apocalyptic world. Bees, by their essence, can be considered as what Deleuze and Guattari call "pack or affect animals" which designate a multiplicity, a population and an assemblage of affects (*Thousand Plateaus* 241). This, however, does not mean that they are pack animals only because they live in communes as a pack. On the contrary, each and every animal has already a pack mode, calling out a larger group of its own species. In other words, every animal necessarily stands for a multiplicity. Thus, one cannot become animal "without a fascination for the pack, for multiplicity. A fascination for the outside? Or is the multiplicity that fascinates us already related to a multiplicity dwelling within us?" (239-240). Toby's fascination with bees is, in this sense, interlinked to her desire to transgress the singularity of the self and to engage in a multiplicity: "Now Toby spen[ds] all her spare hours with Pilar — tending the Edenclyff beehives and the crops of buckwheat and lavender grown for the bees on adjacent rooftops, extracting the honey and storing it in jars. [...] Thus the time passe[s]. Toby stop[s] counting it. [...] At night, Toby breathe[s] herself in. Her new self. Her

skin smell[s] like honey and salt. And earth” (*Year of the Flood* 121). Toby enters into a symbiotic relationship with bees as she converses, touches and lives with them. Her relationship is not of an anthropocentric kind which brags about raising the inhuman to the level of the human but of a pure becoming which both encounters the multiplicity and the inhuman within herself and gives animals back their own agencies. In Toby’s becoming, therefore, it is not only Toby that forms a new self which is no longer singular, molar and Oedipalised, but also bees themselves that are mutually involved in a transformation. For becoming-animal is a bilateral process that both “[traverses] human beings and [sweeps] them away, [and affects] the animal no less than the human” (*Thousand Plateaus* 237). Toby’s becoming-bee is likewise a co-evolution, a mutual relationship during which she goes beyond what Deleuze calls “the white wall” of molar determinations and the black hole of her subjectivity and of her ego. Bees simultaneously become participants in this relationship rather than being merely its objects, which is best clarified when Toby is extremely concerned about the necessity of telling Pilar’s death to the bees in an appropriate way before anyone else. They should be spoken to and consoled as Pilar’s friends:

‘Pilar is dead,’ she said. ‘She sends you her greetings, and her thanks for your friendship over many years. When the time comes for you to follow her to where she has gone, she will meet you there.’ [...] If you didn’t tell the bees everything that was going on, Pilar said, their feelings would be hurt and they’d swarm and go elsewhere. Or they’d die. The bees on her face hesitated: maybe they could feel her trembling. But they could tell grief from fear, because they didn’t sting. After a moment they lifted up and flew away, blending with the circling multitudes above the hives. (*Year of the Flood* 216)

This mutual exchange is achieved when Toby begins to see bees not as objects existing for human needs but more precisely inhuman entities having their own autonomy in life. Thus, becoming-bee brings about the deterritorialisation of both Toby and the bees, placing them into a zone of pure intensities and multiplicities.

Getting free of the straitjacket of the anthropocentric stratum built upon the human/nonhuman binary opposition through her dynamic symbiosis with animals, Toby develops strong ethical concerns about using animal by-products. One of these most problematic ethical issues regarding human relationship with animals in both the pre and the post-apocalyptic world is meat-eating. As Toby grows into a nonhuman liminality, meat-eating as a practice reminds her of her past self which she now faces with guilt. It might be considered that it is merely because she lived among the Gardeners that she might have embraced such an attitude towards meat-eating. It is true to some extent that the Gardeners consider the practice of meat-eating as a kind of slaughter and violation of the equality of all creatures on earth with their slogans: “God’s Gardeners for God’s Garden! Don’t Eat Death! Animals R Us! They looked like raggedy angels, or else like midget bag people. They’d been the ones doing the singing. No meat! No meat! No meat!” (48). Yet it is not the Gardeners’ principles but Toby’s becoming-animal that culminates in a kind of innate guiltiness and shame for her previous practices of meat-eating. This sense of guilt and shame gets even more intensified following her bodily transformation into another identity as Tobia to escape Blanco’s threats. She undergoes several surgeries to peel off her previous identity and attains a new self with a brand new look. For her bodily transformation, ironically, her hair is replaced with a human-sheep hybrid hair-transplant. This hybrid hair transplant and bodily transformation actually become a powerful metaphor for Toby’s becoming-other-than-herself. She is now not a pure human but a human-animal hybrid, not one but a multiplicity: “I could have a whole new me, thinks Toby. Yet another whole new me, fresh as a snake. How many would that add up to, by now?” (282). This is tantamount to saying that through her physical and spiritual transformation, her molar human traits dissolve and she moves into a plane of consistency where true becomings occur.

Toby’s becoming-animal which allows her to reinvent herself is most closely aligned with a transformative power she now attains for all the marginalised and exploited minorities including not merely animals, but women, hybrid pigeons and Crakers. In this sense, it could be argued that becoming-

animal is followed by becoming-minoritarian, namely an affirmative desire to undo all the binaries between majority and minority since “all becoming is [always already] a becoming-minoritarian” (*Thousand Plateaus* 291). To put it in another way, all becoming corresponds to an attempt to diverge from the norms and deterritorialise molar standardisations built upon supposed oppositions and hierarchies:

A becoming-minoritarian exists only by virtue of a deterritorialised medium and subject that are like its elements. There is no subject of the becoming except as a deterritorialised variable of the majority; there is no medium of becoming except as a deterritorialised variable of a minority. We can be thrown into a becoming by anything at all, by the most unexpected, most insignificant of things. You don't deviate from the majority unless there is a little detail that starts to swell and carries you off. (292)

In Toby's case, she is thrown into becoming-minoritarian through her bodily and psychic intimacy with animals. Where white male adults constitute the majority and occupy the centralised position, women, children, old people, plants, animals, hybrid-pigeons and Crakers are all pushed to the margins. In such a world, Toby's becoming emerges as an active micro politics not merely to create a line of flight from her position as a minority but also to form a new life that does not yield to the anthropocentric and phallogocentric view. She therefore begins to feel deeply interconnected with her surroundings, specifically with the most marginalised. Her interconnection stresses an impulse to form creative destratifying lines of flight for the minorities. It at the same time functions as an active medium of overcoming her obsession with the past, embracing the present despite its horrors and discloses the forces of the virtual.

For both Toby and Jimmy, then, becoming occurs as a political affair to deterritorialise the anthropocentric view of the human and to reach a nonhuman intensity. This is particularly because anthropocentrism is a mechanism that colonises and fascizes the human and the nonhuman into molar and arborescent standardisations. Deleuze and Guattari conceptualise this process of representation and signification as “faciality”. For them, faciality designates the site of

overcoding in and through which we are all subjected to the regime of normality and homogenisation (*Thousand Plateaus* 115). This structure organises the category of the human according to the standard of being Western, masculine and white while assigning the rest as the less-than-human or the nonhuman. Becoming, in this sense, comes to the fore “to wreck faciality” and go beyond the human since “[b]eyond the face lies an altogether different inhumanity: no longer that of the primitive head, but of ‘probe-heads’; here, cutting edges of deterritorialisation become operative and lines of deterritorialisation positive and absolute, forming strange new becomings, new polyvocalities. Become clandestine, make rhizome everywhere, for the wonder of a nonhuman life yet” (190-191). Jimmy and Toby, in the same vein, drift into zero faciality by resisting to this overcoding process. In other words, they overcome themselves to transgress the received notions of the human subject and to reach their multiplicities and immanent potentials. In the face of oedipalising and stratifying capitalism, then, the politics of becoming appears as a resistance to the present by pushing the limits of the human as a category, dismantling the antropocentric stratum and disclosing life’s transformative energy.

Considering resistance as the destratification of the faciality of the human molded by and within capitalism, the Crakers could also be seen as a figure of resistance in the form of becoming. The Crakers are the transhuman entities bioengineered by Crake as an alternative to the human. The reason in the creation of the Crakers, for Crake, lies in the fact that deterritorialisations in the category of the human are always inevitably prone to reterritorialisations. It could be argued that Crake sees the microfascistic tendency inherent in human essence as a major obstacle to defeat the capitalist social machine. As opposed to Deleuzian understanding that affirms the human essence despite its microfascistic tendency and recognises the inhuman intensity inherent in the human, Crake sees human essence as a dead end. Rather than attempting to fix the faciality traits in the human and reaching the inhuman, he creates a new hybrid race which is sterilised from all the transcendent and destructive tendencies such as racism, hierarchy, and desire for power. They are no longer affiliated with arborescent institutions such

as family or marriage which would bind them to their roots and restrict their movements. More importantly, they would no longer be categorised according to their race, skin colour or gender, and hence would not be oriented towards any pre-determined telos affiliated with these roots. They are designed to live in harmony with one another and with their environment because they have no sense of superiority or inferiority and of domination or submission, seeing each and every living/nonliving, human/nonhuman, masculine/female, organic/inorganic entity as equal. In this sense, this alternative subjectivity extends into both the human and the nonhuman, blurring all the boundaries regarding these ontological categories and bringing them into an affirmative and transformative form.

4.3. Stuttering Language to Reach its “Rag Ends”

In Atwood’s trilogy, leaning towards the plane of consistency by undergoing the dynamics of becomings could be argued to be the common denominator of Jimmy, Toby and the Crakers. They evolve into a mutual conceptual space within which they constitute blocs of becomings, transgress ontological categories and enter into a zone of indeterminacy. They dismantle the apparatus of the Oedipal capture and draw a schizophrenic line of flight from the molar and stratified positions. To put it succinctly, they move towards life as an immanence, a mode of life which is unmediated, impersonal, pure and beyond any judgment and representation. Yet it cannot be claimed that the constitution of an alternative subjectivity is the one and only motive and medium in their movement towards life as an immanence. The minoritarian subjectivity in the form of becomings is inseparable from the minoritarian use of language and storytelling in the novels. Just like subjectivity and space, language in the pre-apocalyptic world run by late capitalism cannot escape the incessant acts of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation. Language which is essentially heterogeneous is subjected to the formation of a molar identity, standardisation and regulation. It becomes a medium of power and manifests within itself all the binaristic structures that the capitalist social machine relies upon. Deleuze and Guattari call this kind of

language “a language of power, a major or dominant language” (*Thousand Plateaus* 101). It is a language of oppression and domination governed by grammaticality, symbolism and binarism. Therefore, resistance to power inevitably demands a resistance to language of power, a resistance which entails its deterritorialisation and minor use. In *MaddAddam*'s post-apocalyptic world, the minor use of majoritarian language becomes one of the powerful mechanisms of resistance that simultaneously contributes to the formation of new and alternative subjectivities.

Throughout the trilogy, it is Jimmy's and Toby's relationship with the Crakers that allow them to develop a bloc of becoming and a network of self-overcoming in which they become other than themselves as human beings since the borders between the self and the other have dissolved. These moments of transgression actually revolve around their storytelling. This is the initial medium of communication with the Crakers. In the Paradise Project, Crake's primary plan is to break the link “between one generation and the next” by creating the Crakers as hybrid entities sterilised not only of the destructive features of human beings such as race, hierarchy, territoriality but also of human language. However, this problematic plan does not work in the way that Crake imagines. The Crakers break through his design, and get inquisitive about their origins, the world and their environment. In bridging the link between the Crakers, human beings and the world, Jimmy's and Toby's storytelling plays a crucial role. In all three novels, Jimmy and Toby invent stories that both reveal truths about the world and open out new possibilities. Their storytelling is often interpreted as a myth making that implies a transcendent goal or an utopian project. Yet it in effect functions as an act to resist the dominant myths. Even though it appears to be a story of the Crakers' origin, it turns out to be a story of how each character has been somehow victimised by the capitalist social machine and has eventually found his own line of flight from its capture as seen in the story of Toby's nomadic voyaging and Jimmy's coming to terms with himself and the world. Thus, storytelling becomes not a medium of myth making but a way of tackling the here-and-now problems of late capitalism, a way of disclosing its invisible truths and voicing the

unvoiced, and a means of inventing new alternatives, namely, a new earth, a new people and a new language in a Deleuzian sense.

The task of storytelling, which is first taken over by Jimmy, then Toby and lastly by Blackbeard, comes along with the creation of a foreign language, that is, “neither another language nor a rediscovered patois, but a becoming-other of language, a minorisation of this major language, a delirium that carries it off, a witch's line that escapes the dominant system” (Deleuze *Critical and Clinical* 5). This primarily derives from a necessity to communicate with the Crakers. The Crakers as the Deterritorialised par excellence cannot conceptualise any arborescent system built upon binary structures and hence cannot understand the majoritarian language which is organised around such systems. Language which abounds in dualisms, symbolisms, metaphors and transcendent signifiers is completely incomprehensible for them. At this point, Jimmy and Toby are left in a position to decide either to teach the Crakers the majoritarian language they are also imprisoned in or to create an alternative language to communicate. Having already entered into a zone of indeterminacy where they follow a schizophrenic line of flight from their oedipal subjectivity shaped in majoritarian language, Jimmy and Toby seem to opt for the latter on the grounds that teaching the majoritarian language would be to teach all the categories, binary oppositions, codes, concepts and associations inscribed in language. This is central to Toby's concern, as she often associates majoritarian language with “[r]ules, dogmas, laws”: “What comes next? Rules, dogmas, laws? The Testament of Crake? How soon before there are ancient texts they feel they have to obey but have forgotten how to interpret? Have I ruined them?” (*MaddAddam* 250). Rather than instilling all the previously established molar assemblages, they therefore create an alternative language which is not seized by any master signifier, subject position and linguistic binaries. This language cannot be claimed to be entirely distinct from human language; on the contrary, it is derived from human language by deterritorialising its transcendent tendencies.

This new language is “not outside language, but the outside of language” (Deleuze, *Critical and Clinical*, 5). Human language as a majoritarian language is

shaken off and pushed to its limits to reach new linguistic possibilities and reflect the impulse of affects rather than the enforcements of the dominant power. To be more precise, human language is turned inside out, which paves the way for first depleting its problematic inner mechanisms and then creating a minoritarian language out of its remains. In this language shared by Jimmy, Toby and the Crakers, the reliance upon symbols, neologisms, metaphors is abandoned on the grounds that the language of symbolism and metaphors suggests the transcendence of the signifier, that is, the continuous deferral of meaning. The linguistic signifier is a fascizing element working through transcendence; it not only reduces the multiplicity and heterogeneity of language into binaristic series but also establishes a problematic relationship between the word and the world. The word, namely the signifier, does not signify the world itself but a presence which is indeed absent or an absence which is assumed to be present. As Claire Colebrook clarifies, “[i]f signification is, in general, a sign that stands in for what is not present, then this signifier of all signifiers, or ‘transcendental signifier’, is the signifier of what is absent, not present. This signifier signifies that towards which all meaning and speaking is directed; it signifies a promised or deferred presence” (20). The alternative language created in the trilogy is not built upon this assumed relation between the signifier and the signified. On the contrary, there is no sign assigned for concepts which the Crakers do not have in their understanding of life such as racism, hierarchy, territoriality, swears, insults, marriage, kingdoms, gods, money, war and so on: “*Oh Snowman, please, what is violent? [...] What is rape? [...] What is money?*” (*Oryx and Crake* 426). These words sound utterly incomprehensible and have no meaning for the Crakers. This is because language names only what is there, what is perceivable by the Crakers. As Crake puts it, “no name could be chosen for which a physical equivalent [...] could not be demonstrated” (8). This means that the boundary between the word and the world gradually becomes blurred. Likewise, the signifiers in this alternative language are not defined in terms of negative difference, namely, of what they are not because the Crakers do not have the conception of difference as

opposition or binarism. This wipes out all the discourses created out of such binaristic thinking systems lurking behind language as well.

As Jean-Jacques Lecercle remarks in his book *Deleuze and Language*, “[t]he signifier, a carrier of force, an instrument of power, is the main actor in the process of subjectification” (81). The modulations on the inner mechanisms of language including the signification process necessarily bring about changes in the formulation of subjectivity. This is evident in Jimmy’s attitude towards this minoritarian language. Although the Crakers do not have difficulty in acquiring this minoritarian language, Jimmy has great difficulty in formulating and embracing it since language is never solely a means of communication for humans but an ontological site of being. His subjectivity simultaneously moves from the realm of human “being” into the realm of becoming as the majoritarian language begins to dissolve: “From nowhere, a word appears: *Mesozoic*. He can see the word, he can hear the word, but he can’t reach the word. He can’t attach anything to it. This is happening too much lately, this dissolution of meaning, the entries on his cherished wordlists drifting into space” (*Oryx and Crake* 43). This is because deterritorialising forces functioning in space, time and subjectivity are equally at work in language itself. Language becomes a site of resistance which makes him a foreigner in his mother tongue. In Deleuze’s words, language stutters in its syntax, grammar and semantics, it becomes other than itself. As Jimmy describes in his own experience, “language [loses] its solidity, it [becomes] thin, contingent, slippery, a viscid film on which he [slides] around like an eyeball on a plate” (305-306). Thus, he can no longer use a language that is ruled by its grammaticality and semantics. The signifying, rule-based language is now replaced by wordlists, a bundle of irrelevant words taking flight from their linguistic connotations: “Rag ends of language are floating in his mind: *mephitic, metronome, mastitis, metatarsal, maudlin*” (175); “The old wordlists were whipping through his head: *fungible, pullulate, pistic, cerements, trull. [...] Prattlement, opsimath. [...] Concatenation. Subfusc. Crutch*” (382). These words are randomly brought together and grouped to the extent that they disrupt the logical possibilities of meaning and mean absolutely nothing at the end. Language

is therefore turned into a list of names where naming ironically does not stand for power any longer. To the contrary, naming is cruelly mocked as a way of undermining the very mechanism behind it, which is best seen in the Crakers' treatment of proper names as follows:

'What is a Jimmy?' Puzzled frowns.
She'd made an error: wrong name. 'Jimmy is another name for Snowman.'
'Why?' 'Why is it another name?' 'What does a Jimmy mean?' This seemed to interest them much more than death. 'Is it the pink skin on Snowman?' "I want a Jimmy too!"
This last from a small boy. How to explain? 'Jimmy is a name. Snowman has two names.' (*MaddAddam* 24)

As language becomes less representative and less powerful, it simultaneously enters into a phase of depersonalisation and becomes asubjective just like its speaking subjects Jimmy, Toby and the Crakers, who have undergone the processes of asubjective becoming. For Deleuze, language essentially has an impersonal and asubjective nature which is yet organised and restructured around subjectivity through mechanisms of power. Thus, the movements of deterritorialisation and minorisation bring language to its own nature and purge it of subjective positions. One way this new asubjective and impersonal position of language is achieved in these novels is through the use of free indirect discourse, that is, "a newly created speech act that sets itself up as an autonomous form, a pure event that effectuates two acts of subjectivation simultaneously, as if the author [or the narrator] could express himself only by becoming another through a real character, and the character in turn could act and speak only if his gestures and words were being reported by a third party" (Smith, xliv). In the *MaddAddam* trilogy, in the same vein, defined subject positions are abandoned. Even though each of the novels is structured upon the narrations of the characters, they do not speak in the first person pronoun; instead, they are spoken through indirect speech. Once the "I" of the speaker is eliminated, the speaking subject is removed from its central position and the positions of the speakers or narrators and of the characters intermingle. On several occasions, Jimmy and Toby give insight not

only into their own thoughts and feelings in the third person but also into the psyches of other characters like Zeb, Ren and Oryx. In the story of how Zeb meets Lucerne, for example, it becomes so complicated that it gets harder and harder to tell which is whose speech act:

The story went like this. Lucerne met Zeb at the AnooYoo Spa-in-the-Park — did Toby know the AnooYoo? Oh. Well, it was a fantastic place to unwind and get yourself resurfaced. This was right after it was built and they were still putting in the landscaping. The fountains, the lawns, the gardens, the bushes. The lumiroses. Didn't Toby just love lumiroses? She'd never seen them? Oh. Well, maybe sometime... [...]

Lucerne had wafted across the lawn, aware of her bare feet on the damp cool grass, aware of the brush of fabric across her thighs, aware of the tightness around her waist and the looseness below her collarbone. [...]

They were both just so aware, she told Toby; she'd always been aware of other peoples' awareness, she was like a cat, or, or ... she had that talent, or was it a curse — that was how she knew. So she could feel from the inside what Zeb was feeling as he watched her. That was overwhelming! It was impossible to explain this in words, she'd say, as if nothing of the sort could ever have happened to Toby herself.

Anyway, there they stood, though they'd already foreseen what was about to happen — what had to happen. Fear and lust pushed them together and held them apart, equally.

Lucerne did not call it lust. She called it longing. (*Year of the Flood* 139-140)

Even though it is Toby who seems to narrate the story of how Lucerne met Zeb to the Crakers, the narration takes on a doubled voice and it becomes too vague to differentiate whether it is Toby, Lucerne or a third-person narrator that takes over the storytelling. The inner thoughts and feelings of both Toby and Lucerne are so mingled that they become indiscernible. The indiscernibility of Toby's and Lucerne's voices is even more intensified when one takes into account

their relation to Zeb. Both women are deeply in love with Zeb. At this point, it becomes more interesting to see the story of how Lucerne met Zeb in free indirect speech. It is hard to decide whether these speeches tell Toby's own insights into Zeb's and Lucerne's relationship or Lucerne's feelings or experiences or Toby's feelings when she puts herself into Lucerne's shoes. At some point, these speech acts also seem to reflect Zeb's insights with regard to his relationship to Lucerne. This implies the existence of even a fourth subjectivity alongside those of Toby, Lucerne and unknown narrator embedded in these statements. Such a complexity explains why the narrators and the characters do not often function simply as narrators or characters that stand for distinct subjectivities in the trilogy but become a collective assemblage in a Deleuzian sense.

The extensive use of free indirect discourse, in this regard, introduces a collective value into Atwood's trilogy which replaces individual utterances. Utterances surpass individuated statements and become a product of assemblages, of multiplicities. The position of the subject has been taken over by collective assemblages of enunciation which Deleuze designates as "[n]o signifiante, no subjectification: writing to the «th power ([for]all individuated enunciation remains trapped within the dominant significations, all signifying desire is associated with dominated subjects)" (*Thousand Plateaus* 22). They all constitute a form of action to subvert the existing configurations of power and invent a new earth, new usages of language and a people to come in the figure of the Crakers and other resistant dissenters. This necessarily provides this trilogy with a social and political character. The trilogy intricately performs the revolutionary act of deterritorialisation, takes a flight towards the plane of immanence and constitutes the potential for becoming-minor of all states, forms and literature. It is never certain that the moment of deterritorialisation will necessarily come up with affirmative outcomes, considering that it is always in danger of capture. But still this does not prevent Atwood's postapocalyptic world from being "a thing of hope" as the Craker, Blackbeard puts it at the very end of the *MaddAddam* trilogy.

CHAPTER 5

CHINA MIEVILLE'S *PERDIDO STREET STATION* AS AN IMMANENT DYSTOPIA

Young British writer China Mieville (1972-) shares the position of being one of the most notable science-fiction and dystopian writers of the contemporary age with Margaret Atwood. Despite his young age, Mieville is quite a prolific writer with nine novels, several novellas, short story collections, comics and non-fiction writings. As a writer who has strong affiliations with Marxism and socialism, he views writing as a vehicle for social and political action that could bring an affirmative transformation and revolutionary impulse to the society. His commitment to Marxism goes beyond a simple interest. In fact, he is a well-known left-wing activist, a member of the British Socialist Workers Party and an earlier academic in international law, having studied and still investigating Socialist Revolutionaries and other political activisms and struggles. This involvement was first articulated in his publication of his doctoral thesis entitled "Between Equal Rights: A Marxist Theory of International Law," where he deals with how international law has been shaped by commodity relations in the capitalist social machine and makes clear his critical stance towards capitalism. It was then expanded to several other political non-fiction writings. His critical stance accompanied by a revolutionary desire for positive change also complies with his fictional works that necessarily bear a political dimension even if they cannot be reduced to politics only.

It is the strong connection between his desire for change and his political involvement that culminates in his being a successful world-maker. He creates imaginary worlds which abound in monsters, horror and strange situations. For Mieville, his passion for world-making and monster-creating dates back to his

childhood years: “Ever since I was two, I’ve loved octopuses, monsters, abandoned buildings... One gets asked, if you’re into the sort of thing I’m into, how did you get into it, and my response is always: how did *you* get out of it?” (“A Life in Writing”). He has always been attracted by the unseen monstrosity of life that man is locked in and is hence driven by a strong desire not only to show it but also to look for ways of getting away from it. This interest beginning from the very early years of his life has led him to produce fictional works that overlap with several different genres. Mieville obviously has an ability to switch from one genre to another even within the same book without a particular effort. This is why much ink has been spilt on the question of which genre Mieville and his works can be categorised into. One critic has labelled him as “Fantasy writer” (Rayment 9), another has designated his work as “Marxist steampunk” in close relation to “cyberpunk” (Kendrick 259). Yet another has described Mieville as “the most entertaining, interesting, and intellectually gifted writer of Anglophone speculative fiction to have yet emerged in his generation” (Freedman “Speculative Fiction” 25). Among those, Mark Bould, rather than attempting to squeeze his work into a single category, acknowledges the fact that his work actually draws “elements from the formal strategies of sf, fantasy and horror” along with being “profoundly realist, driven to explore ‘aspects of the conflict-ridden and contrajjectory nature of social relationships’” (310). Many, however, agree on finding his work too ambivalent to categorise. Yet the word “ambivalent” would be an inappropriate and even hasty word to define his work, reducing its richness and depth. This might be primarily because there are only a few critics who truly scrutinise Mieville’s work and several of them prefer simply labelling it as “ambivalent” rather than meticulously disclosing its richness.

As opposed to these insufficient descriptions, in one of his interviews titled “Messing with Fantasy”, Mieville acknowledges his conviction with the “New Weird”. The New Weird, which has its roots originally in the works of H. P. Lovecraft, is a term coined by the British writer M. John Harrison in 2003 to define a group of writers and their works that defy being categorised into a single generic form due to their drawing from several genres such as science fiction,

gothic, horror and fantasy. As Noys and Morphy point out, it is indeed an “unsettling transnational hybrid” (117). Since it is a hybrid form that can simultaneously draw upon several genres and yet cannot simply fall into any of them, it is often regarded as a mode of writing rather than a neat genre. The major motivation behind the emergence of weird fiction is then the idea of transgression: it transgresses the strict boundaries not only of genres but of social, political and moral organisations. It has a revolutionary potential for subversion, resistance and transformation, which unavoidably gains weird fiction a political dimension and a revolutionary energy. In this regard, it is not surprising that it is primarily thanks to Mieville and his works that the New Weird has gained its real articulation and commercial success in literary history. Mieville as a renowned Marxist socialist and a creative writer instills his power of writing and political commitment into his fiction, and marks a turning point in the Weird tradition. This is primarily because he has a critical eye on the realities of the world and the weird is just implicit in this reality itself as he expresses in an interview: “I think the whole ‘sense of cosmic awe’ thing that we hear a lot about in the Weird tradition is to do with the sense of the numinous, whether in a horrific iteration (or, more occasionally, a kind of joyous one), as being completely embedded in the everyday, rather than an intrusion. To that extent the Weird to me is about the sense that reality is always Weird” (“China Mieville and Monsters”). With this in mind, what Mieville basically does in his fiction is to draw his material from the present reality and make it estranged from the here-and-now by inhabiting it with monsters, unimaginable creatures and situations. In this way, he makes his reader see the weird, that is reality, with an estranged eye, and hence purports to raise their awareness.

