

THE ANGRY YOUNG NARRATIVES IN ENGLISH DYSTOPIA

JAYA PRATHA RADHAKRISHNAN

Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development, Sriperumbudur

Abstract: *This paper investigates the ‘Angry Young Man’ archetype within two seminal dystopian novels: George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four and Margaret Atwood’s Oryx and Crake. By delving into the fundamental aspects of dystopianism, the study examines how Winston Smith and Glenn embody this archetype within their respective dystopian contexts. Through this analysis, the paper highlights the interplay of dystopian politics and the resistance embodied by these characters. The aim is to elucidate how Orwell and Atwood deploy these rational and intellectual figures to critique and reflect upon the political and societal constructs of their imagined worlds.*

Keywords: *Angry Young Man, Dystopia, Nineteen Eighty Four, Oryx and Crake, Totalitarianism*

1. Introduction

“Every novel begins with a ‘what if’ and then sets forth its axioms”, Margaret Atwood writes in her essay “Writing Oryx and Crake” (2003). Dystopian fiction often emerges from these ‘what if’ scenarios, shaped by an author’s observations of the past and present, and their contemplation on the future. The apprehensive predictions about the dangerous interplay of science and politics that were prevailing before the twentieth century proved to be true and disastrous at the sequences of the world wars. The age that followed, marked by a profound scepticism toward science and technology, revealed the perilous fusion and outcomes of science, politics, and capitalism—arguably one of the most destructive combinations. This disillusionment laid the groundwork for the emergence of dystopian novels preferably in the post-war era.

Dystopia, often termed an anti-utopia, denotes a social setting marked by extreme oppression and a fundamental unsuitability for human survival. J.S. Mill (1988) describes such settings as “too bad to be practicable”. While Marxist critics regard utopian literature as a means to “empower meaningful political action in the present,” dystopian literature transcends simple escapism, embodying “an escape, or attempted escape, to history, which is to say, to the world of contingency, conflict, and uncertainty” (Booker 1994: 3-4). This genre serves as both historically informative and reflective, addressing the issues and patterns of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries—ranging from racism and capitalism to communism, fascism, totalitarianism, colonialism, and digitalism. As “a form of political and politicised writing,” dystopian fiction provides a fictional prognosis on contemporary issues and conflicts (Stock 2018: 14).

More than a work of imagination, analysis and prognosis, dystopian fiction remains a repertoire of ideologies from history and politics, carefully inspected and logistically interpreted. The chosen works of fiction, George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* present a dystopian culture that causes the chief characters to be the angry young men, forlorn and exasperated, at the same time, trying to be rebellious. *Nineteen Eighty Four* presents Oceania, a technologically advanced totalitarian society, which is totally under the surveillance of Big Brother, a technological figure, and his Inner Party. Oceanian culture and the political ideologies are formulated by Orwell based on his understanding and observation of evolutionary politics and revolutionary technologies around his time. *Oryx and Crake* poses a scientific dystopia where Atwood presents the extremity of the twenty-first century lifestyle based on the population's exposure to and impact from science, technology, media and artificialities. This is evidenced by cases such as genetically engineered *pigoons* for human organ harvesting and the virtual world called *Paradice* which imitates the concept of idyllic paradise. *Nineteen Eighty Four*'s protagonist Winston Smith and *Oryx and Crake*'s antagonist Crake are observed as the angry young men of their respective societies under study. Their personality remains in conflict with the social determinants of their dystopian setting, enabling each of them to react as an angry young man, "who will not rub his nose in the golden trough", but will be "bitterly contemptuous of those whom he indicts of cruel insensibility" (Weiss 1960: 287). The phrase "Angry Young Men" was popularised during the 1956 promotional campaign for John Osborne's play *Look Back in Anger*, when the Royal Court Theatre's press officer employed the term to encapsulate the theme (2012); the phrase is likely derived from Leslie Allen Paul's autobiography, *Angry Young Man*, published in the year 1951. Furthermore, J. D. Scott, a journalist for *The Spectator*, characterised the writings of the young British writers of the 1950s, referring to them as *The Movement* which distanced itself from the sombre discussions and poetic sensibilities of the 1940s, instead crafting works to navigate through the corrupt world (Scott 1954). The phrase was then used to describe a group of writers, who much like their characters in their works, expressed cynicism and alienation towards post-war British society. They are the personalities "bored by the despair of the Forties, not much interested in suffering, and extremely impatient of poetic sensibilities". (Oxford 2004: 998). The *angry young man* theme extends beyond John Osborne's era, as reflected in these dystopian works, each unique to its specific setting and context.