Mieville’s motivation to raise awareness and create a difference can be inextricably tied to his being a “political writer of fiction”, as he puts it himself (Mieville “Fantasy and Revolution”). As a strong defender of revolutionary socialism, he necessarily engages with political issues in his fiction with the objective of transforming life for better even if this is not the sole purpose of his works. Most of his works are centred around the possibility of alternatives and

the idea of revolutionary action. His political commitment allows him to make simultaneous use of the potential of several different genres, discharge his extraordinary imagination, and combine the two in order to conceptualise new and alternative worlds in which anything is possible. This unavoidably brings him closer to the position of a dystopian writer. Although Mieville does not see himself as a dystopian writer, he does not deny the connection between the political aspiration of his fiction and that of dystopian narratives, arguing in one of his interviews that “[d]ystopia and utopia are themes, optics, viruses that can infect any field or genre” (“A Strategy for Ruination”). As such, his work cannot avoid being infected by dystopian “optics” not only in terms of its strong tendency to portray the grim reality of the contemporary world and speculate about its possible future but also with regard to its frequent use of dystopian tropes. His imaginary worlds are productions of a creative intervention into the political, economic and social affairs in contemporary societies, where the real figures are often replaced by monsters, weird creatures and situations and located in a different time zone. His weird worlds constitute a social critique imbued with a subversive and transformative twist.

Although Mieville’s weird fiction shows a strong correlation with dystopia as a genre and as a concept, he is quite wary of the possible pitfalls of -“topias”, seeing “the ruptures and monsters that lurk in [them]” (“A Strategy for Ruination”). It is actually a kind of transcendent tendency to totalise and fascize that Mieville finds toxic particularly in the concept of utopia. In a quite similar tone with the major argument of this dissertation, he argues that utopia has a potential to become a “part of the ideology of the system, the bad totality that organises us, warms the skies, and condemns millions to peonage on garbage scree” (Mieville “The Limits of Utopia”). Yet his critical attitude towards utopia does not necessarily mean that he entirely abandons his faith in utopia or opts for dystopia instead. Rather, recognising the very fine line between utopia and dystopia as sibling concepts, he embraces this cautious stance for both. He finds both utopia and dystopia equally dangerous when their “degree of intent” (“The Limits of Utopia”) turns into a fixed and transcendent goal. Thus, he favours any

kind of -topia, be it utopia, dystopia or heteretopia, “without rage, without fury [...] without hate” over its transcendent form (“The Limits of Utopia”). In other words, his political agenda does not envision or intend a single and absolute ideal state of world but a world that would be better only with the creation of multiple alternatives. In other words, he believes in the necessity not “merely to change the world, but to change the agenda about changing the world [...] to keep alternatives alive in [creating a better world]” (Mieville “A Strategy for Ruination”).

With this in mind, Mieville’s understanding of dystopia could be argued to be corresponding to the conception of immanent dystopia. Seeing the grim orientations of late capitalism and globalisation, Mieville is obviously of the opinion that the contemporary world is in a state of crisis. The new form of capitalism, for him, becomes even more oppressive and fascizing than ever. Hence, he perceives today’s “epoch of potential catastrophe” not as “Anthropocene” but as “Capitalocene”, that is, a world order whose primary drive is capitalist interest (Mieville “The Limits of Utopia”). In one of his interviews, he reveals how dystopia is getting closer to “realism”, saying that

It is hard to avoid the sense that these are particularly terrible days, that dystopia is bleeding vividly into the quotidian, and hence, presumably, into ‘realism,’ if that was ever a category in which one was interested. At this point, however, comes an obligatory warning about the historical ubiquity of the questionable belief that Things Have Got Worse, and of the sheer arrogance of despair, the aggrandisement of thinking that one lives in the Worst Times. (“A Strategy for Ruination”)

He appears to see today’s societies as the utopia of capitalism and the dystopia of the rest, which would mean that dystopia no longer suggests an imaginary foresight but has become the here-and-now reality itself. Likewise, Mieville’s works mostly draw upon familiar dystopian scenes from real life by locating them in unfamiliar urban spaces and inhabiting them with a vast variety of fantastic entities. The dystopian world that Mieville portrays in his works could then be argued to correspond to the concept of dysterritory that this dissertation puts

forward. If dysterritory features a very recognisable dystopian reality from the present world, it also promises the possibility of a way out from within. That is why, the idea of resistance and revolution appears in Mieville's works as a necessity. Mieville as an active revolutionary socialist strongly believes it is high time that we created an upheaval that would eliminate the long-established hierarchies and social inequalities. Yet at the same time he is very doubtful about whether a real overthrow of capitalist empire could be achieved since he considers the end of the world even more possible than the end of capitalism. Even if such an overthrow is possible, moreover, he is not quite sure whether this will not lead to the emergence of another empire. Therefore, he opts for an affirmative discourse of hope rather than a radical claim of revolution. The idea of hope, for Mieville, hinges upon the potentialities of the present. The dysterritory, despite its dystopian aspect, preserves in itself a transformative capacity to be disclosed by hope and action. There are multiple ways of disclosing this transformative energy, yet the strategy Mieville embraces in his life and literary endeavor is to use the elements of a vast variety of different genres, particularly those of fantasy and New Weird, as a tool to dream the unreal, namely revolution as a plane of immanence, and then make it real, seeing that "the not-real isn't *separated* from the real" (Mieville "Fantasy and Revolution"; emphasis added). His "weird-dystopian" fiction, then, signifies a literary impulse towards a transformation, a becoming in Deleuzian sense.

Perdido Street Station (2000) is one of Mieville's earliest novels that can be read as an embodiment of dysterritory. The winner of the 2001 Arthur C. Clarke Award and British Fantasy Award, the novel appears as the first of Mieville's "Bas-Lag series," which is composed of two other novels entitled *The Scar* (2002) and *Iron Council* (2004). Bas-Lag is the fictional world Mieville creates as the setting of his novels, which inhabits a very complex and diverse geographical location with the accompaniment of equally complex and diverse subject positions. It comprises several continents, two of which are Rohagi and Bered Kai Nev, having a long and complicated history full of wars, empires and political conflicts. As a reflection of this rich background, the series hosts human, non-

human and hybrid races, monsters and creatures. It is also a bizarre literary form influenced by many genres varying from fantasy and science fiction to cyberpunk and horror. Such a complexity makes Bas-Lag an utterly hybrid world where different voices, values, genres and styles meet and even the opposites overlap in an organic harmony. In this sense, if a single word were required to define the Bas-Lag series, it would be multiplicity. The whole series is a configuration of heterogeneous lines, of a multiplicity at all speeds and intensities that would lend itself to other multiplicities. The multiplicity that occupies the Bas-Lag as a whole unfolds into each novel's form and content as well. Each novel posits an open and transformative multiplicity within itself, stretching and transgressing the boundaries of several genres, of social and cultural norms, of subjectivity and of space in its own unique way. Thus, each novel becomes a reflection of the other both in its portrayal of heterogeneity immanent to the Bas-Lag world and in its rhizomatic characteristics, which provides the Bas-Lag series with an internal consistency even if none of these novels follow the same plot line with the same characters, unlike Atwood's *MaddAddam* trilogy. This is why this dissertation will be focusing only on the first novel of the trilogy, *Perdido Street Station*, considering the limitations of time and space and the necessity of thematic coherence.

Perdido Street Station tells the story of the scientist Isaac Dan der Grimnebulin who lives in New Crobuzon, a city of multifarious races, values and lifestyles. As a part of this multifaceted city, Isaac pursues a subversive lifestyle by digressing from the mainstream ways of being and living not only in his research but also in his life choices. In his profession he chooses an experimental and even subversive topic, which has the potential to ostracise him from his field. In his love-life, similarly, he chooses a cross-species romantic relationship with a Khepri named Lin, which can ostracise him from the society. This subversive life becomes even more complicated after Yagharek, a crippled bird-man, asks Isaac to create a mechanism to restore his ability of flight. Much of the plot concentrates upon Isaac's search for materials and information to create that mechanism. This search eventually turns into a search for and a collective fight against slake-moths

that Isaac and his colleagues accidentally release. This is primarily because the city-government of New Crobuzon misuses these slake-moths that are capable of draining the brains of the city's inhabitants. But the novel finalises with victory, where these brain-draining slake-moths are caught and put away as a result of an arduous fight led by Isaac and supported by a diverse group of individuals from different racial and socio-economic backgrounds. This collective fight against the slake-moths terrorising the city actually says more in terms of the latent political inclination of the novel and of the whole series itself. Beneath this surface plot arrangement, the novel is in effect an allegorical re-presentation of rising globalisation and late capitalism, which encapsulate the entire world. Much as the novel is featured with NeoVictorian sentiments in its embodiment of steampunk technology under the inspiration of 19th century machinery, as Mieville himself acknowledges in one of his interviews ("The Road to Perdido"), it is pretty much like the present societies getting more and more dystopian in nature in its portrayal of complex structures of domination and social control. New Crobuzon corresponds to today's rising capitalist metropolis with its political inclinations, economic interests and co-operations, utterly hybrid population and means of manipulation and control. In this sense, as Jonathan Newell describes it, the novel presents "*a defamiliarised vision of our own social reality*, broadly construed: a reality structured around strictly and largely subconsciously enforced binaries of self/other, us/them, whole/broken" (498; emphasis added).

This re-presentation of the capitalist world order posits the novel as a dysterritory¹⁷ in Deleuzian sense. To be more precise, it both presents a "dystopian territory" as a reflection of the here-and-now dystopian reality, and presents a "disterritory", that is deterritorialised territory, as a reflection of its motivation to go beyond the existing reality. But Mieville's dystopian text differs from Atwood's in its presentation of dysterritory. Although Atwood draws a more or less realistic picture of the here-and-now dystopian reality, Mieville tends to

¹⁷ The concept of dysterritory corresponds to the dual nature of contemporary world and contemporary dystopia, standing for both a dystopian territory and deterritorialised territory, which is discussed in detail in the theoretical chapter.

locate his dystopia in a fantastic context, populating it with fantastic and weird characters. However, what is interesting about his dystopian novel is not that he presents it with fantastic characters but that his dystopia takes on an almost allegorical representation despite the employment of the fantastic. The way Mieville portrays the dystopian city-government becomes almost an allegory of the workings of capitalism. To be more precise, Mieville materialises the abstract concepts related to the inner mechanisms of the capitalist social machine. While illustrating the capitalist exploitation of the minds of people, for example, he literally shows how the slake-moths drain the minds of people rather than depicting it metaphorically. Similarly, he displays the literal hybridisation of the subjects through the process of Remaking to illustrate the notion of hybridity and body without organs inherent to the capitalist social machine. This technique could be expressed with what Regina Barecca coined as “metaphor-into-narrative” (243). As Barecca clarifies, the metaphor-into-narrative, or what others call the concretisation or literalisation of metaphor, is an act of “attaching a buried, literal meaning to what is intended to be inert and meaningless” for the purposes of subversion (244). Although it is hard to guess whether Mieville employs the literalisation of metaphor deliberately or incidentally, it is certain that this technique significantly contributes to the building-up and amplification of his criticism on the dystopian reality of the present societies under late capitalism.

In addition to its concretisation of the capitalist dystopia, the novel also explores the possibilities of resistance within the capitalist system in the same way. Taken in its full trajectory, it becomes obvious that the fight against slake-moths materialises not merely the fight against the corrupt city-government and its criminal associates but also the fight against capitalism. Yet, the nature of this fight is beyond a literalisation of metaphor due to its hybrid aspects. This fight is immanent to the very nature of the dystopian society depicted and the novel’s overall structure. Apparently, New Crobuzon is a capitalist and globalised city-state that is characterised by a strong sense of diversity and hybridity. This hybridity is felt not only in the diversity of its population but also in the diversity of its cultural and social values as well as of its economic interests. In a sense, this

racial, social and economic hybridity is the new spirit of late capitalism ruling this cosmopolitan city. Unlike the general assumption that it stands for the margins of the society, it actually defines both the centre and the margins as an intricate part of the capitalist system. No matter how such a diversity contributes to the workings of the capitalist system in New Crobuzon, there is still a very powerful state apparatus that would keep it under control. This apparatus functions as a vehicle of capture, organising flows of any nature into lines of segmentarity. Yet, such a hybrid mechanism that characterises the very structure of the capitalist social machine necessarily bears strong potentialities for transgression and resistance. Even if the presentation of hybridity in New Crobuzon in effect reproduces the negative system of differences based upon binary oppositions, it is the idea of resistance that actually uncovers the affirmative aspect of hybridity, that is, multiplicity. As such, the novel probes into how this hybridity can be turned into a collective action that would open up lines of flight from domination and manipulation within the capitalist system. Even if it cannot be claimed that the novel promises a victorious revolution that would entirely eliminate the capitalist world system, it is certain that it heralds revolutionary possibilities of drawing a way out from the system and of making hybridity a “vector of deterritorialisation” (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 294) to change its form from a site of negative difference into a site of affirmative multiplicity in terms of space, subjectivity and language.

5.1. Smoothing over the “Hybrid Zone”

Mieville’s New Crobuzon could be regarded as a political arena that witnesses this transformation of the hybrid yet striated space of the city into a hybrid and smooth space of resistance. Unlike Atwood’s portrayal of a pre-apocalyptic world under the control of multinational corporations, New Crobuzon appears as a metropolis that functions as the global centre of capitalism. Even if these two dystopian contemporary societies differ in scale and representation, they fall into the same apparatus of power under the impetus of the capitalist social

machine that is highly concerned with the use and control of space. The same forces that are creating dangerous segregations and capitalist opportunities in the *MaddAddam* trilogy similarly bring about new urban networks, social and spatial striations in *Perdido Street Station*. This concern with spatial organisation is felt even more strongly in New Crobuzon. This is primarily because it is a city-state with a multicultural and hybrid background, inhabiting a vast variety of species alongside humans such as frog-like Vodyanoi, human-bodied and insect-headed Khepri, plant-people Cactacae, humanoid-bird Garuda and brain-draining Slake-Moth. Each of these species is a hybrid entity sharing a common zone with other species in terms of their physicality and racial features yet at the same time having their own unique histories, cultures and languages. Accordingly, each embodies a different way of living and seeing, occupying different urban spaces. Humans live in the central area around Perdido Street Station, Khepri community in Creekside and Kinken, Garudas in Spatters, Vodyanoi in Kelltree and Cactacae in Glasshouse. Each urban space hosting a different racial entity has its own laws, rules, values and standards.

As it is underlined in the novel by Motley who is a Remaking, one of the afore-mentioned hybrid entities, New Crobuzon is characterised by “[t]he hybrid zone” (*Perdido* 41) with multiple races, values, beliefs, lifestyles and forms.. Hybrid zone often corresponds to a positive plurality; “[t]he zone where the disparate become part of the whole” in Motley’s words (41). It suggests an active micropolitics and molecular forces. The micropolitics of hybridity is by its very nature an opposite of the politics of molarisation that defines capitalism. Against capitalism’s inclination towards homogenising and standardisation for social production, the micropolitics of hybridity always has a potential to create revolutionary minorities, becomings and a people-to-come. This makes it a threat for the sustainability and expansion of the capitalist social machine. Thus, New Crobuzon, under the impetus of late capitalism, does not cherish its hybrid zone; on the contrary, its State apparatus actively works to turn it into a zone of segregation and negative differences. In other words, it overcodes the urban space of New Crobuzon only to become a striated space par excellence. The molecular

flows of the hybrid plurality of the city are captured and organised into rigid segregations, and despite its hybrid nature the city is structured upon the principle of polarisation. Hierarchical stratifications are established, and racial lines are highlighted to launch a rigid binaristic system that would replace affirmative diversity. Although the primary form of binarism in the city appears as the one between the human and the non-human races, it is rapidly expanded to each and every racial entity. The molar boundaries drawn between the races are reflected, reproduced and re-enacted upon the literal urban space of New Crobuzon. The State apparatus operates with the motto “Divide, rule” (*Perdido* 93). This is why it is not surprising to see how highly striated and compartmentalised the city is in its organisation of neighborhoods varying from dangerous suburbs (such as Griss Twist and Smog Bend), industrial slums (such as Kelltree and Sobek Croix) to middle class quarters (such as Galmarch and Flyside) and rich and safe districts (such as Flaghill and Rim, to name only a few). Even the city’s architectural design is rigid and exclusionary. It is nonetheless remarkably diverse, which complies with the logic of late capitalism:

And what of the city itself? Perched where two rivers strive to become the sea, where mountains become a plateau, where the clumps of trees coagulate to the south and—quantity becomes quality—are suddenly a forest. New Crobuzon’s architecture moves from the industrial to the residential to the opulent to the slum to the underground to the airborne to the modern to the ancient to the colourful to the drab to the fecund to the barren. (*Perdido* 41)

As Deleuze and Guattari underline, “capitalism operates [...] by a complex qualitative process bringing into play modes of transportation, urban models, the media, the entertainment industries, ways of perceiving and feeling—every semiotic system” (*Thousand Plateaus* 492). The urban space of New Crobuzon is accordingly organised to integrate and strengthen the striations in the social and economic structure of the society and hence to enable the smooth circulation of capital. Each species is therefore highly segregated from one another in terms of living spaces, life styles, socio-economic background, values and beliefs despite

their hybrid features that put them in a common zone. Invisible sets of rules and laws are applied to keep these striations sustained and prevent any transition among them. Transition of any kind, either from one race to another or from the outside of the urban space of New Crobuzon to the inside, is not met with approval. Thus, transition or trespassing of any kind is overly intimidating, especially considering the contribution of the urbanised planning of the city. This intimidating atmosphere of the city is best described from the perspective of Yagharek on his first day of coming to New Crobuzon:

The river twists and turns to face the city. It looms suddenly, massive, stamped on the landscape. Its light wells up around the surrounds, the rock hills, like bruise-blood. Its dirty towers glow. I am debased. I am compelled to worship this extraordinary presence that has silted into existence at the conjunction of two rivers. It is a vast pollutant, a stench, a klaxon sounding. Fat chimneys retch dirt into the sky even now in the deep night. It is not the current which pulls us but the city itself, its weight sucks us in. Faint shouts, here and there the calls of beasts, the obscene clash and pounding from the factories as huge machines rut. Railways trace urban anatomy like protruding veins. Red brick and dark walls, squat churches like troglodytic things, ragged awnings flickering, cobbled mazes in the old town, culs-de-sac, sewers riddling the earth like secular sepulchres, a new landscape of wasteground, crushed stone, libraries fat with forgotten volumes, old hospitals, towerblocks, ships and metal claws that lift cargoes from the water.

How could we not see this approaching? What trick of topography is this, that lets the sprawling monster hide behind corners to leap out at the traveller? (Perdido 1-2; emphasis in original)

Even the topography of the city with its twisted architecture, dirt, decaying neighborhood and inhabitants makes Yagharek feel as an outsider. These rules and laws, however, are set up not only for creating boundaries between races and between the inside and outside of New Crobuzon and promoting isolation instead of interaction, but they are also created to striate each individual race from within.

Khepri community is, for example, based upon a binary logic that fosters gender discrimination, where male Khepris constitute the majoritarian standard as sentient entities while female ones stand for the non-sentient minority.

Apart from the exclusionary mechanism of striation and spatiotemporal boundaries, there are also other mechanisms of control and striation that the capitalist social machine deploys to pursue its capitalist expansion in New Crobuzon. The city could be argued to be in the initial phases of the shift from a disciplinary society into a society of control, which necessarily creates a difference in the ways the State apparatus handles controlling and striating the society, politics and economy. Unlike Atwood's pre-apocalyptic world where there is no obvious governmental system but multinational corporations in power, New Crobuzon is reigned by the city government, a parliament under the leadership of mayor Bentham Rudgutter. The government is equally corrupted in its collaboration with corporate companies, scientists and even criminal bosses. Capitalist interests and economic collaborations are so dominant that the government can no longer be claimed to be the only sovereign power. Likewise, even if the walls of disciplinary institutions have not entirely collapsed in this city-state, they are not as effective as they were in the past, either. New Crobuzon society is, then, not a society entirely under surveillance but a society that uses disciplinary means not for enclosing but for making its subjects "undulatory, in orbit, in a continuous network" (Deleuze "Postscript" 6) in order to ensure the circulation of the capitalist market. With this in mind, one of these regulatory means of the capitalist social machine is the militia, that is, military defence organs of New Crobuzon. The primary duty of militia agents is to sustain the striated space of the city and the political and socio-economic stratifications, which in turn will ensure the safety and durability of the capitalist market that runs through molar polarisations and exclusion. This unit functions in two ways: militia agents either secretly sneak into the society and foster the existing segregation between the races by fueling the hatred; or violently quash any anti-capitalist activity as in the case of the Vodyanoi strike. Since the conquest of the capitalist market becomes the only goal of such states that are in transition to

control societies, as Deleuze puts it, “older methods of [discipline and punishment], borrowed from the former societies of sovereignty, will return to the fore, but with the necessary modifications. [...] In the *prison system*: the attempt to find penalties of ‘substitution,’ at least for petty crimes, and the use of electronic collars that force the convicted person to stay at home during certain hours” (7). This also applies to New Crobuzon where older disciplinary methods are modified with the help of advanced technology to serve utilitarian capitalist ends. One of these is the Remaking that is a process of mutilating and reconstructing the bodies of the criminal convicts as a form of punishment. The reconstruction of the criminals’ bodies in line with their crimes could be seen as an utterly disciplinary regulation but the underlying motivation behind the Remaking is actually to promote capitalist utilitarian logic by turning them into productive hybrid-machines that could attain different functions and hence could work in different areas. This is tantamount to saying that the bodies of the criminals become a space to be deterritorialised only to be reterritorialised as functional organisms that would ideally contribute to the workings of the capitalist social machine.

The latent motive behind the molar striations that the capitalist social machine tends to create on the urban space of New Crobuzon and the space of its subjects’ bodies is to control the free flows of desire. Desire, the moving force and creative energy of life, invests every single social space of the city-state. There the productions of desire necessarily become social productions. But the reason why the capitalist social machine sees desire as something to be repressed lies in the fact that it is “revolutionary in its essence”: “every position of desire, no matter how small, is capable of calling into question the established order of a society: not that desire is asocial, on the contrary. But it is explosive; there is no desiring-machine capable of being assembled without demolishing entire social sectors”, as Deleuze and Guattari underline (*Anti-Oedipus* 118). Desire thus constitutes a major threat to the stability of the dominant power structure, which makes the capitalist social machine take an immediate action to keep it under control. This is perfectly illustrated with the figure of slake-moths in New Crobuzon. Slake-moths

are the creatures designed and created by scientists working for the government. They are violent predators that suck the essential fluid of their victims, draining their dreams, desires, creative energies and revolutionary tendencies, and turn them into empty bodies. As it is described in the novel,

[...] they only feed on the sentient. No cats or dogs for them. They drink the peculiar brew that results from self-reflexive thought, when the instincts and needs and desires and intuitions are folded in on themselves and we reflect on our thoughts and then reflect on the reflection, endlessly... Vermishank's voice was hushed. 'Our thoughts ferment like the purest liquor. That is what the slake-moths drink, Isaac. Not the meat-calories slopping about in the brainpan, but the fine wine of sapience and sentience itself, the subconscious. Dreams. (*Perdido* 375)

They turn this essential fluid into dreamshit, a very powerful illegal drug whose exchange market is in the hands of the government. This ironically reminds one of the actual operation of late capitalism. As desire seeks multiplicity, desiring-production and an infinite network of relations, the capitalist social machine seeks to rob its subjects of desire and its dangerous potentiality. Thanks to slake-moths, it transfers the investments of desire into capitalist production. In this sense, it can be argued that slake-moths stand for the metonymic embodiment of the capital in New Crobuzon, draining the free flow of desire for control and profit.

In this regard, New Crobuzon becomes the locus of capitalist production, namely a striated space where everything including bodies and subjectivities is exposed to the molar capture of the State apparatus and evaluated according to its exchange value. Moreover, the rigid striations and hierarchies created on the urban space of the city reinforce the inequality in labor division, racial discrimination, gendered discourse and repression. As stated in the novel, the city is "gripped in an epidemic, an outbreak, a plague of nightmares" (*Perdido* 349). This is to say that, with the operation of striating forces, capitalism increasingly consolidates itself in the urban space of the city till it reaches the point of perfection. Yet, for Deleuze and Guattari, capitalism's point of perfection

ironically suggests a possibility for a degree of smooth space rather than an absolute striated space. As they argue in *Thousand Plateaus*,

It is as though, at the outcome of the striation that capitalism was able to carry to an unequaled point of perfection, circulating capital necessarily recreated, reconstituted, a sort of smooth space in which the destiny of human beings is recast. Striation, of course, survives in the most perfect and severest of forms (it is not only vertical but operates in all directions); however, it relates primarily to the state pole of capitalism, in other words, to the role of the modern State apparatuses in the organisation of capital. On the other hand, at the complementary and dominant level of integrated (or rather integrating) world capitalism, a new smooth space is produced in which capital reaches its 'absolute' speed, based on machinic components rather than the human component of labor. (492)

That is, the edge of every striated space interferes with the emergence of a smooth space, a form of space that is necessary either for the accelerated circulation of capital or for a resistance to the capitalist social machine. The latter applies to New Crobuzon where smooth spaces emerge as a site of resistance against power. Despite the strict striations on its urban space, the city still stands for a "[c]ondensed force, the potential for counterattack" (*Thousand Plateaus* 481). This is primarily an outcome of the very nature of metropolises. The metropolis, as Negri and Hardt point out, can be seen as "the skeleton and spinal cord of the multitude, that is, the built environment that supports its activity, and the social environment that constitutes a repository and skill set of affects, social relations, habits, desires, knowledges, and cultural circuits" (*Commonwealth* 249). As they continue, the metropolis functions as a platform that both witnesses the multitude's suffering and subordination and allows the conditions for resistance and transformation, which makes it "the inorganic body, that is, the body without organs of the multitude" (249).

New Crobuzon is such a metropolis that resists striation by its very nature. It is a rhizome-city without roots, where not only a network of canals, stations and alleys connects every piece of the city to one another but also a living dynamic of

different cultures, races, traditions and values. Because of this hybrid nature, the State apparatus strives to create rigid boundaries that would physically separate each neighborhood, socially and economically segregate each racial community and enclose each into its own unique living space. Even if the neighborhoods are segregated in line with their prosperity and inhabitants as wealthy quarters, middle-class districts, poor ghettos, it is indeed too hard to draw strict boundaries, considering how close and even interwoven all the neighborhoods are to one another. Canker Wedge is, for example, just “less than two miles from the centre of the city, but a different world” (*Perdido* 575). As opposed to the chaotic and gloomy atmosphere of the city centre that is just next to it, it is one of the most prosperous places in New Crobuzon, having “[l]ow, quiet streets and modest housing, small apologetic parks, frumpy churches and halls, offices with false fronts and façades in a cacophony of muted styles” (575). This is to say that all those hierarchically organised spaces are just one step away from one another as an irony of the divisions they are exposed to. At this point, Perdido Street Station becomes a powerful metaphor of this interwoven and rhizomatic aspect of the space of the city: It is “the centre of New Crobuzon, the knot of architectural tissue where the fibres of the city congealed, where the skyrails of the militia radiated out from the Spike like a web and the five great train lines of the city met, converging on the great variegated fortress of dark brick and scrubbed concrete and wood and steel and stone, the edifice that yawned hugely at the city’s vulgar heart” (*Perdido* 22). It is a microcosm of the city structured by the principles of “connection and heterogeneity” which allow it to ceaselessly and simultaneously establish networks among its various lines (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 7), and by the principle of “multiplicity” that has no points superior or inferior to one another. This rhizomatic nature of the station helps to eliminate any supposed distinction between the centre and the peripheries, defying any categorisation and hierarchy. Hence it makes transition and transgression inevitable between zones, worlds, races and traditions.

Thanks to such a hybrid and rhizomatic nature that is perfectly represented by Perdido Street Station, the striated space of New Crobuzon unavoidably

surrenders to smoothing forces. Unlike the deterritorialising forces that tend to arise out of the most marginalised parts of the society in Atwood's pre-apocalyptic world, however, the seeds of smooth spaces exist not only at the peripheries but also at the very centre of New Crobuzon. The spatio-political contour of the city inhabits and holds that space both as a necessity of the rapid circulation of capital and as an inevitable outcome of its multiplicity. With Deleuze and Guattari's words, "[t]he smooth spaces arising from the city are not only those of worldwide organisation, but also of a counterattack" (*Thousand Plateaus* 481). Despite several striations that are created to control and limit the movement of the subjects from one fixed point to another within an assigned space, movement is never halted in New Crobuzon. It is either because the State apparatus cannot manage to capture each and every territory in its rhizomatic geography (as it is with the suburbs that are beyond its reach), or because there are zones of indeterminacy in each territory that transgress and defy those striations even if the State apparatus somehow reaches and attempts to striate them.

In such a rhizome-city having an infinite number of entrances each of which is simultaneously both detachable and connectable, there are also infinite lines of escape from the confines of the dominant power. The city is, in this sense, invested with a revolutionary desire and envelops an intense force that waits for a stimulus to generate. A nomadic consciousness becomes such a stimulus to activate deterritorialising forces to smooth out the stratified territories by digging out holes from within. In New Crobuzon, the nomadic consciousness appears as a form of political resistance against the State and functions as a war machine, the goal of which is not to destroy but to subvert and transform. It is immanent to the contours of the city that is open, diverse and multiple in its essence and that challenges representation and singular identification. As such, it "does not repose on identity; it rides difference. It does not respect the artificial division between the three domains of representation, subject, concept, and being; it replaces restrictive analogy with a conductivity that knows no bounds" (Massumi "Translator's Foreword" xii). Thus, it has a collective aspect not in the sense that it would suggest a homogenised unity of bodies similar to the ones promoted by

the State but in the sense that it would welcome all acknowledging and respecting their heterogeneity, diversity and multiplicity. As Brian Massumi clarifies, “[r]ather than analysing the world into discrete components, reducing their manyness to the One of identity, and ordering them by rank, it sums up a set of disparate circumstances in a shattering blow. It synthesises a multiplicity of elements without effacing their heterogeneity or hindering their potential for future rearranging (to the contrary)” (xiii). Accordingly, this nomadic consciousness deriving out of the city’s hybridity triggers an affirmative difference and collectivity which would open up smooth spaces of resistance.

Apart from individual attempts like Lin’s, Isaac’s and of many others to smooth out the molar striations, there are also several major sites of resistance that form smooth spaces in the novel, the first of which is Runagate Rampant. Runagate Rampant is “the illegal, radical news-sheet” (*Perdido* 82) driven by minoritarian politics to unravel the operations of the capitalist social machine and to create an awareness in the community against its repressive and discriminative practices. This underground magazine boldly criticises how profit-driven the government is in its decisions, regulations and collaborations, displaying the government’s links with mob crime, with drug and prostitution industry. The main concern of the capitalist social machine in New Crobuzon is, in Runagate Rampant’s words, to “hurn out the commodity, grab the profit, get the militia to tidy up your customers afterwards, get a new crop of Remade or slave-miners for the Arrowhead pits, keep the jails full ... nice as you like” (*Perdido* 138). In this sense, Runagate Rampant offers an alternative presentation of the reality against the dominant representation held by the state. The slogans published in its newspaper and booklets run along the walls of the streets, governmental institutions and even churches:

Graffiti covered every wall. Rude poems and obscene drawings jostled with slogans from Runagate Rampant and anxious prayers:
Half-a-Prayer’s coming!
Against the Lottery!

Tar and Canker spread like legs / City wonders where
her Lover went / Cos now she's being Ravished blind /
by the Prick that is the Government!

The walls of churches were not spared. The Veruline
monks stood in a nervous group and wiped at the
scrawled pornography that had appeared on their
chapel. (*Perdido* 131)

Those graffitis constitute liminal smooth spaces of resistance challenging the cleanliness, order and segmentation fostered in the striated spaces. The site of resistance created by Runagate Rampant can be considered to be smooth space since it is not driven by a dominant ideology except the revolutionary desire to overturn the hierarchical organisations and inequalities created by the state apparatus. Thus, it solely aims to deterritorialise the stratified territories without taking into consideration which racial community they are formed on. Similarly, it does not enclose its deterritorialising activities within a self-contained space of resistance; on the contrary, it is open to any collaboration with other sites of resistance in New Crobuzon. One of these sites of resistance supported by Runagate Rampant is Kelltree strike led by Vodyanoi dockers. The strike begins among Vodyanoi stevedores as a reaction to the unfair labor wages, and rapidly extends across other laborers including humans. By paralyzing the river, they collectively create smooth spaces of resistance that simultaneously paralyze the capitalist operations of the state: "Massive exercise in watercraft. They're going to dig a trench of air across the water, the whole depth of the river. They'll have to shore it up continuously, recrafting the walls constantly so they don't collapse, but they've got enough members to do that in shifts. There's no ship that can jump that gap, Mayor. They'll totally cut off New Crobuzon from river trade, in both directions" (*Perdido* 270). This "all-race union against the bosses!" movement starting and expanding on the shore is actively backed by Runagate Rampant without even being asked for it. In this regard, the smoothing force over the striations of the state is actually not the strikes, slogans or graffitis themselves but the collective action lurking behind them.

In this regard, the collective action against the capitalist social machine in New Crobuzon strongly evokes the motif of the patchwork quilt Deleuze and

Guattari mention in *Thousand Plateaus*. A patchwork is a perfect example of smooth space where different materials in different shapes, size and colour are randomly stitched to one another so as to form a unity. In this unity, there is no particular centre that organises patterns around it, but a juxtaposition of pieces that could be arranged in an infinite number of ways without privileging one over another. In this sense, as Deleuze and Guattari underline, “[t]he smooth space of patchwork is adequate to demonstrate that ‘smooth’ does not mean homogeneous, quite the contrary: it is an amorphous, conformal space prefiguring on art” (*Thousand Plateaus* 477). In the same vein with the formation of patchwork quilt, the collectivity behind the smooth spaces of resistance in New Crobuzon is governed by the principles of heterogeneity, difference and creative connectivity. With such sites of resistance, all those stratifications and molar segregations that the State apparatus strives to create among different racial communities are dissolved; and instead all differences are embraced and turned into a powerful yet heterogenous collectivity where there are no longer us/them oppositions. In other words, it could be argued that the hybrid space of the city, which is turned into a site of negative difference with the striating practices and regulations of the state, retrieves its affirmative multiplicity and diversity with the release of revolutionary desire.

This affirmative collectivity is best illustrated with the unified fight against the slake-moths in the novel. The slake-moths, previously mentioned as gigantic creatures sucking the sentience of all inhabitants, are accidentally set free and constitute a significant threat for the city. With their release, New Crobuzon is “gripped in an epidemic, an outbreak, a plague of nightmares” (*Perdido* 349). Yet the city government’s and Isaac’s reactions to their release display great differences in their motives. While Isaac and his friends try to find and eliminate these creatures to save the city from this “plague of nightmares”, the city-government driven by the capitalist interests seek them only to continue using them against its people for its own profit. The combat against the slake-moths, thus, simultaneously becomes a combat against the government itself and the capitalist social machine it represents. In this triple-edged fight, a truly collective

site of resistance emerges out of “all-races against the bosses” approach. The resistant group led by Isaac consists of people from several different communities: humans who are assumed to be the privileged race in the city, the Weaver that is a giant spider-like creature and the Construct Council that is artificial intelligence created for multifunctional purposes. This heterogenous group becomes victorious only after a collaborative act of creating crisis energy.

Crisis energy, as Yagharek defines, designates “*the channels of power, transformative energy, thaumaturgic flow, the binding and exploding force that inheres*” (*Perdido* 505; emphasis in original). This energy which is “all about potentiality” could be argued to be standing for the virtual in a Deleuzian sense. The virtual is a pure potentiality and constituting power of multiplicity from which the actual unfolds. Its actualisation, as Deleuze puts it, “always takes place by difference, divergence or differentiation. Actualisation breaks with resemblance as a process no less than it does with identity as a principle [...] actualisation or differentiation is always a genuine creation” (*Difference and Repetition* 212) Deleuze, however, does not use “difference, divergence or differentiation” dialectically, namely in oppositional terms. On the contrary, he purges the notion of difference of its transcendent and negative connotations. Likewise, the potentiality of crisis energy in the novel unfolds only through a collective action that affirms differences, diversity and hybridity. As stated in the novel, “[t]he transition from one state to another’s affected by taking something—a social group, a piece of wood, a hex—to a place where its interactions with other forces make its own energy pull against its current state” (*Perdido* 169) This becomes even more telling when one takes into consideration that it is Perdido Street Station, the centre of interaction and multiplicity, where the crisis engine is created out of a network connecting all sources of energy coming from different racial entities, and where the final fight against the slake moths, government and the capitalist social machine triumphs. This testifies to the fact that smooth spaces are not in themselves emancipatory, but rather it is only through a combination of a degree of affirmative difference, collectivity and revolutionary desire that they come into being as spaces of resistance.

5.2. Deterritorialisation of Subjectivity

5.2.1 Hybrid as the New Intermezzo

Smooth spaces are wedded to diverse orientations, multiple entrances, unforeseen and undefined oscillations between points, which is frequently highlighted as “hybrid zone” in the novel. Hybrid zones, by their very nature, are open to smoothing forces, rhizomatic networks of relations and emancipatory practices that halt the functioning of the capitalist social machine. Once the hybrid zones meet an affirmative multiplicity, the molar boundaries and stratified structures dissolve and leave their place to an open site where infinite movement is possible. Then, as Robert Wood points out, hybrid zones can be “intimately linked with a transformation of society through pushing its contradictions to the point of crisis”, a crisis that could be seen as pure multiplicity (85). This pure multiplicity not only reinforces the dissolution of the dominant power structures by offering multiple exits from their capture, but also promotes the unfolding of dominant forms of subjectivity and the emergence of alternative modes of being and living. To put it another way, the hybridity where “the disparate becomes the part of the whole” (*Perdido* 41) is reflected not only in the body of the city, its smooth spaces of resistance and its architecture, but also in subjectivities of its inhabitants. Almost all characters in the novel, no matter which racial community they belong to, are in “the intermezzo” (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 380), illustrating a borderline trajectory either in their bodies or in their ways of being and living. However, the status of being in the intermezzo or hybrid does not necessarily suggest a non-dialectical and affirmative position of being in the novel. On the contrary, hybridity is often turned into a means of subjugation and hierarchical imposition. However, even if hybridity as a form of subjectivity is exposed to the processes of oedipalisation and the normative standardisation of the capitalist social machine, it always has a capacity to offer some schizophrenic lines of flight from and leaks within the molar structures and allows for the creation of affirmative alternative subjectivities as a mode of resistance just as it is

observed on the urban space of the city. The normative standards designed for the subjects are, in this sense, always at stake in New Crobuzon as an outcome of this hybrid nature integral to the body of the city and of its inhabitants.

The capitalist social machine that tends to establish molar segments and segregations on the hybrid space of New Crobuzon equally strives to produce a scheme of negative differences, cruel discriminations and monstrosities on and through the bodies of its hybrid subjects. This is primarily because hybridity constitutes a potential alternative to the standardisation imposed in and by the capitalist system. It is a constantly changing assemblage of diverse forces; moreover, it is utterly dynamic and creative, which can pave the way for the subjects to experience a crossing-of-the-boundaries, a revolutionary trajectory. As opposed to the mobile, ever-changing and improving nature of hybrid subjectivity, however, the capitalist social machine favours immobile and rigid forms of subjectivity even on hybrid bodies. As such, there are two types of hybrid entities in New Crobuzon, both of which are exposed to the molarisation and oedipalisation of the State apparatus. One is the Remades, the hybrid bodies previously mentioned to be produced at state factories: the bodies of crime suspects are literally castrated as a form of punishment. The castration of the subjects often occurs even if the accusation is false or uncorroborated, which testifies to the fact that there are motives other than punishment behind this act. Firstly, these bodies are deterritorialised from their original states of being only to be reterritorialised as working tools of the capitalist social machine. Secondly, these deterritorialised bodies function as the signifier of the power of the State apparatus. In this sense, it can be argued that the bodies are hybridised only to be socially stigmatised and to make hybridity a status to be ashamed of. The other is pure-bred species such as Khepri, Weaver, Garuda and so on, which are naturally hybrid. In either form, be it naturally cross-bred or reconstructed, the subjects hold a bodily heterogeneity by comprising a mutual relationship with different species. The capitalist social machine, however, reduces hybridity imbued with such multiplicity and connectivity to a transcendent normativity, targeting to immobilise its dynamic and transformative force that would open up to creative

becomings. In other words, it models hybridity on the Molar or Sedentary subject since it feeds on the rigid edges, segmentations and hierarchies created as an outcome of its oedipalising identity politics. As such, even if each hybrid entity shares liminal zones of connectivity with those of other species by its very nature, each is segregated from one another by rigid identity markers defined and forced by the State apparatus. These identity markers are gradually internalised by each community and hence culminate in the creation of boundaries and us/them binaries. Accordingly, those trespassing those boundaries and going beyond binary structures are doomed to a cruel ostracisation within their own community. Likewise, no other community would be willing to welcome those ostracised entities.

It is not only the affirmative difference and multiplicity inherent in hybrid subjects that the State apparatus in New Crobuzon strives to mold into essentialist binary structures, there are several other realms of subjectivity such as gender and sexuality that are exposed to oedipalising forces as well. The identity politics run by the capitalist social machine define heteronormative standards for gender and sexuality, equating the male with power and the female with lack of it and canalising the flux of desire in both to heterosexual normative arrangements. As a site of diversity and revolutionary desire, however, New Crobuzon never fully yields to such molar and oedipal arrangements. No matter how hybridity is forced to squeeze into fixed categories and binaristic divisions, it always entails a potential to destabilise all these categories and molecularise the self. Traversing and transgressing the heteronormative and discriminatory discourses into which their subjectivities are moulded, the inhabitants of New Crobuzon are capable of deconstructing the dominant identity politics and the underlying power structures. They easily activate deterritorialising forces to take revolutionary lines of flight from the existing molar forms of subjectivity. Once escaping from the restrictions of these forms, their bodies move into a zone of indeterminacy where they redefine ontological categories of the human, nonhuman and hybrid. In other words, they take a flight from the defined, oedipalised and normative subjectivity into the new, creative and undefined realm of becomings. In the novel,

accordingly, several moments of productive intensity are observed, where the characters experience an immanent encounter with dynamic forces repressed by the State apparatus and evolve into a series of lines of flights and becomings. The coming sub-section will illustrate this.

5.2.2. Queering Desire and Nomadising Science

In *Perdido Street Station*, Isaac's position is certainly indicative of several schizophrenic lines of flight from the molar standards of identity. Isaac appears as the main resistant dissenter of the dystopian city from the early pages of the novel. His deterritorialising activity could be observed under two positions: Isaac as a scientist and Isaac as a lover. He is, as frequently stated in the novel, "the scientist-outcast, the disreputable thinker who walked out of a lucrative teaching post to engage in experiments too outrageous and brilliant for the tiny minds who ran the university" (*Perdido* 12). Science in New Crobuzon cannot escape the capture of the State apparatus, and becomes one of the tools of the capitalist social machine. Most scientists including Vermishank, the head of the department at the university where Isaac once worked, work not for the good of the society but for the benefit of the capitalist social machine. Isaac, however, rejects conforming to majoritarian science, and willingly walks away from the university to pursue his studies. His studies remarkably diverge from mainstream scientific trends, which makes it hard for him to find funding for his experiment and legitimise his findings. Taking schizophrenic lines of flight from the conventional values of science, Isaac defines his work and his position as a scientist as utterly rhizomatic and hybrid:

'I think of myself as the main station for all the schools of thought. Like Perdido Street Station. You know it?' Yagharek nodded. 'Unavoidable, ain't it? Fucking massive great thing.' Isaac patted his belly, maintaining the analogy. 'All the train-lines meet there—Sud Line, Dexter, Verso, Head and Sink Lines; everything has to pass through it. That's like me. That's my job. That's the kind of scientist I am.[...]' (*Perdido* 50-51).

As an alternative to majoritarian science, which is inclined towards linear and teleological thinking and is static and closed to interdisciplinary collaboration, Isaac comes up with a revolutionary form of science, which is innovative, transgressive and interdisciplinary.

In Deleuzian terms, Isaac's research could be argued to be illustrating a "nomad science" that "develops eccentrically, one that is very different from the royal or imperial sciences" (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 362). As Deleuze and Guattari elaborate, "this nomad science is continually 'barred,' inhibited, or banned by the demands and conditions of State science. [...] The fact is that the two kinds of science have different modes of formalisation, and State science continually imposes its form of sovereignty on the inventions of nomad science" (362). This is to say that just as scientists are exposed to the oedipalisation of the State apparatus like any other individual being, science is subject to stratification and molar organisation in accordance with the interests of the capitalist social machine. Isaac, however, boldly resists being a scientist defined, projected and managed in such majoritarian terms, by which he reaches the outer limit of the capitalist social machine. He carries out his research by feeding upon majoritarian science, deterritorialising it from within: He secretly uses and abuses the sources of the university, remains in contact with those in the field and keeps sending his findings to journals for publication so as to have his subversive and transgressive studies recognised and legitimised. He is both inside and outside the system because even if he is educated according to the standards of majoritarian science and owes much of his knowledge to such a heritage, he achieves to keep himself away from its appropriation and remains an outsider within the system who constantly digs holes from within. In this sense, nomad science conducted by Isaac moves beyond being a transgressive mode. He is a nomad that actively turns his science into a war machine against the capitalist social machine. This means that his nomad science has also a revolutionary dimension, which is best portrayed in the collective combat against the slake-moths standing for the capital in essence. As Robert Wood puts it, his research is "intimately linked with a transformation of society through pushing its

contradictions to the point of crisis” (85), a transformation from a state of submission to resistance and from negative discriminations to affirmative multiplicity. As such, he achieves this primarily by modelling such a transformation within himself.

Yet it is not solely his subversive position as a scientist but a combination of his science with his sexual preferences that positions Isaac as a threshold figure calling for multiplicity. Transversal activity seen in his scientific endeavor reappears as a political attitude in his intimate relationship with Lin. In New Crobuzon the capitalist social machine represses collective and individual desire by means of its State apparatus. In a quite similar vein, with its organisation of hybridity as a site of negative differences, it organises desire and abstracts it from its multiplicity and affirmative difference. In this way it normalises desire and reduces its fluidity and mobility to heteronormativity. This reductionist organisation could be seen as the oedipalisation of desire. Desire in its oedipalised form is so internalised in each community that they strictly forbid their people from expressing and actualising any diverse and creative form of desire beyond its normativising limits. Those transgressing the normativising limits are condemned as the abnormal and /or the outsider and pushed either to the margins or to the outside of the society. The position of Isaac both as a human and a scientist also restricts him to the reductionist limits of desire. Yet he transgresses these limits by having a cross-affair with a khepri female, Lin. By doing so, he rescues desire from its Oedipal yoke and reintroduces it into a multiplicity which is its real essence. Isaac experiences this transgressive sexual act as a means of resistance to the dominant power structure that strives to stifle desire by all means. As a scientist-outcast who cannot stick to the conventions of majoritarian science, he cannot stick to the conventions of normative majority in his sexual preference, either, which is depicted in the novel as follows: “He watched her swallow, saw her throat bob where the pale insectile underbelly segued smoothly into her human neck [...] He smiled at her. She undulated her headlegs at him and signed, My monster. I am a pervert, thought Isaac, and so is she. [...] What did he care for convention? He would sleep with whomever and whatever he liked, surely!”

(*Perdido* 10-12) Queering desire with cross-affair is obviously a schizophrenic line of flight that brings about an alternative way of feeling and perceiving against the dominant one. Isaac's describing himself as pervert is, in this regard, quite revealing because the pervert is, as Deleuze and Guattari point out, the one that "resisted oedipalisation [...] since he has invented for himself other territorialities" (*Anti-Oedipus* 67). It promises a liberation of desire and its opening up to infinite possibilities of sexuality. Thus, queering or perverting could possibly constitute a becoming in the sense that it designates a move from the molar and majoritarian subject position towards the molecular and minoritarian one.

Isaac's becoming-queer¹⁸ indeed triggers a movement that brings him into a transformational multiplicity and possible lines of flight from the dominant power. He recognises himself as multiple by overcoming himself and the supposed difference between himself and the other. He enters into becoming-other-than-himself and even becoming-hybrid with other entities, which enables him to reach a third space where he temporarily experiences "a psychic sluice" (*Perdido* 184) Several mindsets, personalities begin to simultaneously invade his consciousness, he feels like rolling into the minds and dreams of other people ranging from "a six-year-old girl laughing delightedly in a language he had never heard but momentarily understood as his own" or "a pubescent boy" to a "cactaceae mind" (*Perdido* 185). He becomes a meeting point, a shared consciousness of almost all the races in New Crobuzon even if temporarily. In quite a similar way to Jimmy's in Atwood's *MaddAddam* trilogy, Isaac's temporary sense of several becomings occurs through his inhering into a non-linear dynamics of temporality. As thoroughly discussed in the previous chapter, an asubjectivity in the form of becoming hardly engages with a linear sense of time since it would be contradictory to its very nature. As such, Isaac's experience of multiple becomings coincides with the destruction of his perception of linear

¹⁸ "Becoming-queer" is a notion that the author of this dissertation derives from Deleuzian notion of becoming, considering that the queer tendencies of Isaac and Lin suggest a becoming. "Becoming-hybrid" is also another coinage introduced by this study which will be touched upon on the upcoming pages of the section.

temporality: “A magic lantern was flickering in his head, bombarding him with a succession of images. This was no zöetrope with an endlessly repeated little visual anecdote: this was a juddering bombardment of infinitely varied moments. Isaac was strafed with a million scintillas of time. Every fractioned life juddered as it segued into the next and Isaac would eavesdrop on other creatures’ lives” (*Perdido* 183). He begins to perceive time not in a linear succession but a simultaneous embodiment of multiple moments, zones of temporality. Just like his subjectivity that is no longer one but multiple through his transgression and psychic unification with other entities, his perception of time is no longer in a chronological sequence but in coexistence with several other time zones and moments of life.

Undoubtedly, such a perception of time and embracement of asubjectivity moves Isaac into a zone of indeterminacy. He definitely pursues a micropolitics of desire. Nonetheless, it would be too strong an argument to say that he fully performs his becomings in the long term. This is because his concern about his status within the majoritarian discourse locates him in a problematic position where he cannot entirely enjoy the deterritorialised intensities and affects unleashed with the liberation of desire. Everything is for Isaac “a reminder that they were, in some contexts, living a secret. Everything was made fraught” (*Perdido* 11). As he thinks, “[t]o cross-love openly would be a quick route to pariah status, rather than the bad-boy chic he had assiduously courted. What scared him was not that the editors of the journals and the chairs of the conferences and the publishers would find out about Lin and him. What scared him was that he be seen not trying to hide it. If he went through the motions of a cover-up, they could not denounce him as beyond the pale” (*Perdido* 13). Becoming-queer or becoming of any kind is perceived as shameful and guilty in such a society under the Oedipal yoke and the capitalist social machine. As stated in the novel, it is a “guilty desire” (*Perdido* 10). But it is significant to recognise that being a social-outcast scares Isaac more than being a scientist-outcast. This is tantamount to saying that his delirium oscillates between two poles, the schizophrenic pole that pushes him into the flows of diverse desire and the

paranoiac pole that pulls him back to a neurotic impasse where he is concerned about his public grace. Nevertheless, much as his transversal sexual activity cannot reach the point of pure becoming due to this constant oscillation, it is certain that it is still an attempt to overcome the capitalist barriers and calls for schizophrenic investments.

5.2.3. Orphaning Art and Unconsciousness against the Oedipal Yoke

As Deleuze and Guattari underline in *Anti-Oedipus*, “[v]ery few accomplish [...] the breakthrough of this schizophrenic wall or limit: ‘quite ordinary people,’ nevertheless. But the majority draw near the wall and back away horrified” (138). Unlike Isaac who comes that close to the schizophrenic limit yet feels “fearful and horrified, but at the fact of having transgressed rather than at the transgression itself” (*Perdido* 438), Lin actualises such a breakthrough with her transgressive act and fully embraces its affects and percepts. The act of transgression followed by a schizophrenic breakthrough is immanent to Lin’s life from the early days of her childhood. She is a female khepri with a beetle head and a human body, already incorporating a multiplicity within herself. Yet this multiplicity is constantly exposed to oedipalising forces in Khepri community. Lin has been confronted with Oedipal repression since the age of six when her hybrid body first began to form. Her position as a female Khepri makes her subjected to double repression: the first is the imposition that Khepri is the inferior race while the second is that female Khepris have a much more inferior position in the social hierarchy since they are believed to have no consciousness and sentience at all due to their femininity:

Since the age of six, when she had torn the chrysalis from what had been her baby headlarva and was suddenly a headscarab, when she had burst into consciousness with language and thought, her mother had taught her that she was fallen. The gloomy doctrine of Insect Aspect was that khepri women were cursed. Some vile flaw on the part of the first woman had consigned her daughters to lives encumbered with ridiculous, slow, floundering bipedal bodies and minds

that teemed with the useless byways and intricacies of consciousness. Woman had lost the insectile purity of God and male. (*Perdido* 215)

Oedipal reterritorialisations in the Khepri community are then organised around the binary oppositions established between both races and genders, and these segregative structures are strongly legitimised on religious law. In other words, Oedipal repression in the Khepri community is in “a double bind” between “the Oedipus of familial authority and the Oedipus of social authority” (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* 81). In this sense, it is not surprising to see how Lin finds herself circumscribed with her family that forces to accept her inferiority and monstrosity as a female Khepri in relation to the he God, to the male members of her community and to the other supposedly superior races. Lin and her sisters are “taught to worship Him with a terrified fervour, and to despise their self-awareness and their soft, chitinless bodies” (*Perdido* 215-216). They are forced to live in a world of self-contempt, guilt and shame with a submission to the Oedipal law. The Oedipal law is so internalised and adopted even by female Khepris that there is no longer a need for “male” figures to represent and implement it. In Lin’s family, to exemplify, it is her mother that becomes an Oedipal figure. It often takes great courage and time for Khepri people to escape such an Oedipal hold since each community in New Crobuzon is run by similar, if not the same, forms of Oedipalisation. As such, it takes Lin until she is fifteen to challenge all the Oedipal, familial and social impositions. She denounces her Oedipal mother as heretic, and flees what she calls “the lunatic self-loathing of Insect Aspect worship, and the narrow streets of Creekside” (*Perdido* 216). Freeing herself from her arborescent roots, she now has an “orphan unconsciousness” where the Oedipal law can no longer apply. She is now an orphan in the sense that she not only rejects the name of her Oedipal mother but also rejects the molar supposition that Khepri woman are devoid of sentience. On the contrary, she unleashes her unconscious from any capture to produce intensities. This orphan status is similarly metaphorised in her baptising herself with a new name. With her baptising, she moves from her previous rigidified subject position into an

asubjective schizo identity, which paves the way for her to destroy all the other transcendent beliefs and Oedipal representations and pursue a life beyond all law.

Once Lin crosses the Oedipal frontiers of identity and rescues desire from its capture, the schizophrenic process of deterritorialisation she activates continues to disrupt other spheres like sexuality and art. The representation of sexuality in the Khepri community slightly differs from its representation in the human society of New Crobuzon. It is not that sexual desire does not undergo a process of oedipalisation in the Khepri community. It actually does, which culminates in the creation of heteronormative standards for sexuality. But different from the human society, desire is, in its most strict sense, kept from female Khepris. Female members of the Khepri society who are taught to see their bodies as a source of contempt and abjection are also denied access to desire and pleasure. In this sense, queering desire with a cross-affair is for Lin a double-transgression. Firstly, she deterritorialises the Oedipal representation of female sexuality as something to be avoided and ashamed of. She achieves this by discovering the nature and operation of her desiring-machines. She begins to see her body as the focal point of pleasure where she unleashes the free flows of desire. The repressed and abject female body is turned into a schizophrenic and affective body after her decontextualising and reappropriation of it. In this sense, she transgresses the defined limits of sexuality that forbid women from pleasure, which she describes as “the most difficult, the most extraordinary transition” (*Perdido* 217):

Her body had been a source of shame and disgust; to engage in activities with no purpose at all except to revel in their sheer physicality had first nauseated, then terrified, and finally liberated her. Until then she had been subjected only to headsex at her mother’s behest, sitting still and uncomfortable while a male scabbled and coupled excitedly with her headscarab, in mercifully unsuccessful attempts at procreation. (217)

Secondly, she traverses the limits of heteronormative standards that restrict the subjects from having affairs with a same-sex or a different-racial entity. This transgressive act, however, does not terrify Lin as much as it does Isaac. This is primarily because Lin as the schizo subject does not see public grace or social

exclusion as a threat to her ontological security. On the contrary, she willingly excludes herself not only from Khepri community but also from human society since she does not purport to have an ontologically-secure position in any society organised around the Oedipal laws. Instead, she keeps a conceptual space for herself where she can overcome ontological barriers, constitute blocs of becomings and enjoy the revolutionary investments of desire.

Apart from being a subversive female Khepri, Lin is an eccentric artist who continues her transgressive activity in her artistic endeavors. Her artistry deterritorialises traditional Khepri art and invents a completely new and creative alternative as a part of her “*rebellion*” (*Perdido* 39). Abandoning the traditional techniques and materials, she performs her art with Khepri spit that is “a wonderful substance [...] for interesting, unsettling ends” (39). Her innovative artistry is way more than a simple subversion of the conventions. It in effect functions as a minor art, namely a signifier of her “resistance” to the dominant power structure: “It had been her only escape. Her only means of expression. Starved of all the light and colour and shapeliness of the world, she had focused in her fear and pain and become obsessed. Creating a presence herself, the better to beguile her” (*Perdido* 667). In this sense, the conceptual space Lin creates to perform her art in often converges with the conceptual space where she performs her transgressive acts in her social and sexual life. Just as her queering becomes “an avant-garde transgression, an art-happening” (*Perdido* 12), her artistic performance becomes a queering of traditions. In this regard, creative affects born out of queering and subversive artistry often slip into each other and make Lin pass into a becoming. Lin experiences a becoming not in the sense that she transforms from one position to another, but in the sense that she enters a zone of indeterminacy where she no longer complies with Oedipalised norms of identity, molar discriminations and negative differences but reaches the affects and sensations deriving out of being one with life. As Deleuze and Guattari suggest, “[t]he artist is a seer, a becomer” (171). Lin is such an artist who is fascinated with the affirmative power of life and strives to free it from its capture with her artistic, sexual and social endeavours. As Motley describes her, she is “the bastard-

zone” (*Perdido* 115), the orphan unconscious, the schizo. Her hybrid body is orphaned from its Oedipal roots and passes from a site of negative differences into an affirmative multiplicity. Her body is, on the one hand, a sign of traversal sexual activity since she actualises the virtual potential of her hybrid body by discovering her erogenous parts. It is, on the other hand, a sign of her artistry since her artistic creation entirely depends upon her Khepri-spit that is another product of her hybrid nature. Then it is her body, a body of affects, that she uses as a source to draw schizophrenic lines of flight and establish the lost connection with life’s creative energy. In this sense, there is an inevitable relationship between her art, schizophrenic lines of flight and her body, which definitely calls for a revolutionary becoming, an affirmative hybridity and a passing into one another not only within herself but also within the society.

5.2.4. “To Think Aesthetically” as a Way of Affirming the Hybrid

Mieville illustrates the close affinity between schizophrenic lines of flight, art and the social body best with the character of Motley. Motley is originally a Remade whose body has been exposed to the remaking process several times and stripped of its organs as a punishment. After several remakings, his body literally becomes unrecognisable as a heterogeneous collection of many different body parts and functions, which is described in minute detail as follows:

Scraps of skin and fur and feathers swung as he moved; tiny limbs clutched; eyes rolled from obscure niches; antlers and protrusions of bone jutted precariously; feelers twitched and mouths glistened. Many-coloured skeins of skin collided. A cloven hoof thumped gently against the wood floor. Tides of flesh washed against each other in violent currents. Muscles tethered by alien tendons to alien bones worked together in uneasy truce, in slow, tense motion. Scales gleamed. Fins quivered. Wings fluttered brokenly. Insect claws folded and unfolded. (*Perdido* 42)

Apparently, his body is reconstructed to have this abject and monstrous appearance as depicted in the novel. The fragmentariness and diversity of his

remade body is represented as something to be ashamed of and feel contempt about. Quite contrary to the agenda of the State apparatus, however, Motley, whose name even suggests an affirmation of diversity, uses this fragmented and diverse body as a source of power. His body in a sense becomes a possible answer to the question “how do you make yourself a body without organs?” (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 149). In other words, Motley’s body becomes a concretisation of body without organs in the novel.

To clarify this, one can begin by drawing an analogy between the remaking process and the working of late capitalism. As Deleuze and Guattari point out in *Anti-Oedipus*, “[c]apitalism tends toward a threshold of decoding that will destroy the socius in order to make it a body without organs and unleash the flows of desire on this body as a deterritorialised field” (33). In a similar vein, the capitalist social machine in *New Crobuzon* puts the body into a constant process of deterritorialisation followed by reterritorialisation: the body is first deterritorialised from its previous organisms by being torn apart from its organs and made into a “body without organs” of capitalism. The body without organs is, in this sense, a state of full intensities, potentialities and decoded flows. It is the deterritorialised socius, which makes it simultaneously open to both smoothing and striating forces. The capitalist machine pursues its circulation by consummating this open potentiality and the decoded flows by recoding, regulating and channelling them. As such, the Remade as the body without organs of capitalism is turned into the abject and monstrous body that is both used to threaten all the other resistant subjects and used to have it work in line with the needs of the State apparatus. It becomes a “cancerous” body without organs whose creative energy is nullified, whose flows of desire are repressed, and whose diversity is condemned to exclusion and discrimination. No matter how the capitalist social machine locates the body without organs into a stratum, as Deleuze and Guattari say, it is always necessarily “the egg [...] the milieu of pure intensity, spatium not extension, Zero intensity as principle of production [...] the egg [that] always designates this intensive reality, which is not undifferentiated, but is where things and organs are distinguished solely by gradients, migrations,

zones of proximity” (*Thousand Plateaus* 164). Motley is perfectly aware of the potential of his body without organs as an epitome of potentiality and fabricates it for himself without it being cancerous. He recognises his body not as an “error or absence or mutancy” but as an “image and essence [...] totality” (*Perdido* 115). Just as Lin who sees her love-life as an art-happening, Motley sees his body as an artistic creation, a hybrid zone to be cherished, a miracle of transition. Transition or variation is, for him, “what makes the world”, “the fundamental dynamic”, “what makes [him], the city, the world, what they are. That is the theme [he] is interested in” (41). Rather than submitting to the marginalised stratum to which his remade body is destined, thus, he denounces it and draws an alternative line of flight for himself by affirming the hybridity he represents. In this regard, he calls himself “the bastard-zone” (115), which could be considered as the bastard in a very Deleuzian sense that defies the majoritarian imposition of subjectivity. As such, Motley as the bastard-zone no longer works for the interest of the capitalist social machine; on the contrary, he becomes a rival to it. Instead of succumbing to the social and economic position that the State apparatus determines for all the Remades, Motley begins to pursue an illegal business that often runs against and even poses a threat to the interests of the capitalist social machine. Even if his motives as a criminal boss often do not comply with the motives of other transgressive subjects like Isaac and Lin, he still singlehandedly constitutes one of the most powerful images of transgression and resistance, compelling us to see possible alternatives to the capitalist social machine. This is to say that his hybridity, which appears as the product of the constant act of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation adopted by the capitalist social machine, now becomes a reversal of this process, working for itself rather than for the capitalist interests of the city-government.

Among all those alternative subjectivities against the ones imposed by the State apparatus, the most radical one Mieville creates is the figure of the Weaver. Weavers are gigantic spider-like entities that are described as monstrous and grotesque just like the Remades due to their hybrid nature:

The Weaver's bulk was mostly its huge teardrop abdomen that welled up and hung downwards behind it from its neck-waist, a tight, bulbous fruit seven feet long and five wide. [...] The creature's head was the size of a man's chest. It was suspended from the front of the abdomen a third of the way from the top. The fat curve of its body loomed above it like skulking black-clad shoulders. [...] The top as smooth and spare as a human skull in black: multiple eyes a single, deep blood-red. Two main orbs as large as newborns' heads sat in sunken sockets at either side; between them a much smaller third; above it two more; above them three more still. An intricate, precise constellation of glints on dark crimson. An unblinking array. The Weaver's complicated mouthparts unhinged, its inner jaw flexing, something between a mandible and a black ivory trap. Its wet gullet flexed and vibrated deep within. Its legs, thin and bony as human ankles, sprouted from the thin band of segmented flesh that linked its headpiece and abdomen. [...] The legs rebounded from the joints almost straight down ten feet, culminating in a point as featureless and sharp as a stiletto. Like a tarantula, the Weaver picked one leg up at a time, lifting it very high and placing it down with the delicacy of a surgeon or an artist. A slow, sinister and inhuman movement. (*Perdido* 331-332)

This grotesque hybrid appearance makes them rather intimidating figures both for the dominant power structure and for the rest of the society. Yet it is not only their bulky bodies but their revolutionary position that makes them a real threat. They are the opposite of Oedipal subjectivity moulded in the capitalist social machine primarily because they have no particular division of conscious and unconscious and hence, as Robert Wood puts it, have “nothing suppressed in the name of an orderly and regulated consciousness” (78). They have access to unmediated thinking, thinking without any filter and any repressed material. This state of having nothing to suppress resonates with an orphan unconscious where the process of oedipalisation or molarisation can no longer be an issue. As such, they have direct access to the creative energy of life which they call “worldweave” (*Perdido* 334). The Weaver describes his worldweaving as follows:

...WITHOUT YOU ASK THE WEAVE IS TIGHT
RUCKED COLOURS BLEED TEXTURES
WEARING THREADS FRAY WHILE I KEEN
FUNERAL SONGS FOR SOFT POINTS WHERE
WEBSHAPES FLOW I WISH I WILL I CAN COILS
OF MONSTERS SHADE SLATESCAPES WINGS
MOIL SUCK WORLDWEAVE COLOURLESS
DRAB IT IS NOT TO BE I READ RESONANCE
PRANCE FROM POINT TO POINT ON THE WEB
TO EAT SPLENDOUR REAR AND LICK CLEAN
RED KNIFENAILS I WILL SNIP FABRICS AND
RETIE THEM I AM I AM A SUBTLE USER OF
COLOUR I WILL BLEACH YOUR SKIES WITH
YOU I WILL SWEEP THEM CLEAN AND KNOT
THEM TIGHT... (335-336)

The Weaver's description of the worldweaving with the acts of cleaning and knotting strengthens the idea that worldweave suggests an immanence of life. As Deleuze argues, life is immanent in its very nature, full of pure multiplicities and affirmative energies. However, since this affirmative power of life poses a threat to the maintenance of the capitalist social machine, life is continuously captured and imprisoned into molar organisations. The Weaver's worldweaving could then be considered as an attempt to clean all these molar organisations blocking the flows on life and open it to new web of relations. The Weaver is, in this sense, a "seer" and a "becoming" of the affirmative power of life. For the Weaver, this creative force, that is the woven patterns of life, could be unleashed only through art: "For a Weaver, to think was to think aesthetically. To act—to Weave— was to bring about more pleasing patterns" (*Perdido* 335). He sees life aesthetically and subsists on the appreciation of life's creative power. Seeing the slake-moths, the representatives of capitalism, as the biggest threat to this affirmative energy of life, thus, he decides to help Isaac in his fight against the capitalist system. In this collective fight, ironically, the Weaver's art becomes the most powerful element to defeat the slake-moths, which in a sense testifies to the power of the artist in becoming-revolutionary and taking schizo lines of flight not only in an individual aspect but also in socio-political aspects.

5.3. Schizophrenising Language

These subjects in the form of various becomings like the Weaver in the novel apparently reach the limit of late capitalism. This limit is the exterior edge of New Crobuzon society where schizophrenia paralyses the working mechanism of the capitalist machine via its divergences. This is to say that the vicious circle of capitalist deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation falls back into a reversal state. It no longer spins the wheel of the capital but opens out onto alternatives that grow from its very middle, namely from the very conditions of its own operation. In Mieville's fiction, however, it is not only the alternative subjectivities and smooth spaces that grow from the middle of the capitalist social machine. Language also becomes a powerful divergence from this cruel machine as complimentary to the formations of subjectivity and space. As previously discussed in Atwood's fiction, language cannot be considered separate from points of capture and points of escape in the late capitalist world. In its majoritarian form, it can easily function as a means of Oedipal encapsulation and molar impositions. It becomes a language through which arborescent structures formed on the realms of space and subjectivity are firmed. In its minoritarian form, however, it can be turned into an efficient weapon to demolish these firm structures from within. Yet this difference between majoritarian and minoritarian language should not necessarily be conceived as two different languages but as two different uses of language. The former understanding would be misleading in tracing the lines of flight occurring within language in New Crobuzon. To be more precise, it is true that there are different languages in New Crobuzon that could be regarded as the language of the majority, which would in this case be the human language, and the language of the minorities, which would then be the language of other communities like Khepri, Garuda, Vadyonoi and so on. Yet this does not mean that the languages of the minorities would definitely be minoritarian because being a part of majority or minority has never been a distinctive feature of being majoritarian or minoritarian. What makes something majoritarian or minoritarian is more of a potentiality to affirm life by extricating

the molecular from its molar organisations, the schizo from its paranoiac investments. In this regard, even if these languages belong to the communities that could be seen as the minority in New Crobuzon, they prove to be majoritarian in their tendencies. For instance, the Khepri language, despite its being a language of the minority, is an utterly majoritarian language in the sense that it functions as a capturing machine of patriarchy, that is the dominant discourse, representation and signification in Khepri society. Thus, once one is immersed into Khepri language, he is simultaneously captured into the molar structures underneath. This is best recognised by Lin who finds the molarising power of Khepri language rather intimidating and hence fears using it:

Since the age of six, when she had torn the chrysalis from what had been her baby headlarva and was suddenly a headscarab, when she had burst into consciousness with language and thought, her mother had taught her that she was fallen. [...] She remembered her tentative conversations with the other children, who taught her how her neighbours lived; her fear of using the language she knew instinctively, the language she carried in her blood. (*Perdido* 215-216)¹⁹

As such, while language, no matter which community it belongs to, often appears in its majoritarian form with its perfected grammaticality, punctuation, semantics and signification in New Crobuzon, some minoritarian uses also appear as an unconscious political act of resistance. As Daniel W. Smith puts it, there are several ways of minorising a language, which involves “taking any linguistic variable-phonological, syntactical or grammatical, semantic-and placing it in variation, following the virtual line of continuous variation that subtends the entire language, and that is itself apertinent, asyntactic or agrammatical, and asemantic” (“Introduction” 1). In *Perdido Street Station*, accordingly, Mieville strains language to its extreme limits where it begins *to stutter, murmur and even stammer* in a Deleuzian sense. The stuttering of language could be considered to

¹⁹ The same quotation has been used previously to clarify how the female Khepris are repressed and oedipalised. This study has found it necessary to reuse the same quotation in order to underline the function of language in the process of oedipalisation as a means of power.

be its turning inside out. Once language is reverted and reaches its outside, it simultaneously reaches its underlying operations and puts them into play. This is achieved in the novel with a strong sense of musicality, poetics, ungrammaticality and lack of punctuation embraced in the language of Yagharek and the Weaver. To begin with the former, Yagharek who is a crippled Garuda, an irreversible outsider in both his community and in human community adopts a poetic language that is eminently musical, emotional and abstract. His speech is often incomprehensible because he carries language to heart-touching musical tones and often sounds like the voice of a cry. In the words of those listening to him, he “spoke like a poet. His speech was halting, but his language was that of the epics and histories he had read, the curious stilted oration of someone who has learnt a language from old books” (*Perdido* 46) His speech at times tends to be an outpouring of sentences that are so overly-poignant as to put a halt to the operation of the majoritarian language domineering the lives of New Crobuzon people:

*I sleep in old arches under the thundering railtracks.
I eat whatever organic thing I find that will not kill me.
I hide like a parasite in the skin of this old city that
snores and farts and rumbles and scratches and swells
and grows warty and pugnacious with age. [...]
(Perdido 59)*

*I have fostered, the source of my sorrow and my
shame, the anguish that has brought me to this great
wen, this dusty city dreamed up in bone and brick, a
conspiracy of industry and violence, steeped in history
and battened-down power, this badland beyond my
ken. [...] (Perdido 4)*

*I feel the wind force my fingers apart. I am buffeted
invitingly. I feel the twitching as my ragged flanges of
wingbone stretch.
I will not do this any more. I will not be this cripple,
this earthbound bird, any longer.
This half-life ends now, with my hope.
I can so well picture a last flight, a swift, elegant
curving sweep through the air that parts like a lost
lover to welcome me.
Let the wind take me.*

*I lean forward on the wall, out over the tumbling city,
into the air. Time is quite still.
I am poised. There is no sound. The city and the air are
poised. [...]* (*Perdido* 707-708; emphasis in original)

His speech is a kind of poetic speech that Deleuze and Guattari would think “actualises these powers of bifurcation and variation, of heterogenesis and modulation, that are proper to language” (*Essays: Critical and Clinical* 108). It is like poetic leaks from the flow of desire congealed in prose, which is most felt when one takes into account particularly how and when Mieville implants Yagharek’s speeches in the complexity of his novel and to what they contribute. All of his speeches are italicised and woven in-between prosaic parts, which serves two ends in the novel. Firstly, this systematic oscillation between the prose of majoritarian language and Yagharek’s prose poetry offers a gap, a divergence, a move from its hegemony by undermining its power and undoing its dominance over the whole narrative. This oscillation, in a sense, testifies to language’s turning inside out. Each poetic piece that interrupts the prosaic parts becomes the outside of language. Each works up to a rhythm and/or musicality where one can go beyond the pre-existing logic of molar thinking immersed in language, and hence directly addresses the sentiments. Second, Yagharek’s prose poetry often introduces the non-orderly consciousness into the Oedipalised consciousness inscribed in majoritarian language. In other words, it becomes the outside of orderly consciousness in the sense that it moves the narrative lens from how the capitalist social machine works to create a submissive consciousness, a non-threatening insider to how the consciousness of an outsider, of a schizo operates. With this two-fold effect in mind, it could be argued that Yagharek’s prose poetry engages in a minoritarian inclination, constituting a new rhythm of thinking, a stuttering that deterritorialises language in order to mobilise, stretch, take a flight and even dance.

In *Perdido Street Station*, Yagharek’s speeches are not the only example for the stuttering of language through poetry. With the character of the Weaver, linguistic deterritorialisation reaches its extreme point in the novel. Among all the revolutionary attempts to dig holes in language from within, it could be argued

that the Weaver's is the most purely minoritarian one because his language embodies several linguistic anomalies that exceed the constraints of majoritarian language. First of all, his speech is represented in capital letters without any punctuation and intonation, where no phrase or sentence is properly finalised but is instantly followed by another word, phrase or sentence and no particular conjunction or punctuation is used to distinguish them as in: "FIVE DIGITS OF A HAND TO INTERFERE TO STRIP WORLDFABRIC FROM THE BOBBINS OF THE CITY-KIND FIVE AIR-TEARING INSECTS FOUR FINELY FORMED NOBLE BERINGED WITH SHIMMERING DECORATION ONE SQUAT THUMB THE RUNT THE RUINED EMPOWERING ITS IMPERIOUS SIBLING FINGERS FIVE A HAND" (*Perdido* 333). The capitalisation of his speech could be regarded as a way of an outpouring of the Weaver's thoughts and feelings without any filtering, and an indication of his sonorous rebellion. As previously discussed, he is a character that represents a schizo mind where the taken-for-granted boundaries of the conscious and the unconscious are blurred. This means that the way the Weaver thinks is the same with the way he speaks, there is no mechanism of filtering between the two. At this point, the abandonment of punctuation and intonation contributes even more to the idea that all of his speeches are indeed an unmediated stream of his consciousness. This makes his language reach an asyntactic and even agrammatical dimension. His words spill out of his mouth in the form of babbling without filtering of any sort, which makes them almost incomprehensible for those adopting a proper language in its proper linguistic order. They are utterly spontaneous, repetitious, improvised and anomalous. There are even times when they come close to sounding like a voice of body or bodily sensations, a cry or an echo:

The echoes of the scissors came back. As they returned and crept up from below the threshold of hearing, they metamorphosed, becoming words, a voice, melodious and melancholy, that first whispered and then grew more bold, spinning itself into existence out of the scissor-echoes. It was not quite describable, heartbreaking and frightening, it tugged the listener close; and it sounded not in the ears but deeper inside, in the blood and bone, in the nerve-clusters...

FLESHSCAPE INTO THE FOLDING INTO THE
FLESHSCAPE TO SPEAK A GREETING IN THIS
THE SCISSORED REALM I WILL RECEIVE AND
BE RECEIVED. (*Perdido* 330)

Such an effect is achieved mostly through grouping words or phrases that sound alike. His speech is thus often perceived as an unbearable, inarticulate and squeaky murmur by humans, even by the most revolutionary ones like Isaac and his crew, as in: “AND I AND I WILL BE BY BY-AND-BY...” (*Perdido* 336). The effect of the Weaver’s language is even more intensified through the movements and vibrations of his body that is found to be equally bulky, grotesque and squeaky by other characters. His language stutters, trembles and totters just as his body does. Much as it is perceived to be cacophonous and grotesque by many in the novel, the Weaver’s stuttering is actually a minoritarian language that is carved out from within majoritarian language. This new language not only undermines the power of the dominant language that stands for the dominant power and slows down its pace throughout the novel, but also overreaches the boundaries of Oedipalised consciousness and becomes the language of the schizo. It is a language of a schizophrenic subject living at the very limits of the capitalist social machine. The Weaver’s schizo mind is, as previously discussed, “in a continuous, incomprehensible, rolling stream of awareness” (*Perdido* 630) where there are no Oedipal filters, repressed layers or “no ego to control the lower functions, no animal cortex to keep [it] grounded”, “no hidden messages from [its] secret corners [...]”, no mental clearout of accrued garbage bespeaking an orderly consciousness (30). It is a purely orphaned, non-orderly consciousness. Hence what comes out of such a consciousness is accordingly an unrepressed flow of revolutionary desire. It is this overflow of desire that intoxicates the Weaver on his own juice, turns him into a schizo, stammers his language and makes him bubble not speak: “And all the while it fought, the Weaver sang its ceaseless monologue. . . . OH HOW IT DOES HOW IT BRINGS ME TO THE BOIL I BUBBLE AND EFFERVESCE I AM DRUNK INTOXICATED ON THE JUICE OF ME THAT THESE MAD-WINGERS FERMENT . . . it sang” (*Perdido* 558). In this sense, only such a language coming out of such a mind can become “the

boom and the crash” in a Deleuzian sense in the face of the grim system that paralyzes its subjects in *New Crobuzon* (*Essays: Critical and Clinical* 113).

Both Yagharek’s and the Weaver’s language reminds one of the way in which modernist and experimental writers such as James Joyce, Beckett and e. e. cummings use and abuse majoritarian language. Deleuze and Guattari often make reference to these modernist writers to illustrate the ways in which language can be stuttered and minorised, particularly in their books *Kafka: Towards a Minor Literature* and *Essays: Critical and Clinical*. These writers’ use of language intentionally deviates from the conventional standards and units of language with several techniques inherent in their writing style like the constant use of lower case letters, unmeaning, agrammaticality, run-on lines, fragmentation, wordplays and so on. All these divergences and inversions, for Deleuze and Guattari, presuppose pure intensities, multiplicities and variables at the very limit of language. In other words, although the stuttering of language by these writers might seem as a kind of defect created in language at first glance, it is, on the contrary, a significant way of expressing their resistance to majoritarian language as a means of dominant power and enriching it from within. The same goes for Yagharek and the Weaver in the novel. Yagharek’s and the Weaver’s language is apparently a systematic deviation from the standards of majoritarian language in *New Crobuzon*. Majoritarian language that is structured upon an arborescent and singularistic thinking system via its grammar, syntax and other internal organisation is now introduced into a new multiplicity. In a sense, language becomes hybrid, a playful mixture, an experiment just like the space of *New Crobuzon* and the nature of its hybrid subjects.

Yet it is not these linguistic deterritorialisations that singlehandedly reinstate language its affirmative power, multiplicity and polyphony. The use of free indirect discourse also contributes to the creation of such a linguistic polyphony. In one instance, for example, Isaac’s insight into his subversive relationship with Lin is presented in free indirect discourse:

And yes, Isaac could play that game. He was known in that world, from long before his days with Lin. He was, after all, the scientist-outcast, the disreputable

thinker who walked out of a lucrative teaching post to engage in experiments too outrageous and brilliant for the tiny minds who ran the university. What did he care for convention? He would sleep with whomever and whatever he liked, surely! (*Perdido* 12)

Using an impersonal voice instead of Isaac's own voice here echoes a collective voice of the community that is equally displeased with the restrictive and prohibitory conventions. In other words, it becomes the voice of a people-to-come in the dystopian city of New Crobuzon. In another instance, likewise, the questions concerning Yagharek's crime and punishment are posed in free indirect discourse, where the voice of Yagharek mingles with the voice of his victim, Isaac and some unknown narrator:

The act itself, of course, though that was a vague and nebulous brutality in his mind (did he beat her? Hold her down? Where was she? Did she curse and fight back?). What he saw most clearly, immediately, were all the vistas, the avenues of choice that Yagharek had stolen. Fleeting, Isaac glimpsed the denied possibilities.

The choice not to have sex, not to be hurt. The choice not to risk pregnancy. And then . . . what if she had become pregnant? The choice not to abort? The choice not to have a child?

The choice to look at Yagharek with respect? (*Perdido* 693-694)

If he took Kar'uchai at her word, he could not judge the punishment. He could not decide whether he respected garuda justice or not: he had no grounds at all, he knew nothing of the circumstances. So it was natural, surely, it was inevitable and healthy, that he should fall back on what he knew: his scepticism; the fact that Yagharek was his friend. Would he leave his friend flightless because he gave alien laws the benefit of the doubt? (*Perdido* 697)

The transitions between Yagharek's voice and other voices are so smooth that it is hard to distinguish who exactly posed the questions. This co-mingling of voices becomes even more important when Yagharek's crime and punishment are taken

into consideration. Yagharek commits the crime of stealing the choice of a female of his own species, and, as a punishment for his choice-theft, he is dispossessed of his wings and of his name and expelled from his own community. Driven into an exile, he has never been given any chance to reconcile with himself, his victim or his community. The use of free indirect discourse, at this point, helps posing such critical questions that should have been asked long before, shedding light upon Yagharek's inner feelings about his crime, Isaac's insights into Yagharek's position as an offender and his victim's position, his victim's own feelings and experiences and finally the collective common sense. In doing so, free indirect discourse displaces the dominant discourse that seems to be exclusivist and unvoicing, and becomes inclusive of even the most marginalised, victimised and ostracised. It allows for voicing different subjective experiences simultaneously without excluding or privileging one over the other since it is composed of enunciations that are indifferent to who is saying and to any hierarchical positioning.

A considerable part of the novel consists of such enunciations that are basically dependent upon other enunciations, namely enunciations that are a mixture of narration and interior monologue. The use of free indirect discourse in the novel is quite telling. As language grows from its very middle with more and more linguistic undoings, newly created dialects or minoritarian languages, it becomes more and more open to free indirect discourse as in *Perdido Street Station*. This is primarily because free indirect discourse, as Deleuze puts it, "testifies to a system which is always heterogeneous, far from equilibrium. [It] is not amenable to linguistic categories, because these are only concerned with homogeneous or homogenised systems" (*Cinema I* 73). If language is something that is never entirely complete, fixed and homogenous just like subjectivities, the very nature of language is then free indirect discourse since it never straightforwardly gives insight into the mind and perception of the subject but at the same time it is never entirely detached from the character, either. This means that it is always being more than one, namely being an assemblage. As such, Mieville's novel is all about being more than a singularity, being more of a hybrid

or of a multiplicity in terms of space, subjectivity and language. This is why, the use of free indirect discourse becomes a very powerful stylistic embodiment and representation of the major arguments going on throughout the novel.

Mieville's novel, to conclude, suggests a political agenda through the notion of transgression in favour of multiplicity. The notion of transgression functions as a multifaceted feature that is reflected on the level of the novel's style, structure and organisation of space, subjectivity and language. The novel in this sense transgresses all the generic, stylistic, spatial, subjective and even linguistic boundaries, and reaches a point of multiplicity. This point is often metaphorised in the novel as a "hybrid zone" that is depicted in two different ways. In its first treatment, hybridity appears as a bundle of negative differences, molar organisations and fascistic polarisations. In its second treatment, however, it appears as an affirmative multiplicity that comes along with a transformative power. What is most remarkable about the portrayal of these two treatments is that they actually shed light upon how late capitalism operates and how its operations can be interrupted. In a sense, Mieville could be argued to suggest that capitalism is indeed a hybrid zone. It is a hybrid zone in the sense that it works upon its diversity by continually reducing it to a system of differences. Yet at the same time it is highly prone to transgression and destruction from within due to this diversity and can easily be turned into a site of resistance and positive transformation. From this standpoint, Mieville's novel takes a revolutionary path in not only disclosing the here-and-now dystopian aspect of the contemporary world but also in discovering the ways to draw lines of flight from its inside.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The primary and highest aim of literature is, for Deleuze, “[t]o leave, to escape [...] to trace a line [...] to cross the horizon, enter into another life.[...] The line of flight is deterritorialisation” (*Dialogues* 36). The act of deterritorialisation is not merely a defining feature of literature but also a principal characteristic that typifies the movement of the contemporary world. Literature, particularly dystopian literature, makes use of deterritorialisation in creating ruptures and divergences from the dominant power structures while the contemporary world under the reign of late capitalism makes use of it to ensure the circulation of capital. Although the act of deterritorialisation does not serve the same end in these two instances, this interesting intersection between dystopian literature and the contemporary world has been a major source of inspiration for the pursuit of this study.

In this regard, this dissertation has attempted to suggest a new conception of contemporary dystopia and to draw upon a Deleuzian approach in analysing Margaret Atwood’s *MaddAddam* trilogy and China Mieville’s *Perdido Street Station* in conjunction with this new conception. This new conception is primarily based on the notion of “dysterritory”, which corresponds to the very nature of contemporary societies as double-edged: both as a dystopian territory where late capitalism rhizomatically and immanently expands itself through its continuous acts of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation, and as a disterritory where this continuous act of deterritorialisation falls back on itself, is turned into an act of resistance and hence helps to create lines of flight from this immanent machine. Relating the emergence of dysterritory to the transition of societies from the disciplinary to the control mode, this dissertation has argued that such a transition

could be signalling a new moment in the history of dystopia. It has continued its argument by designating this new moment as that in which contemporary dystopia comes closer to the plane of immanence and begins to display new tendencies distinguishing it from earlier examples. This dissertation has termed this important moment of newly-arising tendencies in the concept of dystopia, as “immanent dystopia”. It has defined immanent dystopia as a kind of dystopia that tends to re-present the here-and-now societies as a dysterritory, due to both its here-and-now dystopian reality and its deterritorialising potentiality. It has also underlined that immanent dystopia distinguishes itself from transcendent dystopian examples in terms of its process-orientation and emphasis on the present. In doing so, this dissertation has also acknowledged the potential problems that may be involved in making such a novel definition and in carrying out a Deleuzian reading of the works in the light of this new definition. Both Atwood’s and Mieville’s texts, however, have provided remarkably rich materials to reduce these potential problems to a minimum.

The analyses have shown that both Atwood and Mieville strongly embrace the role of the dystopian writer as a cultural clinician, depicting the dystopian reality not for criticism’s sake but for the sake of creating an affirmative transformation in today’s societies. Both the pre-apocalyptic world of the *MaddAddam* trilogy and New Crobuzon in *Perdido Street Station* become the portrayal of present societies under the yoke of late capitalism, which works through its Oedipalising, molarising and striating forces. Both provide a close insight into how the capitalist social machine operates as illustrated through the workings of the multinational pharmaceutical corporations in Atwood’s work and the function of the slake-moths and the city government in Mieville’s novel. Despite the similarities in the overall structure of the societies portrayed in the novels, it has been observed that Mieville’s work differs from Atwood’s particularly in three aspects. Firstly, unlike Atwood who tends to stick to typical conventions of dystopia, Mieville introduces an allegorical presence in his dystopian work. This allegorical presence is most strongly felt in the process of remaking as an allegory of hybridity inherent in the nature of New Crobuzon

society, in the function of the slake-moths as an allegory of the capitalist system's usurpation of people's minds, and in the characterisation of Motley as an allegory of the body without organs of the socius in the capitalist social machine. It would be too assertive a claim to say that such an allegorical presence is a deliberate employment of Mieville. Yet it can be argued that it is an outcome of the intersection between Mieville's social and political criticism and his inclination towards genres like fantasy and weird-fiction. His social and political criticism goes one step further than simply portraying the dystopian aspects of the capitalist system and lays bare its inner working mechanisms in a more concrete way. His engagement with the fantastic and the weird allows him to stretch the boundaries of dystopia and create characters and situations that lend an allegorical dimension to dystopia. Secondly, unlike the *MaddAddam* trilogy picturing a society of control in full terms, Mieville's work depicts a society that is in transition from the disciplinary mode to the control mode. This necessarily culminates in the employment of different means of control and resistance. But, more importantly, this difference helps us to expand on the nature of this transition. Regarding the differences in the portrayal of the societies of control in Atwood and Mieville, in this sense, this dissertation has shown two important points that are underemphasised in Deleuze's and Guattari's work. Firstly, such a transition is closely connected to a series of several other passages, the most important of which is the passage to the latest configuration of capitalism. This transition happens based upon the way and the speed in which a society yields to late capitalism, and it cannot be asserted that each and every society's passage is of the same degree, of the same pace and of the same style. Accordingly, the difference between Atwood's and Mieville's texts can become a testimony to the idea that this passage has occurred at different paces in North America and Western Europe – a topic which could be explored for further comparative studies. More importantly, even if the passage to a society of control is complete, it does not necessarily suggest that the disciplinary logic entirely disappears; on the contrary, it transforms into a different logic that could more effectively comply with late capitalism. That is why it is not surprising to observe glimpses of disciplinary

institutions in the dystopian worlds created by both Atwood and Mieville. A third important difference between Atwood's and Mieville's works is that *Perdido Street Station* does not give rise to any ethical questions such as those appearing through the *MaddAddam* trilogy. In the dystopian world of the *MaddAddam* trilogy, Atwood presents the creation of the Crakers as an alternative species to human beings. The Crakers are stripped of all the problematic tendencies of human beings. Although the creation of the Crakers is not the only way of resistance presented in the novel, and is highly affirmative in its motivation, it is still actualised at the cost of the annihilation of the human race. This inevitably generates some ethical questions and makes some readers question Atwood's attitude towards immanence as a dystopian writer. This dissertation does not find Atwood's position problematic in the sense that the end of the trilogy is quite affirmative in reconciling human beings with their alternatives and in instilling hope in the idea of abandoning microfascistic and transcendent tendencies. But still the questions Atwood's work gives rise to are valuable to underline the necessity of interrogating the reasons why it is not Mieville but Atwood that appears more ambivalent in her attitude towards immanence. One way of explaining this may be the fact that Atwood is of an older generation, which could place her closer to the idea of transcendence. Such a claim, however, requires a lot of support and evidence to become convincing, and this could be the subject of yet another study on Deleuze and literature.

While the re-presentation of the current societies of control in Atwood's and Mieville's works constitutes the dystopian pole of dysterritory despite the differences stated above, the transformation they have envisioned constitutes the other pole of dysterritory, that is, disterritory. The creation of disterritory, as previously discussed, lies in the revolutionary act of deterritorialisation. The detailed analyses of the texts have shown that both authors take the act of deterritorialisation to its extreme to wipe out all the stratas that repress desire and bind it to capitalist productions. For Deleuze, the leading stratas that confine desire most and create arborescent structures are spatial organisations and subjectivisations. Therefore, Atwood and Mieville particularly test out the

formation of smooth spaces in lieu of striated spaces and asubjectivities in lieu of Oedipalised organisms in their novels. They shed light upon how striations on space are created by the capitalist social machine in the first place and how new configurations of space can be created through smoothing these striations. In the *MaddAddam* trilogy, such smoothing forces are generated not merely by those located at the margins of the society such as the Gardeners but also by those occupying the very centre like the resistant scientists including Crake. In *Perdido Street Station*, in a similar vein, smoothing forces are initiated by a collective action that equally embraces both the most privileged and the underprivileged in the society as in the fight against the slake-moths. This similarity is remarkably significant in telling us that there is always a potential for resistance inherent even in the most striated spaces, which could be uncovered through a collective action. This is because of the constant interplay between smoothing and striating forces in the societies of control. These forces exist in a mixed form. This is tantamount to saying that all the striated spaces are prone to deterritorialisation from within due to their mixed positions just as all the smooth spaces run the risk of being stratified again.

Drawing upon the analyses of the texts at hand, this dissertation has also demonstrated that the societies of control defined by their rhizomatic, complex and hybrid nature are more open to the flourishing of such smoothing forces. These forces can be generated more easily in the societies of control from within because such societies as the pre-apocalyptic world of *MaddAddam* and the hybrid society of New Crobuzon reside on the plane of immanence; they are relatively more flexible and less confining in appearance, and their means of control is more likely to be used against themselves. This applies to the field of subjectification as well. As suggested by Deleuze's notion of "the coils of a serpent" ("Postscript" 7), the field of subjectification in the societies of control is elastic and hence can be stretched for the emergence of new configurations. Thus, it is not surprising to see how effectively Atwood and Mieville expose the rigid forms of subjectivity to the act of deterritorialisation. They place their characters in a kind of delirium where subjectivity begins to take flight from all the pre-existing norms and models, and

moves towards a becoming or a nomadic trajectory. The alternative subjectivities put forward as a consequence of deterritorialising activity are often beyond the Oedipal form, getting rid of all the reductive codes that bind them to the prison of the organism, and discovering the deterritorialised flows of desire. Once the subjects break free from the Oedipal yoke, they move towards a becoming in which they overcome themselves by overturning the rigid stratifications structured upon their subjectivity. This process has often been observed in the novels as becoming-other-than-the self or becoming-minoritarian, both of which suggest a transformation into an entity that is capable of carving out a space and affect to be in a more affirmative relationship with itself, with the world and with other entities. However, this dissertation has also shown that such a transition to a form of becoming could not necessarily be permanent or absolute. On the contrary, as Deleuze and Guattari continually underline, the act of deterritorialisation which carries the subjects from the molar and Oedipal modes to a nomadic movement or becoming always runs the risk of further reterritorialisations in different forms. This is why, it is only a few who could actually achieve absolute deterritorialisation such as the Crakers, Jimmy and Toby in the *MaddAddam* trilogy and Lin and the Weaver in *Perdido Street Station*.

Be it relative or absolute deterritorialisation that takes place in these texts, however, it is obvious that the principal drive behind these acts is to affirm life by rescuing it from its congestions. This drive positions both Atwood and Mieville as a part of a larger political agenda, which can be called the micropolitics of dystopia. They constitute a struggle against the majoritarian power and its practices. This struggle lies in their revolutionary potential to create not only lines of flight from and within the dominant power but also new alternatives and novel conceptions. As Deleuze often highlights in *What is Philosophy?*, there are three major disciplines through which the active micropolitics of resistance and affirmative creation could come into being. These are art, science and philosophy. In the *MaddAddam* trilogy and *Perdido Street Station*, as depicted in the analyses, art and science become the major means through which an active micropolitics of resistance is formed against the capitalist social machine. They depict how science

and art could frame a revolutionary deviation from the majoritarian forms by becoming a nomad science as in the case of Crake and Isaac and becoming a minor art as in the case of Lin and Motley. What is more interesting is that the transgressive politics drawn in science and art merge with philosophy in their constitution of new conceptions. This explains why Crake's Paradise project has an underlying philosophical aspect, that is, a struggle not only against the capitalist practices of multinational corporations but also against the microfascistic tendency inherent in human beings. Such a philosophical depth culminates in the creation of a new conception of man as an entity deprived of all his transcendental ties, which is put into practice through the Crakers. In the same way, Isaac's nomad science generates from a revolt against science relying upon a binaristic thinking system and represents the conception of transgression in its endeavour to converge multiple fields and lines. In artistic activities, accordingly, a similar philosophical attitude is embraced both by Lin and by Motley. They employ art as an act of resistance, a line of flight from the domineering power structures. In this regard, the micropolitics drawn by Atwood and Mieville become a testimony to the fact that contemporary dystopian texts could become "a resistance to the present", an enterprise of "acting counter to the past, and therefore on the present, for the benefit, let us hope, of a future— but the future [...] [as] the infinite Now, the nun" (Deleuze and Guattari *What is Philosophy?* 112).

This creative enterprise illustrated by Atwood and Mieville suggests that these dystopian texts could be seen as examples of minoritarian writing or minor literature, which Deleuze and Guattari define through its political aspect, collective dimension and deterritorialisation of language. The micropolitics explicitly drawn by these writers becomes a manifestation of their underlying political agenda. Both dystopian texts are obviously bound up with wider concerns rather than with individual problems, which is to turn inside out the operations of the capitalist social machine as a political form and dispense with its arborescent systems based on binary sets. This necessarily gives these texts a collective dimension because there are only collective assemblages of enunciation

that replace the subjects of any value. This is not to say that these texts do not have any narrators or characters. It rather suggests that the voice of the narrators and characters are there not to be in the forefront but to open these texts to a larger context where each and every individual voice indeed designates a collective utterance. This collective utterance is the voice of what Deleuze calls a people-to-come. As shown in the analyses, both Atwood and Mieville engage in an effort to fashion the people that are missing in the majoritarian discourse. Therefore, the people-to-come depicted in these dystopian texts represent not the majority but the people that enter into becoming-revolutionary against what is majoritarian. The people-to-come of these dystopian narratives are then a minor people that discover and revitalise the very forces inherent in the present to create new possibilities for life. They are, in this sense, internal war machines of the dystopian present. They bore holes from within to distribute a new domain that would tolerate any divergences and multiplicities. This political and collective enterprise Atwood and Mieville introduce in their dystopian texts is also intricately reflected in their narrative styles and linguistic inquiries as a sign of their minoritarian writing. Both writers experiment with the impact of deterritorialisation in language without following a particular path other than letting language take flight and stutter. The stuttering of language is achieved in the *MaddAddam* trilogy by removing it from its representative, transcendent pole and introducing it into the world of signifiers that are purged of binarism. In *Perdido Street Station*, however, the same impact is created through linguistic anomalies such as ungrammaticalities, silences and asyntactic divergences. Even though these texts differ in terms of their strategies to deterritorialise the majoritarian language, they unite in their success in forming a minoritarian language within it. Unlike the majoritarian language that allows only for the voice of the powerful, the minoritarian language they formulate could articulate the impersonal forces and potentialities of life unleashed through revolutionary means. This is best illustrated in the intense use of free indirect discourse in both texts, which Deleuze sees as the real form of language that could enunciate the impersonalities, intensities and haecceities of life. In this way, in a sense, language turns back to

its natural state just like life itself that turns back to its unorganised, chaotic yet productive form.

The political dimension and the deterritorialising activity indicate that Atwood and Mieville become clinicians of civilisation and practitioners of minoritarian writing. They also demonstrate how their works become an enterprise of health since they manifest in themselves not merely the here-and-now dystopian reality but also a virtual potentiality for transformation. These works as contemporary dystopian texts, therefore, employ a double process of deterritorialisation: the deterritorialisation of space, subjectivity and language as a way of affirming life. They also employ the deterritorialisation of the concept of dystopia as a way of moving it to the plane of immanence. They dismantle the traditional understanding of dystopia by changing its content and form from the worst future scenarios to the here-and-now contemporary reality and from the grim pessimism to an affirmative hope. It cannot be said that this is the real agenda behind these works envisioned by Atwood and Mieville, but nonetheless it cannot be denied that these works are clearly reformation of traditional forms of dystopia. These aspects necessarily make them a successful articulation of immanent dystopia, as this dissertation has argued.

The primary concern of this study has been to develop a new conception of dystopia from a Deleuzian perspective and depict the manifestation of this new conception in contemporary works such as Atwood's trilogy and Mieville's novel. In doing so, however, it has confronted several important points and questions which require detailed exploration but which this dissertation could not focus on due to the limitations of time and space. To begin with, this dissertation has briefly touched upon the differences and similarities between Atwood and Mieville as dystopian writers. Yet a comparative study could elaborate on the ways in which Atwood and Mieville differ from each other and delve into the reasons for these differences. Likewise, further studies could be carried out to specifically investigate the nuances and complexities of the emergence of immanent dystopia in different literary environments or different geographical coordinates. This dissertation has offered a new theoretical framework by looking

at dystopia from a Deleuzian lens. More precisely, it has introduced a possible Deleuzian insight into utopian studies and created a possible Deleuzian conception of dystopia as an alternative to existing ones. Since this has been primarily a Deleuzian revisiting of dystopia, it has adopted an affirmative thought about the possibilities of resistance and revolution by drawing upon contemporary works. It has been observed that contemporary dystopia tends to display a more hopeful impulse in articulating ways of resistance to and within the dystopian reality. Yet this dissertation has acknowledged that this increasingly-hopeful impulse, which is interpreted as a tendency towards immanence in this study, does not necessarily characterise each and every dystopian work created in the contemporary era. There is always a possibility of falling back on transcendence, or more specifically, there is always a possibility of what Deleuze and Guattari call further reterritoralisations. In this regard, new studies can elaborate on this possibility of transcendence in contemporary dystopia and interrogate its possible reasons. In doing so, what is essential is to closely trace the possibility of transcendence in the historical trajectory of dystopia as this dissertation has done and to observe whether it is simply a random tendency to fall into the trap of transcendence, or whether it could be interpreted in line with a new theoretical articulation of the contemporary world and contemporary literature. In putting forward the latter option alongside the former one, this dissertation wishes to draw attention to post-postmodernist theories and liminality studies which gained popularity particularly in the last decade. These studies usually conceptualise the existence of a small degree of transcendence which, they argue, is inseparable from the immanence of life. Yet this small degree of transcendence does not necessarily kill or lessen the immanence of life; it is still possible to affirm life despite the possibility of its capture in transcendence. Some of these theories even go so far as to suggest that a certain degree of transcendence can sometimes function affirmatively. This raises new questions as to how these theories relate to Deleuzian philosophy, which highlights that there is always a possibility of the restoration of transcendence (*What is Philosophy?* 100) and of further reterritoralisations (*Thousand Plateaus* 54) but still “[t]here is no need to fear or

hope, but only to look for new weapons” (“Postscript” 4). In this regard, further studies can shed light upon the confrontation between these post-postmodernist approaches and Deleuzian philosophy and examine their reflection in contemporary literature in general and dystopian fiction in particular.



REFERENCES

- Aldea, Eva. *Magic Realism and Deleuze*. London and New York: Continuum, 2011.
- Ardoin, Paul, S. E. Gontarski and Laci Mattison. *Understanding Deleuze, Understanding Modernism*. London and New York: Bloombury Publishing, 2014.
- Atwood, Margaret. "Notes on Power Politics." *Acta Victoriana* 97. 2 (1973).
- . *The Handmaid's Tale (1985)*. London: Vintage Books, 1996.
- . "Introduction: Into the Labyrinth." *Negotiating with the Dead: A Writer on Writing*. New York: Anchor Books, 2002. xiii-xxv. Print.
- . *Oryx and Crake (2003)*. London: Virago, 2013. Print.
- . *The Year of the Flood (2009)*. London: Virago, 2013. Print.
- . *MaddAddam (2013)*. London: Virago, 2014. Print.
- . "Burning Bushes: Why Heaven and Hell Went to Planet X." *In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination (2011)*. London: Virago, 2014. 15-38. Print.
- . "Dire Cartographies: The Roads to Ustopia." *In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination (2011)*. London: Virago, 2014. pp.38-66. Print.
- . "George Orwell: Some Personal Connections." *In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination (2011)*. London: Virago, 2014. 141-150. Print.

- Bally, Charles. "Le style indirect libre en français. moderne." *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 4 (1912): 549-556.
- Banfield, Ann. *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982. Print.
- Barreca, Regina. "Metaphor-into-narrative: Being Very Careful with Words," *Women's Studies* 15 (1988): 243-256.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser. Michigan: U of Michigan P, 1994. Print.
- Bignall, Simone and Paul Patton. *Deleuze and the Postcolonial*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2010. Print.
- Bogue, Ronald. *Deleuze on Literature*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- . "Deleuze and Guattari and the Future of Politics: Science Fiction, Protocols and the People to Come." *Deleuze Studies* 5 (2011): 77-97.
- Booker, Keith. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature*. Westport: Greenwood, 1994. Print.
- . *Dystopian Literature: a Theory and Research Guide*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994. Print.
- Bosco, Mark. "The Apocalyptic Imagination in *Oryx and Crake*." *Margaret Atwood: The Robber Bride, The Blind Assassin, Oryx and Crake*. Ed. J. Brooks Bouson. New York: Continuum, 2010. 156-172. Print.
- Boson, J. Brooks. *Brutal Choreographies: Oppositional Strategies and Narrative Design in the Novels of Margaret Atwood*. Amherst, MA: U of Massachusetts P, 1993. Print.
- Bould, Mark. "Mind the Gap: The Impertinent Predicates (and Subjects) of King Rat and Looking for Jake and Other Stories." *Extrapolation*. Ed. Javier A.

Martínez, Andrew M. Butler, Michael Levy, Sherryl Vint, Lisa Yaszek and Patricia Melzer. Texas: Morgan Printing, 2009. 307-326.

Boundas, Constantin V. *Deleuze and Philosophy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2006. Print.

Brecht, Bertolt. "A Short Organum for the Theatre." *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*. Ed. and Trans. John Willett. New York: Hill and Wang, 1964. 179-205.

Buchanan, Ian and John Marks. *Deleuze and Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000. Print.

Buchanan, Ian and Claire Colebrook. *Deleuze and Feminist Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000. Print.

Buchanan, Ian and Gregg Lambert. *Deleuze and Space*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2005. Print.

Buchanan, Ian, Tim Matts & Aidan Tynan. Introduction: Towards a Schizoanalytic Criticism. *Deleuze and The Schizoanalysis of Literature*. Ed. Ian Buchanan, Tim Matts and Aidan Tynan. New York and London: Bloomsbury, 2015. 1-25. Print.

Burns, Lora and Birgit M. Kaiser. *Postcolonial Literatures and Deleuze*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Case, Eleanor and Maggie McDonald. "Life After Man": Interview with Margaret Atwood. *New Scientist* (2003): 40-43.

Claeys, Gregory. "The Origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Claeys. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. 107-135.

———. "Three Variants on the Concept of Dystopia." *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, On Screen, On Stage*. Ed. Fatima Vieira. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholarship Publishing, 2013. 14-19.

———. *Dystopia: A Natural History*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. Print.

Cohn, Dorrit. “Narrated Monologue: Definition of a Fictional Style.” *Comparative Literature* 18.2 (1996): 97-112.

Colebrook, Claire. *Understanding Deleuze*. Ed. Rachel Fensham and Terry Threadgold. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin, 2002. Print.

Collins, Suzanne. *Hunger Games*. New York : Scholastic Press, 2008.

Colman, Felicity J. “Affect.” *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revisited Edition*. Ed. Adrian Parr. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2005.

Davis, Laurence. “Dystopia, Utopia and Sancho Panza.” *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, On Screen, On Stage*. Ed. Fatima Vieira. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholarship Publishing, 2013. 23-29.

DeFalco, Amelia. *Imagining Care: Responsibility, Dependency, and Canadian Literature*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2016.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Masochism: An Interpretation of Coldness and Cruelty (1971)*. New York: Zone Books, 1991. Print.

———. *The Logic of Sense (1969)*. Ed. Constantin V. Boundas. Trans. Mark Lester and Charles Stivale. New York: Columbia UP, 1993. Print.

———. *Difference and Repetition (1968)*. Trans. Paul Patton. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. Print.

———. *Cinema 1: Movement-Image (1986)*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P., 1997. Print.

———. “Postscript on the Societies of Control”. *October* 59 (1992): 3-7.

———. *Essays: Critical and Clinical (1993)*. Trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997. Print.

———. *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life (1995)*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002. Print.

———. *Nietzsche and Philosophy (1962)*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson. New York: Columbia UP, 2006. Print.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature (1975)*. Trans. Dana Polan. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P., 2003. Print.

———. *Kafka: Minör Bir Edebiyat İçin (1975)*. Trans. Özgür Uçkan & Işık Ergüden. İstanbul: YKY, 2008. Print.

———. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (1972)*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1983. Print.

———. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (1980)*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987. Print.

———. *What Is Philosophy? (1991)*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, New York: Columbia UP, 1994. Print.

———. *Felsefe Nedir?* Trans. Turhan Ilgaz. İstanbul: YKY, 1991. Print.

Deleuze, Gilles and Claire Parnet. *Dialogues II: Revisited Edition*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Columbia UP, 2007. Print.

Demerjian, Louisa M. "Introduction." *The Age of Dystopia: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*. New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016.

Dowd, Garin. "Paris and its Doubles: Deleuze/Rivette." *Deleuze Studies* 3.2 (2009): 185-206.

- Freedman, Carl. "Speculative fiction and international law: The Marxism of China Miéville." *Socialism and Democracy* 20.3 (2010): 25-39.
- . "To the Perdido Street Station: The Representation of Revolution in China Mieville's *Iron Council*." *Extrapolation* 46. 2 (2005): 235-250.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess 1887–1904*. Ed. and Trans. J. Masson, London & Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1985.
- . "Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality (1905)." *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 7. London: Hogarth, 1953.
- . "The Infantile Genital Organisation: An Interpolation into the Theory of Sexuality (1923)." *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol.19. Ed. and Trans. James Scrahey. London: Hogarth, 2001.
- Jameson, Fredrick. "Then You Are Them". *London Reviews of Books* 31.17 (2009): 7-8.
- Joseph, Terra Walston. "Victims of Global Capitalism in Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Imaginary." *The Age of Dystopia: Our Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*. Ed. Louisa MacKay Demerjian, 2016. 35-47.
- Garforth, Lisa. "No Intentions: Utopian Theory After the Future." *Journal for Cultural Research* 13.1 (2009): 5-27.
- Gerber, Richard. *Utopian Fantasy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1973.
- Griffin, Micheal J. and Tom Moylan. "Introduction: Exploring Utopia." *Exploring the Utopian Impulse: Essays on Utopian Thought and Practice*. Bern, Peter Lang, 2007. 11-19.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. "Time out of Joint." *Time and History in Deleuze and Serres*. New York: Continuum, 2012. 147-153. Print.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2000. Print.

———. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Books, 2004. Print.

———. *Commonwealth*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2009. Print.

Harrison, John M. “Through the White Thin Bone of a Hare.” *TTA Press Discussion Forum*, 4 September 2003. Web: <http://www.ttapress.com/discuss/messages/27/89.html>

Holland, Eugene W. *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Hertzler, Joyce O. *The History of Utopian Thought (1922)*. London: Allen and Unwin, 2012.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. London: Falmingo, 1994. Print.

Kafka, Franz. *The Trial (1925)*. Trans. Mike Mitchell. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

Kaufmann, Moritz. *Utopias*. London: Kegan Paul, 1879. Print.

Kendrick, Christopher. “Monster Realism and Uneven Development in China Mieville’s *The Scar*.” *Extrapolation*. Ed. Javier A. Martínez, Andrew M. Butler, Michael Levy, Sherryl Vint, Lisa Yaszek and Patricia Melzer. Texas: Morgan Printing, 2009. 258-276.

Kumar, Krishan. *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987. Print.

———. “Utopia’s Shadow.” *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, On Screen, On Stage*. Ed. Fatima Vieira. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholarship Publishing, 2013. 19-23.

Küng, Hans. *A Global Ethic For Global Politics and Economics*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan of Book VI: Desire and Interpretation 1958-1959*. Trans. by Cormac Gallagher. Unpublished.

———. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan of Book VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis 1959-1960*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Dennis Porter. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Lambert, Gregg. "On the Uses and Abuses of Literature for Life." *Deleuze and Literature*. Ed. Ian Buchanan and John Marks. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000. 135–66. Print.

Lecerle, Jean-Jacques. *Deleuze and Language*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. Print.

Levitas, Ruth. *The Concept of Utopia*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2010. Print.

Levitas, Ruth and Sargisson, Lucy. "Utopia in Dark Times: Optimism/Pessimism and Utopia/Dystopia." *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. Eds. Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan. New York: Routledge, 2003. 13-29. Print.

Marx, Karl. *Capital Vol I*. Trans. Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin Classics, 1990. Print.

Massumi, Brian. Translator's Foreword. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987. ix-xvi. Print.

May, Todd. *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

Mieville, China. *Perdido Street Station* (2000). New York: Ballantine Publishing Group, 2001. Print.

- . “The Limits of Utopia.” *Eighth Annual Nelson Institute Earth Day Conference*, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 20 April 2014, Keynote Address. Web.
- . “A Life in Writing.” Review of the Author, by Justin Jordan. *The Guardian*, 13 May 2011. Web: <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2011/may/14/china-mieville-life-writing-genre>
- . “China Miéville: Messing With Fantasy.” Interview by Charles N. Brown. *Locus: The Newspaper of the Science Fiction Field*. 48.3 (2002): 4-76.
- . “China Miéville and Monsters: ‘Unsatisfy me, frustrate me, I beg you.’” Interview by Jeff VanderMeer. *Weird Fiction Review*, 20 March 2012. Web: <http://weirdfictionreview.com/2012/03/china-mieville-and-monsters-unsatisfy-me-frustrate-me-i-beg-you/>
- . “Fantasy and revolution: an interview with China Miéville.” Interview by John Newsinger. *International Socialism Journal* 2.88(2000). Web: <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj88/newsinger.htm>
- . “A Strategy for Ruination: An Interview with China Mieville.” Interview by Boston Review. *Global Dystopia*, 8 January 2018. Web: <http://bostonreview.net/literature-culture-china-mieville-strategy-ruination>
- . “The Road to Perdido: An Interview with China Mieville.” Interview by Richard Marshall. *3:AM Magazine*, 2003. Web: http://www.3ammagazine.com/litarchives/2003/feb/interview_china_mieville.html
- Moylan, Tom and Raffaella Baccolini. “Introduction: Dystopia and Histories.” *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. Ed. Tom Moylan and Raffaella Baccolini. New York: Routledge, 2003. 1-13. Print.
- . *Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia*. Colorado: Westview. 2000. Print.

- Newell, Jonathan. "Abject Cyborgs: Discursive Boundaries and the Remade in China Miéville's *Iron Council*." *Science Fiction Studies* 40.3 (2013): 496-509.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks (1873)*. Trans. Marianne Cowan. Washington: Regnery Publishing, 1998. Print.
- . *The Gay Science (1882)*. Trans. Adrian Del Caro and Ed. Bernard Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.
- . *Thus Spoke Zarathustra (1883- 1891)*. Trans. Adrian del Caro and Ed. Robert Pippin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.
- Noys, Benjamin & Timothy S. Morphy. "Introduction: Old and New Weird." *Genre*, 49.2 (2016): 117-134.
- Orwell, George. *1984 (1949)*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing, 1983. Print.
- Pascal, Roy. *The Dual Voice: Free Indirect Speech and its Functions in the Nineteenth-Century European Novel*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1977. Print.
- Plato. *Republic (380 BC)*. Trans. G. M. A. Grube, Ed. C. D. C. Reeve. Indiana: Hackett Publishing, 1992. Print.
- Rao, Eleonora. "Home and Nation in Margaret Atwood's Later Fiction." *The Cambridge Companion to Margaret Atwood*. Ed. Coral Ann Howells. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Rayment, Andrew. *Fantasy, Politics, Postmodernity: Pratchett, Pullman, Miéville and Stories of the Eye*. Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 2014. Print.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

- Ryan, Derek. *Virginia Woolf and the Materiality of Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2013. Print.
- Sargent, Lyman Tower. "The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited." *Utopian Studies* 5.1 (1994): 1-37.
- . "US Eutopias in the 1980s and 1990s: Self-Fashioning in a World of Multiple Identities." *Utopianism/Literary Utopias and National Cultural Identities: A Comparative Perspective*. Ed. Paola Spinozzi. Bologna: COTEPPRA/University of Bologna, 2001.
- Slack, J. D. "Contextualising Technology." *Rethinking Communication, Volume Two: Paradigm Exemplars*. Ed. B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe and E. Wartella. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989. 329-45.
- Smith, Daniel W. Introduction: "'A Life of Pure Immanence': Deleuze's 'Critique et Clinique' Project." *Essays: Clinical and Critical*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P., 1997. ix-iv. Print.
- Storr, Merl and Chrysanthi Nigianni. *Deleuze and Queer Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2009. Print.
- Synder, Katherine V. "'Time to Go': The Post-Apocalyptic and the Post-Traumatic in Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake*." *Studies in the Novel* 43.4 (2011): 470-489.
- Talpalaru, Margrit. "Extinctathon: Margaret Atwood's Urge for an Immanent Episteme in *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood*." *Canada and Beyond* 3.1.2 (2013): 243-265.
- Terra Walston, Joseph. Victims of Global Capitalism in Margaret Atwood's Dystopian Imaginary. *The Age of Dystopia: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*. Ed. Louisa MacKay Demerjian. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016. 35-47.
- Tynan, Aidan. *Deleuze's Literary Clinic: Criticism and the Politics of Symptoms*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2012.

Wagner- Lawlor, Jennifer. "With No Guarantees, Of Course." *Postmodern Utopias and Feminist Fictions*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 58-89.

Wood, Robert. "'Extravagant Secular Swarming': Space and Subjectivity in China Mieville's *Perdido Street Station*." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 59.1 (2018): 75-89.

Vieira, Fatima. The Concept of Utopia. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Claeys. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. 3-28. Print.

Zamyatin, Yevgeny. *We*. Trans. Mirra Ginsburg. New York: Avon, 1987. Print.

APPENDICES

A. CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Çokay Nebioğlu, Rahime
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 24 April 1989, Gaziantep
email: rhmcky@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MA	Ankara University, English Language and Literature	2013
BA	Gaziantep University, English Language and Literature	2006

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2013- Present	Gazi University	Research Assistant
2011-2012	Ankara University	Instructor
2011-2011	Gaziantep University	Research Assistant

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Turkish (Native), English (Advanced), French (Intermediate), German (Beginner)

PUBLICATIONS

1. Çokay, Rahime & Ela İpek Gündüz. The Hours (2002): An Unfaithful Adaptation. *The Silk Road of Adaptation*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.

2. Çokay, Rahime. Some Women are More Equal than Others: Sisterhood Revisited in A Passage to India and Burmese Days. *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*. Vol4, Issue 1, 2015. p.405-414
3. Çokay, Rahime. History as a Work of Fiction: Barnes and Flaubert's Parrot. *History in Western Literature*. Gaziantep: Gaziantep UP, 2013, p. 451-459.
4. Çokay, Rahime. The Process of Reconstruction in Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol 9, Issue 4, 2012. p.325-333.
5. Çokay, Rahime. Peter Ackroyd's Chatterton: History vs. Fiction. *Humanitas*. Vol 2, Issue 4, 2014. p.61-73.
6. Çokay, Rahime. The Problem of Love and War: Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida. XII. *International Language, Literature and Stylistics Symposium Proceedings*. Vol 1, Issue 1, 2012. p.216-220.
7. Çokay Nebioğlu, Rahime. Rites of Passage: Fragments of Tragedy in Postmodern Fiction. *Humanitas*. Vol 4; Issue 8, 2016. p. 85-96
8. Çokay Nebioğlu, Rahime. Gender, Power and Sexuality in John Ford's 'Tis Pity She's a Whore. *The International Journal Of Humanities & Social Studies*. Vol 4, Issue 3, 2016. p.144-151.

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Contemporary literature, modernist literature, continental philosophy, critical theories, psychoanalysis, adaptation studies, utopian studies, Turkish utopia/dystopia, postcolonial studies, post-postmodernism.

B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Günümüz toplumları, on yıllar süren politik, ekonomik ve sosyal değişimin ardından, görünürde eskisine göre daha esnek ve özgürlükçü sanılan ancak aslında eskisinden çok daha kontrolcü ve baskın olan yeni bir toplum yapısına bürünmüştür. Birçoğu tarafından neoliberalizm olarak da adlandırılan bu değişimler bütünüyle birlikte bir bakıma Pandora'nın kutusu açılmış ve açığa çıkan sorunlar yalnızca politik ve ekonomik değil aynı zaman sosyal ve bireysel hayatın her noktasına çok daha kolay ulaşmaya başlamıştır. Çağdaş toplum kuramcılarının birçoğuna göre, gittikçe yayılan ve güçlenmeye başlayan bu değişimler, Pandora'nın kutusundaki son “umut” ışığını da yok etmeye başlamış, günümüz toplumunu çıkmaz sokağa sokmuştur. Ancak bu karamsar bakış açısının aksine, 20. yüzyılın sonlarından itibaren oluşmaya başlayan bu yeni yapı, her ne kadar toplumları eskisinden daha büyük tehditlerle karşı karşıya bıraksa da, aynı zamanda bu tehditlerin üstesinden gelme olanaklarını da bünyesinde bulundurmaktadır. Bu durum, çağdaş distopya yazarları tarafından fark edilmiş olsa gerek, distopik eserlerinde günümüz toplumunun gittikçe kötüye giden durumunun içinde “direnişin” ve “kurtuluşun” hala mümkün olduğunu göstermeye başlamışlardır. Toplum yapısını takiben yazarların bakış açılarındaki bu değişimin eserlerine de yansımaları, kaçınılmaz olarak çağdaş distopyanın, önceki yüzyılın kanonlaşmış örneklerinden ayıran birtakım farklılıkları beraberinde getirmiştir. Çağdaş distopyada gözlemlenen bu farklılıklar, birçok eleştirmenin dikkatini çekmiş ve daha yakından irdelemeye yöneltmiştir. Ancak şu ana kadar hiçbir çalışma, bu farklılıkların distopya tarihinde yeni bir aşamaya geçilmiş olabileceği düşüncesine yaklaşmamıştır.

Bu çalışma, ütopya ve distopya çalışmalarındaki bu eksikliği göz önünde bulundurarak, çağdaş distopyaya yeni bir bakış açısı getirilmesi gerektiği fikrinden yola çıkmıştır. Bu durum, günümüz distopik eserlerinde ortaya çıkan bu farklılıkların distopya kavramını Deleuzyen felsefe ile ortak paydada

buluşturabileceği düşüncesini doğurmuştur. Fransız filozof Gilles Deleuze günümüz toplumunda gerçekleşen yeni yapıyı, geç kapitalizmin (late capitalism) doğuşuyla ilişkilendirerek, bu yapının aslında disiplin toplumlarından denetim toplumlarına bir geçişin göstergesi olduğunu savunmuştur. Geç kapitalizmin doğuşunu ve beraberinde getirdiği değişiklikleri irdelerken, Deleuze, tıpkı çağdaş distopya yazarlarının yaptığı gibi, yalnızca gittikçe kötüleşmekte olan toplum dinamiklerinin kaynakları, etkileri ve sonuçlarını değil, bunların kendi içinde barındırdıkları olumlu potansiyelleri ve kurtuluş ihtimallerini de ele almıştır. Bu bakış açısından yola çıkarak, bu çalışma eğer toplumların geç kapitalizme geçişi, yeni bir sosyal yapıyı doğuruyorsa, aynı zamanda distopya tarihinde de yeni bir dönüm noktası yaratmış olabileceğini savunmakta, bu yeni oluşumu Deleuzyen çerçevede incelemeyi ve çağdaş distopyaya alternatif bir tanım getirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca bu yeni tanımın somut örneklerini gösterebilmek adına, ileri gelen çağdaş distopya yazarlarından Margaret Atwood ve China Mieville'in eserlerinin Deleuzyen okumalarını yapmayı hedeflemektedir.

Bu çalışma analiz bölümleri dışında, kuramsal altyapıyı oluşturan iki ayrı bölümden oluşmaktadır. Kuramsal altyapının birinci bölümünde distopya kavramının oluşumuna ve distopyanın tarihsel sürecine Deleuzyen felsefe ışığında bakılmıştır. Distopya, her ne kadar 20. yüzyılın başlarında ütopyaya tepki olarak doğan bir tür olarak gösterilse de, kavramsal içeriği onu ütopyadan uzaklaştıramamıştır. Thomas More'un *Ütopya* (1516) adlı eseriyle doğduğu düşünülse de, aslında bir düşünce yapısı ve kavram olarak Platon'a kadar dayanan, "hiçbir yer" anlamına gelen ütopya, en bilinen tanımıyla, idealist bir gelecek resmi. Ütopyanın doğuşundaki temel eğilim, içinde bulunulan toplumda yaşanan sorunlardan yola çıkarak ideal bir gelecek resmi çizmek ve o geleceğe ulaşmayı hedef edinmektir. Bir bakıma toplumu "daha iyiye" taşıma arzudur. Distopya ise yine içinde bulunan toplumdaki oluşumlardan duyulan memnuniyetsizlikten yola çıkarak, daha da kötüleşen bir gelecek resmi çizmektedir. Her ne kadar distopyada resmedilen gelecek temsili ütopyadakinin karşıtı olarak görünse de, aslında distopya da ütopya gibi aynı yazın tekniklerini kullanarak "daha iyi" bir yaşayış ve varoluş hedefine ulaşma isteğinden

doğmuştur. Bu ortak “erek-odaklılık” (telos-orientation), başta Gregory Claeys olmak üzere birçok eleştirmenin ütopya ve distopyayı kardeş kavram ve türler olarak görmesine neden olmuştur.

Ancak hem ütopya hem distopyada fark edilen bu amaç odaklılık kavramı görüldüğü kadar masum bir kavram mıdır? Bu çalışma eleştirel yaklaşımına bu kavramın içeriğini, çağrışımlarını ve etkilerini inceleyerek başlamıştır. Amaç-odaklılık bu çalışmada fenomenolojik çağrışımlarından uzak, ütopya ve distopya kavramları bağlamında en basit anlamıyla “daha iyiye gitme arzusu” olarak tanımlanabilir. Amaç-odaklılık olgusu bu noktada nihai metafizik ereğe (transcendental telos) yönelimi içinde barındırmaktadır. Bir bakıma “erekselci” olarak da tanımlanabilecek bu yönelim, kaçınılmaz olarak karşısına çıkan herşeyi ikili karşıtlıklara dönüştüren sistemler üzerine kuruludur. Distopya kavramındaki bu erekselcilik, distopyanın gelecek-odaklı (future-oriented) yaklaşımından da anlaşılabilir. Distopyanın temellerinin dayandığı “daha iyiye” gitme arzusu yalnızca gelecek için öngörülen bir hedeftir. “Daha iyi” her zaman gelecekte konuşlandırılmış ve bu nedenle de hep ilerlemeci ve gelecek-odaklı bir yaklaşım benimsenmiştir. Distopyanın doğuşunu tetikleyen “şimdiki zaman” ise yalnızca geleceğe ulaşmak için bir aracı görevi görmeye başlamıştır. Bu durum geçmiş, şimdi ve geleceğin birbirinden keskin çizgilerle bölümlendiği ilerlemeci ve çizgisel bir zaman anlayışının da bir göstergesi olmuştur. Distopya kavramında gizlenen bu amaçlılık ve beraberinde oluşan çizgisel zaman anlayışı, kavramın yapı taşı oluşturan “daha iyiye” gitme hedefini olumsuzlamakta, distopya kavramını paralise etmekte ve aşkınlık düzlemine (plane of transcendence) yaklaştırmaktır.

Distopya kavramında görülen bu amaçlılık ve çizgisel zaman anlayışı, en somut şekilde 20.yüzyılın başlarında çıkan distopya örneklerinde görülmektedir. George Orwell, Aldous Huxley, Yevgeny Zamyatin gibi distopya türünün kanonlaşan isimleri, bu eserlerde son derece katmanlaşmış, hiyerarşik bir düzen üzerine kurulu totaliter ulus-devlet yapılarının baskın olduğu gelecek toplumları resmetmektedir. Disiplin toplumları olarak da adlandırılacak bu toplumlarda, düzen ve denetim baskıcı devlet aygıtları tarafından sağlanmakta, bireyler çok

keskin sınıfsal ayrımlara maruz bırakılmaktadır. Devlet, düzenini sarsmayacak ve koşulsuz ve sadık şekilde uyum sağlayacak özneler yaratma eğilimindedir. Dolayısıyla bu distopik ulus devlet, hiçbir bireysel farklılığa, farklı renklere ve seslere tolerans göstermemekte, aksine sn derece homojen sistemler ve özne kavramları oluşturmaya çalışmaktadır. Bu tür totaliter baskılara karşı çıkan muhalif sesler elbette ki olur. Ancak kanonlaşmış bu ilk örneklerde, bu karşıt sesler ya öldürülerek ya da devlet aygıtlarınca cezalandırılarak kaçınılmaz bir yenilgiye mahkum edilir. Bu kanonlaşmış ilk distopya örneklerinde karşıt sesi temsil eden başkahramanların özgürlükçü girişimleri hep başarısızlıkla sonuçlandırılır. Aşkınlık düzlemine yaklaşan distopyada, totaliter distopik toplumdan kaçış ihtimali ya da muhalif girişimlerdeki başarılı olma ihtimali sıfırlanmıştır. Bu durumun sebebi distopya kavramındaki amaçlılık ve çizgisellik sorunsalı olarak düşünülebilir. Bir başka deyişle, distopyanın son derece kötümser bu kanonik örnekleri, dayandıkları diyalektik sistem gereği ikili bir zıtlığı beraberinde getirmektedir: “daha kötü” bir gelecek düşüncesi ve distopyanın çıkış noktası olan “daha iyi” bir gelecek düşüncesi. “Daha kötü” olan seçenek distopik eserlerde resmedilirken, “daha iyi” seçenek onun çıkış noktası olan, arka plandaki ideal alternatiftir. Şimdiki zaman, bu iki seçenektan birine ulaşmak için yalnızca bir köprü görevi görmektedir. Buna göre, “daha kötü” olan seçenekte özgürlük ve kurtuluş ihtimali yoktur, çünkü özgürlük ve kurtuluş yalnızca ideal alternatifte mevcuttur. Her ne kadar bu ilk distopya örnekleri totalitaryanizmi eleştiriyor olsa da bu birini mutlak şekilde diğerinin üstünde tutan ikili karşıtlığa dayalı düşünce yapısının aslında totaliter yapıdan pek farkı yoktur. Bu durum, distopyayı amacından uzaklaştırarak aşkınlık düzlemine yerleştirdiği için bu çalışma bu tür eğilimlerin görüldüğü distopyaları “aşkın distopya” (transcendent dystopia) olarak adlandırmaktadır. Distopyanın tarihine bakıldığında aşkın distopya örneklerinin 20.yüzyılın başlarında çıkan ilk örneklerle kesiştiği gözlemlenmiştir, bu nedenle bu çalışma bu kesişmeyi distopya tarihinde dikkate alınması gereken önemli anlardan biri olarak görmektedir. Fakat bu sonraki distopyanın sonraki dönemlerinde benzer eğilimleri gösterip aşkınlık düzlemine yaklaşan hiç bir distopya örneğine rastlanmayacağı anlamına gelmemektedir.

1970'lerden itibaren postmodern düşüncenin çıkışı distopyayı aşkınlık düzleminden yavaş yavaş uzaklaştırmaya başladı. Aşkınlık ilkelerinin yıkılmaya başlamasıyla, distopya “sonuç”tan “süreç”e, “gelecek”ten “şimdi”ye yönelmeye başladı. Bu yönelimin somut örnekleri, en belirgin şekilde çağdaş distopyaların üretilmeye başlandığı 20.yüzyılın sonları ve 21.yüzyıla denk geliyor olsa da, 1970lerde postmodern düşüncenin getirdiği çoğulculuk, fragmentasyon ve yapıbozuma uğratma eğilimleri distopyada yadsınamayacak değişimler meydana getirdi. Moylan ve Baccolini bu değişimin farkına varıp tanımlamaya çalışan ilk eleştirmenlerden olmuştur. Distopya tarihinde gerçekleşen bu değişimler nedeniyle, bu dönemde ortaya çıkan distopik eserleri “eleştirel distopya” olarak adlandırmışlardır. Eleştirel distopya, Moylan ve Baccolini'nin tanımına göre, mevcut güç sistemlerine eleştirel bir bakış açısıyla yaklaşan ve ilk distopya örneklerindeki keskin kötümser tavrı terk ederek içinde ütopyik yansımalar barındıran distopyalardır. Bu distopya kavramına yeni tanıttırılan ütopyik yansımalar, özellikle 1970lerde çıkan bu eserlerin önceki dönemdekilerin aksine mutlak başarısızlıkla değil de muğlak, yoruma açık ve dolayısıyla eskisine nazaran daha umut verici bir sonla bitmesinden anlaşılabilir. Bu çalışma, Moylan ve Baccolini'nin bu yeni tanımını, distopyada gerçekleşen yeniliklerin fark edilebilir ve yeni bir tanımlı gerekiyor boyutta olduğunun somut bir örneği olduğu için benimsemekte, ancak bu eleştirmenlerin distopyanın yalnızca belirli örneklerinin “eleştirel” olarak tanımlanması fikrine katılmamaktadır. Distopya kavramı, kaçınılmaz olarak bünyesinde “eleştirel” bir bakış açısı barındırmakta ve hatta bu bakış açısından doğmaktadır. Ernest Callenbach, Joanna Russ, Ursula Le Guin, Margaret Atwood ve Marge Piercy gibi yazarlarla bu dönemde ortaya çıkan distopyayı önceki dönemden farklı kılan eskisine göre daha umut dolu sonlarının olmasının yanı sıra, öncekinden çok daha güçlü şekilde toplum üzerinde baskı kuran sistemleri bozma ve sınırları ihlal etme eğiliminde olmasıdır. Bu durum, distopyanın onu keskin ve tamamiyle pessimist sona hazırlayan aşkınlık düzleminden çıkmaya başladığının bir işareti olarak düşünülebilir. Bu nedenle bu çalışma, bu eğilimleri ve Moylan ve Baccolini'nin tanımındaki eksikliği göz

önünde bulundurarak “eleştirel distopya” yerine “transgresif distopya” tanımını daha uygun bulmuştur.

Ancak 20.yüzyılın sonlarında geç kapitalizmin sosyal, ekonomik ve politik değişimleri beraberinde getirmesiyle, distopyayı bu aşkınlık düzleminden uzaklaştıran eğilimler daha belirginleşmeye başlamıştır. Bu anlamda gerçekleşen en önemli fark distopyanın artık kötü bir “gelecek” resmi çizmekten, şu an içinde bulunulan mevcut durumu temsil etmesidir. Çağdaş distopyada resmedilen toplumlar, olası toplumlardan çok gerçekten var olan distopik toplumların neredeyse alegorik birer temsilidir. Dolayısıyla, aşkın ve transgresif distopyalardaki gibi kurulabilecek bir “gelecek” idealine artık yer yoktur, aksine “daha iyiye” gitme düşüncesi yerini şimdiyi kurtarma ve şu anki toplumda olumlu değişimler yaratma isteğine dönüşmüştür. Dolayısıyla gelecek odaklı yaklaşımdan ulaşılarak şimdiye odaklanılmaya başlanmıştır. Bu durum, aslında çizgisel zaman anlayışından uzaklaşılmasının bir göstergesidir. Artık geçmiş, şimdi ve gelecek arasındaki keskin çizgiler yerine, geçmişi hala içinde yaşadığı ve geleceğin tüm potansiyellerinin içinde barındığı bir şimdi düşüncesi daha baskındır. Bu zaman anlayışında, dolayısıyla geçmiş, şimdi ve gelecek birbirini takip eden parçalar değil, her üçü de aynı anda varolabilen bir bütün olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Şimdiki zamana olan bu yönelim, bir bakıma Deleuzyen anlamda şimdinin iyileştirici, yaratıcı ve değiştirici gücünün farkına varılmaya başlandığının işaretidir. Bir başka deyişle, şimdi birbirinden bağımsız zaman dilimlerinin bir parçasını değil, bir çokluk, bir güç ve yoğunluğu temsil etmektedir. Dolayısıyla, distopik toplumlarda olumlu değişimleri gerçekleştirebilecek tüm potansiyel aslında şimdi zamana içkin bir özellik olarak tanımlanabilir. Bu durum, distopyayı aşkınlık düzlemine yaklaştıran amaçlılık eğiliminin de “işlevselliğe” dönüşmesine olanak sağlamıştır. Çağdaş distopyanın eleştirdiği ve olumlu değişime mübrem şekilde ihtiyaç duyan toplumlar, şu an içinde yaşamakta olduğumuz toplumlar olduğu için, geleceğe yerleştirilen metafizik bir erek yerine, şimdiyi iyileştirebilecek, Deleuzyen deyişle şimdide algılam ve duygulamalar (affects and percepts) yaratmayı hedefleyen bir işlevsellik önce çıkar. Algılamalar, Deleuze ve Guattari’ye göre, düşünüldüğünün aksine bir bireyin algılaması veya duygulanımı

değil de, tamamen kendine içkin bir yoğunluk, bir oluş veya olasılıklar bütünüdür. Bir bakıma, hem değişimi getirebilecek tüm virtuel potansiyel hem de değişimin kendisidir. Dolayısıyla, kendini aşmadır. Bu kendini aşma eylemi, aslında arzunun akışkanlığına kavuşması olarak da düşünülebilir.

Peki, distopya ile arzunun ne bağlantısı vardır? Aslında arzu, hayata dair herşeyle alakalıdır. Çünkü Deleuze'ün de üstüne basarak defalarca dile getirdiği gibi, arzu hayatın kendisidir. Bir başka deyişle, hayat arzunun akışkanlığından oluşmaktadır. Arzu bu anlamıyla, hayatın içinde taşıyıp duran virtuel enerjinin hepsidir. Arzu, değiştirici, iyileştirici, yenileyici, üretici güçtür. Hayatın akışkanlığını sağlayan bir bakıma aslında arzunun akışkanlığıdır. Hayat ve hayatın içinde barındırdığı arzu akışları, Deleuzyen felsefede içkinlik düzlemi olarak da bahsedilir. Bu bağlamda, distopya aslında arzunun akışkanlığının durdurulması ve içkinlik düzleminden aşkınlık düzlemine taşınmadır. Arzunun akışkanlığı durduran gerekçelerle bir toplumu distopikleştiren nedenler aslında aynıdır. Arzu bir güçtür ve bu düzen için bir tehdit unsurudur. Tüm toplumlarda arzu, devlet aygıtların otoritesi karşısında bir tehlike oluşturur çünkü arzu özgürlükçü ve devrimcidir. Bu nedenle, devlet aygıtları otoritesini ve düzeni arzunun bu gücünü kontrol altına alıp, akışkanlığını pıhtılaştırarak ve hatta dondurarak kurmaya çalışır. Arzunun akışkanlığı ancak üzerinde ağaçsı (arborescent) yapılar yapılar durdurulabilir. Ağaçsı yapılar, aslında ağaçsı düşünme sistemlerinin, yani aşkın erek odaklı, ikili karşıtıklara dayalı, hiyerarşik bir düşünme şeklinin bir ürünüdür. Devlet aygıtları, uzam, özne, zaman, dil gibi arzunun hareketinin oluşabileceği her yerde bu yapıları kurarak varolan potansiyelini en aza indirmeyi ya da arzunun üretimini kendine yönlendirmeyi hedefler. Bunun için arzunun akışkanlığı üzerine pürtüklü uzamlar, verili bölmeler yerleştirir. Dolayısıyla, bir toplumu distopik hale getiren hayatın ve arzunun akışkanlığının bir bakıma yerli-yurtlulaştırılmasıdır (territorialisation).

Bu bağlamda çağdaş distopyayı aşkınlık düzleminden içkinlik düzlemine taşıyan aslında arzunun akışkanlığını yeniden kazanmasına tanınan olanaktır. Çağdaş distopya, içinde bulunduğu toplumun doğası gereği de arzunun akışındaki tıkanmaları açmaya daha elverişlidir. Bu distopyaların içinde bulunduğu denetim

toplumları, daha sonra detaylı şekilde anlatılacağı gibi arzunun akışının yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırılıp (deterritorialisation) daha sonra devlet aygıtlarının hedefleri doğrultusunda yeniden yerli-yurtlulaştırması (reterritorialisation) ilkesine dayalıdır. Bir başka deyişle, arzu tamamen üretken bir akışkanlık olduğu için, devlet aygıtları sosyal üretiminin sürekliliğini sağlayabilmek için önce arzuyu üzerinde bulunan tüm yerleşik yapılar, kodlar ve bölümlenmelerden arındırıp yeni yerleşik yapılar, kodlar ve bölümlenmelere hazırlar. Bu dikkate alındığında bu toplumların ve kaçınılmaz olarak bu toplumları resmeden çağdaş distopyaların, bu yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma ve yeniden yerli-yurtlulaştırma zinciri arasından kaçış çizgileri (lines of flight) çizmesi daha olasıdır. Nitekim bu nedenle de çağdaş distopya eserlerinde aşkın distopyada gözlemlenen aşırı umutsuzluk ve kötümserlik, transgresif distopyadaki belirsizlik hali terk edilir. Çağdaş distopyadaki karşıt görüşlü ve direnişçi başkahramanlar, kaçınılmaz yenilgiye mahkum bırakılmaktansa, eylemlerinde başarıya ulaşırlar. Bu başkahramanların özgürlükçü eylemleri, önceki distopya örneklerindeki gibi mevcut düzene karşı eşit derecede metafiziği temsil eden temsili ve ikili karşıtıklara dayalı düşünce şekli üzerine kurulu alternatif bir düzen yaratma ya da varolan düzenin dışında varolma girişiminden ziyade, içinde bulunan sistemin açıklarını bulup onu eğip bükmeye, iyi yönde değiştirmeye ve onun içinde birçok varolma şekilleri bulmaya yöneliktir. Yani, mevcut distopik sistemi tıpkı sistemin kendisinin de işleyişinde olduğu gibi, yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırmaya çalışmaktır. Bu olumlu anlamda yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma eylemi, yalnızca içinde bulunulan toplumu değil aynı zamanda çağdaş distopyayı da içkinlik düzlemine taşıyan en önemli faktördür. Bu nedenle bu çalışma, bu tür amaçlılığın yerini işlevselliğin aldığı, şimdinin onarıcı ve yaratıcı gücünün öne çıktığı ve gelecekte çok şimdiye yönelen, keskin umutsuzluğun terk edilerek kaçış çizgilerinin var olduğu umudunu veren, çizgisel zaman anlayışını terk ederek tüm zaman dilimlerinin birbiriyle kaçınılmaz olarak iç içe olduğu yoğunluklar olduğu düşüncesini ön plana çıkaran ve dolayısıyla tüm bunlar sayesinde içkinlik düzlemine yerleşen çağdaş distopyayı “içkin distopya” olarak adlandırmayı daha uygun bulmaktadır. Daha önce aşkın distopya için de söylendiği gibi, bu içkin özellikler daha çok distopya tarihinde daha çok

çağdaş döneme denk gelen örneklerde çoklukla bulunduğu için bu çalışma bu adlandırmayı yapmakta, içkin distopyanın distopya tarihinde getirdiği değişiklikler nedeniyle önemli bir dönüm noktası olduğunu ileri sürmekte ancak bu tanımları keskin çizgilerle ayırmamaktadır. Her ne kadar bu olumlu eğilimler çağdaş distopya örneklerinde gözlemlense de, daha önceki dönemlerdeki distopya örneklerinin hiçbirinde benzer eğilimlere kesinlikle rastlanmayacağı anlamına gelmemektedir.

İçkin distopyayı anlayabilme yollarından en önemlisi, “yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma” teriminin ne anlama geldiğini ya da ne işlev gördüğünü bilmekten geçmektedir. Deleuze ve Guattari, her ne kadar bu terimi aynı anlamıyla başka sözcüklerle diğer çalışmalarında kullanıyor olsa da, tam anlamıyla bu terime en çok *Bin Yayla: Kapitalizm ve Şizofreni 2* kitaplarında yer verirler. Deleuze ve Guattari'nin kullandığı diğer tüm terimlerde de olduğu gibi, yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma teriminin birebir tanımını vermek kolay ve olası değildir, ancak nasıl işlediği anlatılarak anlamları keşfedilebilir. Yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma, bir bölgeyi, uzamı, dili, özneyi veya üzerinde pürtüklü ve ağaçlı yapıların oluşturulduğu herhangi birşeyi bozguna uğratma, bu yapıların kurulu olduğu kodlamaları, sistemleri temizleme olarak düşünülebilir. Bir başka deyişle, durgunluğu harekete, ikili karşıtlığı çokluğa, organizmayı organsız bedenlere açan eylemdir. Bu çalışmanın başından beri eleştirilen metafizik düşünceye düşmesi kaygısını bertaraf edebilmek adına, bu çalışma “içkin distopya”ların tanımlanmasını daha da kolaylaştıracak ve içkin distopyadaki yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma eyleminin önemini öne çıkaracak alternatif bir “söz yapımı” (coinage) üretmiştir: dysterritory. Yersizyurtsuzlaştırma ve distopya sözcüklerinin bir birleşimi olan “dysterritory” iki anlama gelmektedir: distopik yapı ve yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırılan yapı. Bir başka deyişle, distopik olmasına rağmen bu distopik özelliklerini yok edecek güce sahip olan yapı, bir bakıma Deleuzyen anlamda “şimdi”nin temsil ettiği herşey. “Şimdi” akışkanlığı ve gücü pıhtılaşmış yapılara indirilerek distopik bir düzene dönüştürülür, ancak her zaman içinde bu akışkanlığı yeniden kazandıracak yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma güçlerine sahiptir. Bu nedenle hem distopya hem de distopyanın panzehiridir. Bu nedenle bu çalışma bu

iki karşıt anlamı içinde barındıran “dysterritory” sözcüğünü yaratma ihtiyacı duymuştur. İçkin distopya dolayısıyla, “dysterritory”nin temsil edildiği distopya örnekleridir.

Deleuze ve Guattari, *Felsefe Nedir?* adlı kitaplarında “iletişimden yoksun değiliz, tersine fazlasıyla var ondan, biz yaratmanın eksikliğini çekiyoruz. Şimdiki hale direncin yokluğunu çekiyoruz. Kavramların yaratılması, kendiliğinde bir gelecek formuna çağrı yapar, yeni bir toprağa ve henüz varolmayan bir halka seslenir” (100) diyerek şimdi-burada varolan distopik düzene olan tepkisizliğe isyan eder. Ancak, bu yakınmada bahsi geçen direniş eksikliğinden kastedilen aslında şimdinin distopik toplumlarına hiçbir eleştirinin olmaması değildir. Deleuzyen bağlamda, direniş yaratmayla eşittir. Direniş beraberinde olumlu ve çoklu alternatif yaşam şekillerini, özne oluşları beraberinde getirir. Bu anlamıyla, Deleuze ve Guattari’nin eksikliğinden şikayet ettiği direnişin çağdaş distopya yazarları tarafından yapılmaya başlandığı söylenebilir. İçkin distopya, yalnızca günümüzün geç kapitalizmin hükmü altındaki distopik toplumlarına olan eleştiriden ibaret değildir. İçkin distopyada varolan yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma eylemi yeni bir dünya, yeni insanlar yaratacak boyutta devam eder. Ancak bu yeni dünya ve yeni insanlardan kastedilen, eskisine birebir zıt, metafizik tehlikeler barındıran bir alternatif değildir. Yeni bir dünya, arzunun tüm akışkanlığına kavuşmuş, yeniliklere ve üretime açık dünyadır. Yeni insanlar ise, Deleuzyen anlamda “kayıp insanlar”, “gelecek insanlar” (a people-to-come) ya da “minör insanlar”dır. Minör insanlar, kayıptır çünkü içinde buldukları çoğunlukçu söylem (majoritarian discourse) onları toplumun marjinlerine iterek sessizliğe mahkum eder. Minör insanlar, yalnızca dil, din, ırk, ekonomik altyapı, sosyal statü veya cinsiyetleri dolayısıyla dışlanan insanlar değildir, bünyesinde özgürlüğü ve direnişçi bir potansiyel bulunduran, arzunun akışına izin veren herkestir. Gelecek insanlar, distopik toplumlarda dayatılan stabil özne kavramlarına karşı çıkan “oluş”lardır (becoming). Oluş, içkinlik düzlemi üzerindeki akışkanlık ve hareketlilikten doğan yeni özne kavramları olarak düşünülebilir. Deleuzyen felsefede oluş, kadın-oluşla (becoming-woman) ile başlar, bunun nedeni tarihteki ilk ikili karşıtlık kadın-erkek karşıtlığından doğan erkeği egemen ve üstün norm kılan düşüncedir. Oluş

sürecinin ulaşabileceği en son nokta ise anlaşılmaz-oluştur (becoming-imperceptible). Oluş, Deleuze ve Guattari'nin düşüncesine göre, yıkım üzerine değil, ikili karşıtlık üzerine kurulu özne kavramına halihazırda sahip olduğu çoğulluğu kazandırma üzerinedir. Dolayısıyla oluşta, dışlanmaya ve marjinleştirmeye veya ötekileştirmeye yer yoktur. Bu bağlamda, içkin distopya bahsi geçen şimdikiye olan direncin bir parçası olarak, oluş süreçlerinden geçen insanlara ses verir.

İçkin distopyanın çoğunlukçu politikaya karşı bu duruşu, çizdiği azınlıkçı politikanın (minoritarian politics) bir göstergesidir. Bu çalışmaya göre, bu düşünce içkin distopyanın minör edebiyat olarak görülebileceği düşüncesini doğurur. Deleuze ve Guattari, minör edebiyatı üç temel özelliğe göre tanımlar: “dilin yersiz-yurtsuzlaşması, bireyselin dolaysız-siyasal olana bağlanması ve sözcelemin kolektif düzenlenişidir” (*Kafka: Minör Bir Edebiyat İçin* 28). Öncelikle, içkin distopyada herşey kaçınılmaz olarak politik bir boyut taşımaktadır. İçkin distopya, bireysel hayat öykülerinin ve bireysel sorunların anlatıldığı bir yazın türü değil, bireysel herşeyin aslında daha büyük politik bir çerçevenin parçası olduğu eleştirel bir yazın türüdür. Kavram olarak da ortaya çıkışı, mevcut politik düzene getirilen eleştirel bakış açısından doğmakta ve çoğunlukçu baskın söylem içinde azınlıkçı bir politika yaratmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu durum, distopya kavramı ve yazın türüne politik bir boyut kazandırmakla kalmaz, aslında bireysel olan herşeyin kolektif olduğu gerçeğine de ışık tutar. İçkin distopyada bireysel sözcelem yoktur, dile getirilen herşey bir çokluğu ve kolektif bilinci temsil eder. İçkin distopyanın minör edebiyat boyutunda incelendiğinde sorunsallaştırabilecek en önemli etken dilin yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırılması olarak görülebilir. Deleuze ve Guattari'nin dilin yersizyurtsuzlaştırılmasından kastı, dilin modernist metinlerde olduğu gibi eğilip bükülmesi, ters düz edilmesi ve dolayısıyla dil yoluyla ve dilin bünyesinde kurulan molar yapıları temizleyip, minör bir dil yaratılmasıdır. Minör bir dil, dilin grameri, söz dizimi, anlambilimi gibi dilsel mekanizmalar üzerinde oynamalar yapılarak gerçekleştirilebilir. Bir başka deyişle, dili kendine yabancılaştırmak ya da ana dili içinde bir yabancı gibi davranmaktır. İçkin distopyanın, dili modernist

metinlerin yaptığı boyutta eğip büktüğü söylenemese de, dil ile güç arasındaki ilişkiden bu kadar haberdar olan bir yazın türünde kaçınılmaz olarak dilde kırılmalar yaratılır. Dil, çoğunlukçu gücünü kaybetmeye başlar ve içkin distopyanın temsil ettiği azınlıkçı politikanın bir parçası olur. Bu daha çok içkin distopyada kullanılan serbest dolaylı anlatımla mümkün olur. Serbest dolaylı anlatım, karakterlerin düşünce ve konuşmalarını birinci tekil şahısla değil de üçüncü tekil şahısla anlatılmasıdır, Dolayısıyla serbest dolaysız anlatımda iki farklı bakış açısına aynı anda ışık tutar ve bu iki bakış açısı birbirinden ayırt edilemeyerek kişisel olmayan (impersonal) bir boyut kazanır. Çünkü Deleuze'e göre dilin gerçek yapısı kişisel değildir. Dolayısıyla, serbest dolaylı anlatım dili üzerinde kurulan metafizik sistemlerden kurtarıp özüne döndüren minör değişikliklerden biridir.

İçkin distopyanın minör edebiyata yaklaşması, çağdaş distopya yazarını da Deleuze'ün deyimiyle toplum klinisyenleri (clinicians of the civilisations) olarak görülebilir. Deleuzyen bağlamda, minör edebiyat yazarları, toplumun klinisyenleri olarak yalnızca toplumun sorunlarını, bir başka deyişle hastalıklarının semptomlarını, saptamakla kalmaz aynı zamanda onları tedavi etmek için uğraşır ve aktif çözümler arayışına girer. Günümüz toplumları, geç kapitalizmin etkisi altında yaşam enerjisini yitirmeye, arzu akışlarını pıhtılaştırmaya başlamıştır, çağdaş distopya yazarları öncelikle hayatın temel enerjisinin tıkanıdığı noktaları saptayıp bunları neredeyse alegorik bir şekilde eserlerinde ele almakta ve bu tıkanıklıkları açma ve onlardan kurtulma yollarını aramaktadırlar. Bir başka deyişle hayatı olumlu olmaya çalışmak, çağdaş distopya yazarlarının başarmayı amaçladıkları en temel emeldir.

Böylelikle bu çalışmada kuramsal çerçevenin ilk bölümünde çağdaş distopyanın yeni tanımına, onu önceki dönemlerden ayıran önemli özelliklere ve çağdaş distopya yazarlarının kazandıkları yeni kimliğe değinilirken, ikinci bölümünde ise ilk bölümde ileri sürülen yeni terminoloji "dysterritory" daha da detaylandırılarak içkin distopyanın materyalini oluşturan günümüz toplumunun sosyal, ekonomik ve politik yapısını Deleuzyen felsefe kapsamında ışık tutulmaktadır. Birinci bölümde içkin distopyayı meydana getiren unsurun

“dysterritory”yi resmediyor oluşundan bahsedilmişti. Ancak dysterritory’yi oluşturan etmenleri anlayabilmek için Deleuze ve Guattari’nin günümüz toplumlarına ve bu toplumların etkisi altında bulunduğu geç kapitalizme daha yakından bakmak gerekir. 20. yüzyılın sonlarına doğru, teknolojinin gelişmesi, artan globalleşme ile 18. yüzyıldan bu yana gözlemlenen kapital ve devlet aygıtı arasındaki ilişki ve kapitalizmin yapısı değişikliğe uğramaya başladı. Ulus-devlet odaklı kapitalist sistem yerini yavaş yavaş global ve şirketleşen bir kapitalist sisteme bıraktı. Geç kapitalizm olarak da adlandırılan bu kapitalizmin en güncel aşaması, eskisinden çok daha esnek, yayılımcı, global, içkin ve köksapçı (rhizomatic) bir yapıya sahiptir. Bunun temel sebeplerinden biri, 18.yüzyılda baş gösteren ulus-devletçi kapitalizmin aksine geç kapitalizmde aşkın bir güç kaynağının olmamasıdır. Dolayısıyla aşkın bir merkez yerine, onu içkinlik düzlemine taşıyan süreklilik ilkesine dayalı bir güç akışı ve hareketliliği vardır.

İçkinlik düzlemindeki geç kapitalizm, Deleuze ve Guattari’ye göre, aksiyomatik (axiomatic) prensibine göre işler. Aksiyomatikten kastedilen, sürekli bir zincir şeklinde devam eden kodlarından arındırma, yeniden kodlama sürecidir. Bu, sürekli tekabül eden yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma ve onu takiben yeniden yerli-yurtlulaştırma eylemi olarak da görülebilir. Bu süreç kapitalist sistemde şöyle işler: kapitalist makina socius üzerinde daha önceden oluşturulmuş tüm kodlama, bölümlenmeleri, pürtüklü yüzeyleri temizleyerek, onu organsız bedenlere (body without organs) dönüştürür. Organsız bedenler, bedenin organizmalaşmasına karşı onu bir düzene bağlayan ve organizmaları oluşturan her şeyden kurtararak, bir başka deyişle arzu akışlarını tıkanıklıklarından arındırarak yeniden olumlu potansiyellerini kazanmış halidir. Organsız bedenler, arzunun üretimine açılmış bir alan olarak düşünülebilir. İçkinlik düzleminde olumlu bir potansiyel barındıran organsız bedenler, kapitalist sistem tarafından yalnızca kapitalist üretimin sürekliliğini sağlamak amacıyla, yani yeniden olumsuzlanmak üzere yaratılır. Bu sürekli kapitalist üretimi amaçlayan sistem, dysterritory’nin distopik yakasını oluşturan etmendir. Ancak organsız bedenlere dönüşen socius ya da bir başka deyişle pürtüklü uzamların kayganlaştığı anlar, kaçış çizgileri çizmek ve yeni yaratımlar için en uygun anlardır. Bu noktada kapitalizmin aksiyomatiğinin

dayandığı yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma hareketi kendine çevrilebilir ve böylelikle dysterritory'nin olumlayıcı yakasını beraberinde getirir. Bu iki yaka, geç kapitalizmin paranoyak ve şizofrenik eğilimlerine değinildiğinde daha iyi anlaşılacaktır.

İşte bu her zaman kaçış çizgilerine açık olan aksiyomatik özelliği güvende tutabilmek için kapitalizm arzu üzerinde düzenlemeler yapmaya yönelir. Arzu, Deleuze ve Guattari'ye göre, daha önce de bahsedildiği gibi içkin bir üretkenliğe sahiptir. Kapitalizm bu üretkenliği denetim altına alarak kendine çevirir. Dolayısıyla, geç kapitalizmin egemen olduğu toplum tiplerinde sosyal üretim, arzunun üretiminden başka bir şey değildir. Arzu üretimi ve sosyal üretim arasındaki bağlantı, en iyi şekilde kapitalizm ve psikanaliz arasında bağlantı göz önünde bulundurularak anlaşılabilir. Deleuze ve Guattari'ye göre, kapitalizm özü gereği üretken ve devrimci olan arzu ve bilinçdışını kendine bir tehdit olarak görür, bu noktada psikanaliz bu üretkenliği ve arzunun olumlu anlamına ket vurmak için en etkili araç olur. Özellikle Lacancı psikanalizde arzu, bu coşkun yaratıcı gücüne karşın hiçbir zaman doldurulamayacak “yoksunluk” olarak tanımlanır. Benzer şekilde Freudyen psikanalizde ise, sürekli bastırılması ve dizginlenmesi gereken gerçekleştirilememiş ve gerçekleştirilmesi yalnızca haz (pleasure) ile ilişkilendirilen tehlikeli isteklerden ibarettir. Ancak Deleuze ve Guattari'ye göre arzu, yoksunluk, sapkınlık veya hiç bir noktaya varamayan hazları değil, akışkanlığı, üretkenliği, yaratıcılığı, yeniliği, devrimciliği, moleküler dinamikleri ve çokluğu bünyesinde barındırır. Dolayısıyla arzu her zaman olumlayıcıdır. Arzu ve arzunun akışkanlığı ile dolu olan bilinçdışı, psikanalizde anne-baba-çocuk üçgeni arasına sıkıştırılarak Odipalleştirilmeye çalışılır. Odipal kural, aslında Deleuze ve Guattari'ye göre anne-baba-çocuk arasında var olduğu iddia edilen ama tamamiyle arzuyu yanlış temsil etmeye ve olumlayıcı gücünü köreltmeye/hadım etmeye yönelik bir tiyatral girişimdir. Bu tiyatral ilişki sayesinde arzu, bir yasak ile ilişkilendirilir. Bu ilişkinin aksine bilinçdışı, Deleuze ve Guattari'ye göre yetimdir. Anne-baba-çocuk üçgeninin dışında kapitalist sistem için sorun teşkil eden bir dinamiğe ve güce sahiptir. Bu durum dikkate alındığında arzunun ve bilinçdışının bu tiyatral yanlış temsilinin

altında yatan temel sebep, aslında psikanalizin kapitalist sisteme uysal, olumlu yapıcı arzularından arındırılmış ve tehlike oluşturmayacak Odipal özneler yaratmaktır. Bu özne yaratım sürecinde, arzuları hadım edilmiş Odipal özne sağlıklı, normal bireyi belirleyen toplumsal standart olarak kabul edilir. Bu Odipal normun dışına çıkan, arzunun akışkanlığının hala aktif olduğu özneler ise marjinal, sağlıklı, sapkın ya da normal olmayan olarak etiketlenir ve dışlanır.

Deleuze ve Guattari, kapitalizmin kapitalist yaratım sürecinde yaptığı arzunun akışkanlığı üzerindeki düzenlemelerin iki eğilimden oluştuğunu ileri sürer: paranoyak ve şizofrenik eğilimler. Arzunun üzerindeki paranoyak yatırımlar, aslında yeniden-yerli yurtlulaştırma eylemine maruz bırakılıp olumlu yönünü yitirdiği tekilci, yerleşik (sedentary) ve faşist eğilimlerdir. Şizofrenik yatırımlar ise, kapitalizmin arzuyu yeniden kodlayabilmek için yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırdığı noktaya ortaya çıkan çoğulcu, çok sesli, göçebe ve özgürlükçü eğilimlerdir. Deleuze ve Guattari'ye göre, paranoya ve şizofreni organsız bedenler üzerinde farklı amaçlara hizmet ederler. Biri organsız bedenler üzerindeki arzuyu sınırlayıp indirgerken diğeri arzunun yenilikçi gücünü olumlar. Bu nedenle organsız bedenler kapitalizmin paranoyak kolunda birer baskı alanına dönüşürken, şizofrenik kolunda birer özgürlük alanıdır.

Geç kapitalizmin psikanalizle olan bağı ve kapitalist sistemdeki bu paranoya şizofreni ilişkisi, Deleuze ve Guattari'yi "şizoanaliz" olarak adlandırdıkları yeni bir okuma yöntemi edinmeye yönlendirir. Şizoanaliz, kapitalizme hizmet eden psikanalitik okumaya karşı alternatif bir okuma şeklidir. Psikanaliz, her ilişki türünü anne-baba-çocuk üçgenine indirgeyerek ve arzunun olumsuzlanmasına göre yorumlarken, şizoanaliz arzunun akışkanlığını kazandığı noktaları, kapitalist sistemdeki şizofrenik kaçış çizgilerini takip etmeyi amaçlar. Bu bağlamda şizoanaliz ya tıpkı içkin distopyanın yaptığı gibi yeni dünyalar, yeni insanlar yaratmaya, ya da kapitalist sistemin Odipal kısılacısından kurtulmayı başaran şizo öznelerin dünyayı ve kendilerini yeniden keşfedişlerini izlemeye çalışır (*Anti-Oedipus* 35). Yani, arzu akışlarını takip eder. Şizoanalizin bu olumlu özelliğinin, içkin distopya ile örtüşmesi sebebiyle bu çalışma, şizoanalizi okuma yöntemi olarak benimsemiştir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmada ele alınan içkin distopya

örneklerinde, şu an içinde yaşamakta olduğumuz distopik toplumdaki pürtüklü yüzeylerin nasıl kayganlaştırıldığı, Odipal öznelerin nasıl oluşlara ve şizolara dönüştüğü, dilin nasıl üzerinde kurulan güç unsurlarından kurtularak minör bir dile dönüştüğü ve tüm bunların bu metinlerde nasıl işlendiğini irdelenir. Bir başka deyişle, dysterritory tanımından da anlaşılacağı gibi distopyanın nasıl kendi kendini panzehiri olabildiği gösterilir.

Bu teorik çerçevenin ardından üçüncü bölümde Margaret Atwood'un *MaddAddam* üçlemesinin bu hedefler doğrultusunda şizoanalitik okuması yapılmaktadır. Atwood'un *Antilop ve Flurya*, *Tufan Zamanı* ve *Maddaddam* romanlarından oluşan bu üçlemesinde, tam olarak Deleuze'ün "denetim toplumu" olarak adlandırdığı geç kapitalizmin egemenliği altında uluslararası şirketlerin devlet kavramından daha güçlü olmaya başladığı bir toplum resmedilir. Bu denetim toplumunda artık ulus-devletlerde görülen aşkın bir güç kaynağının yerini, büyük şirketler almış, genetik bilim son derece ilerlemiş ve yalnızca bu şirketlere hizmet eder hale gelmiş, doğal kaynaklar tüketildiği için yapay gıdalar üretilmeye başlanmıştır. Şirket kapitalizmi olarak da adlandırılabilir geç kapitalizmin egemenliği altındaki bu toplum, pürtüksüz uzamların (smooth space) yerli-yurtlulaştırma hareketiyle pürtüklü uzamlara (striated space) dönüştürülmesine şahit olur. Pürtüklü uzamların oluşturulmasında öncelikle içeri-dışarı ikili karşıtlığı rol alır. Toplum, Compounds ve Pleeblands olarak ikiye ayrılmıştır. Compounds, bu büyük şirketlerin hem yaşam hem de çalışma/üretim alanlarının bir arada olduğu kompleksler iken ve bünyesinde yalnızca daha üst tabakaya ait olduğunu ileri sürdükleri kendi çalışanlarını barındırırken, Pleeblands bu tabaka dışında kalan kadınlar, göçmenler, evsizler gibi marjinalleştirilmiş halk yerleştirilmiştir. Bu iki uzam arasındaki içeri/dışarı karşıtlığı, içeri yakasını oluşturan Compounds'un son derece güvenilir, dışarıyı temsil eden Pleeblandlerin ise tehlikeli olduğu düşüncesi üzerine kurulur. Bu iki uzam arasında geçiş yasaklanmıştır. Her ne kadar böyle bir ayırım yaratılsa da Atwood'un her iki uzamı da anlatı yöntemleriyle hem içerden hem dışardan bakış açılarıyla aynı anda göstermesi, aslında her iki uzamın da eşit derecede hiyerarşik ve kodlayıcı yapıya sahip olduğu gözlemlenir. Her iki uzamda da çok sesliliğe, olumlu farklılıklara yer

yoktur, bireysel keskin bir homojenliğe mahkum edilmiştir. Örneğin, Compounds'ta evler, okullar, hastaneler ve hatta insanlar da dahil herşey şirketlere aittir. Her ne kadar bireyleri görünürde baskı altında tutan, özgürlüklerini kısıtlayan herhangi bir aygıt görünmüyor olsa da tüm hayatları cep telefonları, parmak izleri veya bilgisayarları yoluyla denetim altında tutulmaktadır. Atwood'un çizdiği bu distopik günümüz toplumunda, sosyal hayatla içiçe geçmiş olan kapitalist üretim, tam olarak aksiyomatiğe göre gerçekleşmektedir. Özellikle ilaç şirketlerinin işleme şekli tam bir yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma ve yeniden yerli-yurtlulaştırma döngüsüne ışık tutar niteliktedir. Tamamen kapitalist kar amacı güden bu şirketler, hastalıkları laboratuvar ortamında üretmekte, bu hastalıkların tedavisi için ürettikleri ilaçlarla bu hastalıkların sürekliliğini sağlamakta ya da yeni hastalıkların ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Dolayısıyla bireylerin aldığı her ilaç bir sonraki alacağı ilacı garantilemektedir. Bir başka deyişle, bu şirketler bilimi kapitalist üretkenliği artıran birer pürtüklü uzama dönüştürmüştür. Yine benzer şekilde, HelthWyzer adlı şirketin genetik bilimi kötüye kullanmasıyla ürettiği yapay kahveler için açılan Happicupa kahve zincirleri, küçük esnafı yok olmaya mahkum etmektedir.

Deleuze ve Guattari'nin savunduğu gibi, her pürtüklü uzam pürtüksüz uzamlara dönüştürülmeye elverişlidir, nitekim Atwood'un distopik toplumunda bu büyük şirketlerin yaratmış olduğu pürtüklü uzamlar içten yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma eylemine maruz bırakılır. Dolayısıyla her ne kadar tüm hiyerarşik ve denetimci uzamlar tamamiyle kaygan yapıya sahip olmasa da, Pleeblandlerde ortaya çıkan Gardeners ve Compounds içinde oluşan devrimci bilim adamları gibi alternatif gruplar tarafından bu uzamlar içerisinde alternatif pürtüksüz uzamlar yaratılır. Gardeners, kapitalist kar amacıyla hayvan türlerini tehlikeye sokan, genetikle oynayarak yalnızca insanların ihtiyaçlarına hitap edecek hayvan türleri üreten, ilaç sektörü ile insanları ölüme mahkum eden bir insan-merkezci sisteme karşı, doğayı ve doğadaki tüm canlıları eşit gören ve koruyan, vejeteryan ve barışçı bir gruptan oluşmakta, bu grup yalnızca Pleeblandlerde ötekileştirilmiş insanlar değil, aynı zamanda Compounds'ta diğerlerinden daha avantajlı bir konuma sahip olduğu halde içinde bulunduğu sistemde olumlu değişiklikler yaratmak isteyen

insanlardan da oluşmaktadır. Benzer şekilde Paradise Project adı altında Compounds'taki bilim adamlarının oluşturduğu grup da benzer özellikler taşımakta, bilimi kapitalist bir silah olarak sömüren bu sisteme karşı kendi silahını kullanarak içten yıkmayı amaç edinmiştir. Bu grupların yarattığı uzamları pürtüksüz kılan şey, şirket kapitalizminin yarattığı toplumsal kodlamaları ve hiyerarşileri reddederek, güç merkezlessiz yalnızca özgürlüğe ulaşmanın ortak payda olduğu, tüm renklerin ve seslerin kabul gördüğü birer direnç alanı yaratmalarıdır.

Bu tür pürtüksüz direniş uzamlarının yaratılması, kapitalist özne yaratımında pıhtılaştırılan arzu akışlarını yeniden canlandırmaya elverişli bir ortam sağlar. Şirket kapitalizminin uysal, özgürlükçü ve yaratıcı gücünü yitirmiş bireyler yaratması, Odipal babaları sayesinde gerçekleşir. Bu üçlemede arzuyu hadım eden Odipal babalar, Zeb ve Adam'ın babası The Rev, Toby'nin patronu Blanco ve Jimmy'nin babası tarafından temsil edilir. Bu temsiller arasından en ilginç aynı zamanda PetrOleum adlı petrol üreten bir şirketin kilisesinde papazlık yapan the Rev'dir. The Rev, adeta kapitalizm ve Odipal yasa arasındaki ilişkiyi karikatürise eder şekilde, dualarında günahlarının affedilmesi gibi şeyler için değil petrol için dua etmekte, hem çekirdek ailesinde bir baba olarak hem de kilisede bir papaz olarak kapitalist doktrinleri aşlamaya çalışarak sisteme baş kaldırmayacak bireyler yetiştirmeyi amaçlar. Bu Deleuze ve Guattari'nin, "ne zaman arzu ihanete uğratılsa, lanetlenirse, içkinlik düzleminden koparılsa, arkasında bir papaz vardır" (*Anti-Oedipus* 154) ifadesine ışık tutar niteliktedir.

Bu şirket kapitalizmi altındaki denetim toplumlarında her ne kadar sürekli arzu Odipalleştirmeye yönelik girişimler olsa da bu şizofrenik kaçış çizgileri çizmeye bir engel değildir. Toplumun bastırılmaya çalışılan çok renkliliği ve çoğulluğu her zaman açığa çıkarılmayı bekleyen bir güç olarak beklemektedir. Bu üçlemede nitekim, geç kapitalizmin Odipal özne üretimine olan en büyük darbe onun en büyük silahı olan bilimden gelir. Crake başta olmak üzere bir takım devrimci bilim adamları, sürekli sömürü ve üretim üzerine dayalı bu sistemin öznelerine karşı yeni bir özne kavramı yaratmaya girişirler. Bu projenin fikir babası Crake de özneyi aşkınlık düzlemine çeken tüm mikrofaşist eğilimlerinden arındırarak yeni bir insan kavramı yaratır. Crakers olarak yarattığı bu yeni

insanlar, din, dil, ırk, cinsiyet, güce özenme, hiyerarşiye duyulan arzu gibi tüm özelliklerinden arındırılmıştır. Bu alternatif özne yaratımı dışında, bu üçlemede kapitalizm içerisinde üretilen kalıplaşmış standartlardan uzaklaşarak göçebe kaçış çizgileri ve oluşlar ortaya çıkar. Bunlardan en belirginini, bu distopik toplumun en büyük sıkıntılarında insan merkeziliğe karşı getirilen minor-oluş ve hayvan-oluştur. Romanın ana karakterlerinden Jimmy'nin minor-oluş sürecine girmesini sağlayan, onun ontolojik konumuna sıkı sıkıya tutunmuş tavrından yavaş yavaş uzaklaşmaya çalışmasıdır. Jimmy, insanın doğadaki tüm canlılardan daha üstün sayıldığı ve tüm canlıların hizmet etmek için varıldığı bir söylemin en somut ürünüdür. Crakerların yaratılması ve dünyayı ele geçiren salgınla birlikte bu ontolojik konumu güvende tutan çizgisel zaman anlayışı yok olmuştur. Gelecek artık insanın üstünlüğüne dayalı aşkın bir gelecek değil, belirsizliklerden oluşan bir yoğunluktur. Bir bakıma Paradise Project, distopik toplumu yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırarak organsız bedenlere dönüştürmüştür. Organsız bedenlerin bu kaotik yoğunluğu, her ne kadar başta Jimmy için travmatik sonuçlar doğursa da, doğayla ve doğadaki tüm canlılarla daha önce gerçekleştiremediği ilişkiler kurmaya başlaması, insan merkezci bakış açısından uzaklaşarak bir minör-oluşa doğru ilerlemesini sağlar. Benzer şekilde Toby karakterinde de insan-merkezci söyleme alternatif olarak hayvan-oluş sürecinin getirdiği yoğunluklar ve olumlanan arzu akışları gözlemlenir. Toby, kadınların ve hayvanların bir "et" olarak görüldüğü toplumda başından beri marjinalite itelenmiş bir karakterdir, ancak içinde barındırdığı özgürlükçü enerji ve arzu akışları Odipalleştirilerek sessizliğe mahkum kılınmıştır. Toby'nin Gardeners olarak adlandırılan alternatif direniş grubuna katılması, onun olumsuzlanan tüm potansiyelini yeniden keşfedip yalnızca kendisi için değil tüm hayvanlar, kadınlar ve Crakerlar için yaratıcı bir güze çevirmesine sebep olur. Toby'nin hayvan-oluşu en net şekilde arılarla kurduğu yakını ilişkide gözlemlenir. Onun hayvan-oluşu, onun arılarla konuşması, onların bakımını üstlenmesinde ya da onlar gibi davranmasında değil, arıların ontolojik statüsünü insanın ontolojik statüsünden ayırt edemeyecek bir dünya görüşünü farkında olmadan benimsemeye ve yaşatmaya başlamasında yatar.

Atwood, bu yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırma hareketini dilin kullanımında da sergiler. Crakerların yaratılması, yalnızca Odipal özneye bir alternatif oluşturmakla kalmaz, aynı zamanda bu Odipal öznelere içine mahkum edildikleri ve onları hadım eden çoğunlukçu dile de içten bir darbe indirir. Farklı bir ontolojik düzlemde konumlandırabileceğimiz Crakerların kullanmakta olduğu dil aslında, çoğunlukçu dilin yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırılmış, kendi dinamiklerine yabancılaştırılmış bir versiyondur. Bu dil, metafizik köklerinden arındırılmış, ikili karşıtlıkları ya da aşkınlık bildiren kavramları ifade edebilecek hiçbir göstergeye sahip değildir. Kavramı olmayan hiçbirşeyin bu dilde karşılığı yoktur. Dolayısıyla Crakerların tüm mikrofaşist eğilimlerden arındırıldığı düşünülürse bu dil de tüm mikrofaşist ve aşkın eğilimlerden arındırılmış alternatif bir dildir. Ancak bu üçlemede dile çokluğunu ve kişisel olmayan doğasını yeniden kazandıran, Atwood'un sıklıkla kullandığı serbest dolaylı anlatım tekniğidir. Bu teknik, farklı bilinç akışlarını birbirinden ayırt edilemeyecek şekilde sunarak, çoğunlukçu dildeki köreltilen anlaşılabilir bilinçakışı ve canlı dinamikleri yeniden hayata geçirir.

Üçüncü bölümde bu şekilde Atwood'un üçlemesinde distopik bir şirket egemenliği altındaki denetim toplumunun hem distopik yönleri hem de kendine çizdiği kaçış çizgileri, yani dysterritory'yi nasıl resmettiği ele alınırken, dördüncü bölümde ise China Mieville'in Baslag üçlemesinin ilk romanı olan *Perdido Sokağı İstasyonu* odak noktasıdır. Bu bölümde üçlemenin tamamının değil, yalnızca ilk romanının ele alınma sebebi, Atwood'un aynı olay örgüsünü işleyen ve ortak karakterleri çoğunlukta olan üçlemesine karşın, bu üçlemede her romanda birbirinden bağımsız olay örgülerinin ele alınması nedeniyle bu çalışmanın çizdiği kuramsal çerçeveye en uygun ele alabilmek için kısıtlamaya gidilmesidir. *Perdido Sokağı İstasyonu*, Bas-Lag olarak adlandırılan dünyada Yeni Crobuzon şehrinde geçmektedir. Yeni Crobuzon şehri, Atwood'un dünyasından farklı olarak, ekonomik işbirliklerinin eşit derecede ön planda olduğu sosyal, etnik ve coğrafi yapısı açısından son derece melez, şehir-devletince yönetilen bir metropolistir. Her ne kadar politik yapısı açısından bir şehir-devleti olarak görünse de aslında melez yapısı sebebiyle globalleşmenin ve geç kapitalizmin somut bir örneği olan Yeni Crobuzon, disiplin toplumundan denetim toplumuna geçme aşamasında olan

günümüz Avrupa ülkelerini anımsatır niteliktedir. Bu toplumda disipline edici ve düzenleyici devlet aygıtları kullanılmaya devam eder, ancak ilginç şekilde adeta bu geçişi karikatürise eder şekilde bu aygıtlar tıpkı denetim toplumlarında olduğu gibi geç kapitalizmin üretkenliğine hizmet eder. Aslında bir bakıma, bu devlet aygıtları global toplumun melez yapısını yeniden-yerliyurtlulaştırmaya, üzerindeki arzu akışlarını pıhtılaştırmaya uğraşır. Çünkü melezlik kendi içinde bir çokluğu, hareketliliği ve devrimci gücü temsil eder. Aslında bütün roman bu melez yapının, bir yandan uzamların oluşturulmasında, özne ve dil yaratımında nasıl devlet aygıtlarınca baskılanarak yaratıcı ve yenilikçi gücünün baskılanıp dondurulmaya çalışılırken, diğer yandan bu gücün ister istemez nasıl bu baskılanmış yönlerini nasıl yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırdığını anlatır.

Yeni Crobuzon'un melez yapısının en belirgin gözlemlendiği yer, şehrin köksapçı (rhizomatic) yapısıdır. Devlet aygıtları bu melez yapı üzerinde her ne kadar toplum üzerinde ayrımcı ve hiyerarşiye dayalı pürtüklü uzamlar kurmaya çabalar. Dolayısıyla her etnik grup birbirinden kültürel, sosyoekonomik ve dilsel anlamda keskin sınırlarla ayrılmakta, etnik kökenlerine göre sosyal hiyerarşide statüleri belirlenmekte ve bu ayırım mekansal ayrımlara dönüştürülmeye çalışılmaktadır. Örneğin, insanlar Perdido Sokağı İstasyonu çevresinde merkezi ve refah düzeyi daha yüksek bir bölgede konumlandırılırken, Khepri topluluğu Creekside ve Kinken gibi gecekondulu mahallesi denilebilecek bölgelerde, Garuda topluluğu Spatters, Vodyanoi topluluğu Kelltree gibi endüstriyel ve fakir bölgelere yerleştirilmişlerdir. Ancak her ne kadar devlet aygıtı, böyle bölümlenme ve ayırma yoluyla toplumda pürtüklü uzamlar yaratmaya çalışsa da, Yeni Crobuzon'un melez yapısı tüm bu yerli-yurtlulaştırma eylemlerini kaçınılmaz olarak yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırır. New Crobuzon, öylesine köksapçı bir yapıya sahiptir ki en zengin mühitle en fakir muhit dipdibedir ve bunlar arası geçişler yasak olsa da kaçınılmazdır. Dolayısıyla her pürtüklü uzam aslında kayganlaştırmaya son derece müsaittir ve hatta pürtüksüz uzama dönüştürülmesi önlenemez derecede olasıdır. Bu yüzden New Crobuzon, romanda sıklıkla “melez uzam” olarak adlandırılır ve bu yapısı en somut şekilde romana adını da veren Perdido Sokağı İstasyonu'yla resmedilir. Perdido Sokağı İstasyonu, tüm şehrin kanallarını,

sokaklarını birbirine bağlayan bir bağ, “Yeni Crobuzon’un merkezi [...] şehrin kalbi” (*Perdido* 22) olarak tanımlanır. Şehrin merkezinin temsil ettiği köksapçı, melez yapı aslında şehrin tüm köşelerini de temsil eder ve direnişçi pürüksüz uzamların ortaya çıkmasını kolaylaştırır. Bir başka deyişle, aslında Yeni Crobuzon gibi geç kapitalist global toplumların bu kendiliğinden melez yapısı, her ne kadar bölümleyici güçlere maruz kalsa da her zaman kaçış çizgileri çizilmeye eğilimlidir.

Bu durum, özne yaratım sürecinde de gözlemlenir. Toplum, böcek kafalı insan vücutlu Khepriler, insan-bitki karışımı Cactaeler, yarı insan yarı kuş Garudalar gibi birçok farklı melez ırktan gelen insanlardan oluşur. Bu melezliğin kendi içinde varolan çokluk, yoğunluk ve akışkanlık, kapitalist sosyal makina için bir tehdit oluşturur, bu nedenle bu melezlik yani çoklu farklılıklar sürekli ikili karşıtlıklara indirilmeye çalışılır, toplumlar arasında gerçekte varolmayan nefret tohumları ekilerek bu düşmanlıkla düzen sağlanmaya uğraşılır. Bu toplumda melezlik, utanılacak ve sosyal statüde daha düşük gösterecek bir özellik olarak içselleştirilecek söylemler yaratılır. Bu söylemler, her toplumun kendi içerisinde Odipalleşme süreciyle toplumun bireyelerine aşılır. Fakat melezliğin içinde barındırdığı direnişçi potansiyel her zaman açığa çıkmaya hazırdır ve çoğu zaman bu Odipalleşme sürecine direnir. Örneğin, devlet aygıtları, suçlu olduğunu düşündükleri bireylerin bedenlerini melezleştirerek cezalandırır, Remade adını verdikleri bu yeni ırkı gerek duydukları farklı işlerde çalıştırlar. Bu cezalandırma adı altında yapılan işlem aslında kapitalist özne yaratımı ve kapitalist üretime bir örnek teşkil eder. Bireyler daha suçları kanıtlanmadan bile bu melezleştirme işlemine maruz tutulurlar, çünkü bu ceza yöntemi olarak uygulanan melezleştirme işlemi sadece melezliğin olumlu potansiyelini olumsuzlamakla kalmaz aynı zamanda kapitalist üretim için gerekli olan sürekliliği ve hareketliliğe de olanak sağlar. İronik şekilde, bu negatif melezleştirme işlemi, kapitalizmin özne üretimindeki şizofrenik kaçış çizgisi olasılıklarına ışık tutar niteliktedir. Her ne kadar melez birey aslında yeniden-yerliyuurtlulaştırmak amacıyla birer organsız bedene çevrilmiştir. Organsız bedenler içinde bu amacı tersine çevirecek tüm gücü barındırır. Nitekim romanda da böyle karakterlere sıklıkla rastlanır. Örneğin

Motley, Remaking süreciyle oluşturulmuş melez bir bireydir, ancak kapitalist sosyal makinanın amaçladığı gibi yalnızca kapitalist çıkarlara hizmet edip toplum içinde dışlanmış ve marjinalleştirilmiş bir hayatı yaşamaktansa, melez bedenini olumlayarak tüm potansiyelleri kullanarak kapitalist sisteme karşı bir alternatif oluşturur, bir başka deyişle kapitalist sistemin işleyişini kendine çevirir. Benzer şekilde melezliği sebebiyle Yeni Crobuzon'da ve kadınlığı sebebiyle kendi Kehpri toplumunda dışlanan Lin, melez bedeninin gücünü alternatif bir sanat akımı oluşturmak için açığa çıkarır ve sistem içerisinde konumlandırılan statüsünden bir kaçış çizgisi çizmeyi başarır, bedeni gibi yarattığı sanat da melezdir ve bu onun en açık "direniş" aracıdır.

Çokluğun ikili zıtlıklara çevrildiği en önemli alanlardan birinin de dil olduğu düşünülürse, melezliğin içinde barındırdığı özgürlükçü güçten çoğunlukçu dilin kaçabilmesi mümkün değildir. Yeni Crobuzon'da dilin yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırılması öncelikle The Weaver olarak adlandırılan melez ırkın, çoğunlukçu dili şiirselleştirirerek, onu bir kurallar bütününe dönüştüren sözdizimi, anlambilimi, gramer, büyük küçük harf uyumu ve noktalama gibi içsel mekanizmalarını terk ederek o dil içinde yeni alternatif bir dil oluşturulmasıyla sağlanır. Bu aslında dilin temsil ettiği ve içinde barındırdığı baskın güç merkezlerine olan bir başkaldırı olarak düşünülebilir. Benzer şekilde tıpkı Atwood gibi Mieville'in de kullandığı serbest dolaylı anlatımla sağlanır. Romandaki serbest dolaylı anlatım kullanımı, tıpkı birbirine geçmiş ve ayırt edilemez melez bedenler ve uzamlar gibi birbirinden ayırt edilemez bilinç akışlarını sunarak dilin gerçek gücüne yani çokluğuna ulaşmasını sağlar.

Bu analizler dikkate alındığında Atwood ve Mieville'in eserleri her ne kadar çizdikleri toplum dinamikleri açısından küçük farklılıklar gösterse de, her iki yazar da dystterritory'nin geç kapitalizmle oluşan distopik yönünün nasıl kendine çevrilebileceğini göstererek, aslında günümüz toplumlarında alternatif yaşamların ve oluşların yaratılabileceği yenileyici gücün ve arzu akışkanlığının her zaman mevcut olduğunu gösteren birer içkin distopya örnekleri sunarlar. Metinlerinde benimsedikleri bu umut verici tavır, onları birer minör yazar, eserlerini de birer minör edebiyat olarak görmemize olanak sağlar. Her iki yazarda bariz şekilde

içinde buldukları kapitalist sisteme ve sosyopolitik atmosfere olan eleştirel duruşlarını, baskın politikaya karşı azınlıkçı bir politika benimseyerek gösterirler. Bu onların distopik metinlerine kaçınılmaz olarak politik bir boyut kazandırır. Bu metinlerde bireysel olarak karakterlerin yaşadıkları ön planda değil, arkaplanı oluşturan sosyo-ekonomik ve politik konumlar ön plandadır. Dolayısıyla metinlerdeki her sözcelem aslında kolektif bir sözcelemin parçasıdır. Bunlar günümüz distopik toplumlarında, marjinalleştirilmiş, susturulmuş alternatif seslerin duyulmasını sağlayan kolektif girişimlerdir. Bu kolektif yapı, ayrıca çoğunlukçu dilin ikili karşıtlıklarla bastırıldığı, dilin doğasında bulunan çokluğu ve bireysel olmayan yönü çıkarmalarıyla daha da güçlenir. Bu bakımdan bu içkin distopya örnekleri toplumun tıkanıklıklarını açan birer yersiz-yurtsuzlaştırıcı vektör görevini üstlenirken, bu içkin distopya yazarları da Deleuze'ün deyiimiyle toplumu tedavi eden birer hekim görevini üstlenirler.

TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU / THESES PHOTOCOPY PERMISSION FORM

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 :

Adı / Name :

Bölümü / Department :

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) :

.....

.....

.....

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide and photocopy whether all or part of my thesis providing that cited.
2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) / Release the entire work for Middle East Technical University access only. (With this option your work will not be listed in any research sources, and no one outside METU will be able to provide both electronic and paper copies through the Library.)
3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of one year.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date