Nineteen Eighty Four is a dystopian fiction of the twentieth century, as it themes around totalitarianism with dictatorship, surveillance, lack of privacy, manipulation and class conflict. The Republic of Oceania functions under the Inner Party and the Inner Party operates under its ultimate headstrong digitised leader, Big Brother, who is known and seen only by the image representation of a pair of eyes, a heavy moustache and some "handsome features" and a phrase stating "BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU" (Orwell 2017: 11). Under the icon of Big Brother, the Inner Party decides what the people should know, do and even think. The party exercises absolute control over the lives of the people in Oceania through constant surveillance, the manipulation of truth, psychological repression and the

subtle enforcement of compliance with its demands and doctrines. Also, it has the ultimate control of Oceania's past and present. Oceania has its newly emerging language system *Newspeak*, which has launched a new set of words, eliminating any words that refer to freedom and choice. Oceania's history tends to be the result of its alterations in the present by the party. It is subject to change all the time as even its allies and foes are constantly swapped, altogether causing the people to go insane. Also the party seeks to control its residents' thoughts, emotions and expressions under the name of *thoughtcrime* and *facecrime*. Further, it exercises its rights by suddenly seizing anyone for such crimes without evidence or proof, rendering a person as *unimagined* or an *unperson*, thereby vaporising him/her from the society. The irrationality in Oceania as a result of totalitarianism is hinted at by Orwell through the calculation "two and two make five" (idem: 243). Winston Smith, who initially felt "a sense of complete helplessness", turns out to be *angry* and *young* as the plot progresses (ibid).

Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* exemplifies dystopian speculative fiction, delineating two contrasting worlds: the pre-catastrophic and the post-catastrophic. The pre-catastrophic world is divided into three distinct zones: the Compounds, where "the top people lived"; the Modules, which housed individuals of mediocre status; and the Pleeblands, where "the addicts, the muggers, the paupers, the crazies" with infections and diseases resided (Atwood 2003: 25-31). The elite Compounders, representing corporate capitalism, were the architects of a genetically engineered and scientifically overwhelming world. They shaped the media, culture, and lifestyle, influencing not only the Module dwellers and Pleeblanders but also their own class. This society, altogether, was characterised by an overabundance of choices—"too much hardware, too much software, too many hostile bioforms, too many weapons of every kind. And too much envy and fanaticism and bad faith" (idem: 32). The media and entertainment became inundated with obscenity and violence, leading to a culture where gruesomeness became the norm. The human body was redefined as, "executions were its tragedies, pornography was its romance" (idem: 98). In contrast to the protagonist Jimmy, who resigns himself to his fate, his friend Glenn, known later as Crake, emerges as the *angry young man* who actively challenges the societal order. Crake, disillusioned with the prevailing system, becomes the antagonist by planning and executing a catastrophe that eradicates the existing society and its flawed principles.

In the realm of select dystopian novels, two contrasting societies are depicted: one marked by excessive choice and extravagant freedom, and the other by a profound lack of choice and fundamental liberty. Despite their differences, both societies are characterised by dehumanisation, pervasive surveillance, a technologically driven way of life, pronounced class divisions, violence, paranoia, and mechanisms of control and manipulation. In both scenarios, the common populace is subjugated under the influence of capitalistic structures, where the intentions and actions of the ruling class are driven by the overarching system in which they operate. In these repressive frameworks, Winston Smith and Glenn symbolise the oppressed. The narratives highlight their efforts to assert their individuality—through their personal thoughts, desires, actions, and intentions—within a collectively suppressed society.

2. The rise and fall of a trailblazing *angry young man* in 1984

In a letter written to Julian Symons on 4 February, 1949, Orwell (1968: 475) described his *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as “a Utopia in the form of the novel”, and hinted that he had actually “ballsed it up”. The motive behind his writing of the novel is captured in his letter to Francis A. Henson on 16 June 1949:

My recent novel is NOT intended as an attack on Socialism or on the British Labour Party (of which I am a supporter) but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralised economy is liable and which have already been partly realised in Communism and Fascism. I do not believe that the kind of society I describe necessarily will arrive, but I believe (allowing of course for the fact that the book is a satire) that something resembling it could arrive. I believe also that totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals everywhere, and I have tried to draw these ideas out to their logical consequences. The scene of the book is laid in Britain in order to emphasise that the English-speaking races are not innately better than anyone else and that totalitarianism, if not fought against, could triumph anywhere. (idem: 502)

Winston Smith, the protagonist of the novel, was a thirty-nine-year-old man employed at the Ministry of Truth, known as *Minitrue*. Within the hierarchical structure of Oceania, Smith occupied a middle position, holding a role within the Inner Party. His income sufficed to meet his basic needs, and he resided in modest accommodations. At this point, Smith had not yet fallen out of favour with the Inner Party, but he wrestled with his own conscience. He maintained an “expression of quiet optimism” when visible to the telescreen, yet his genuine optimism surfaced only when he was out of its view (Orwell 2017: 14). Smith was well aware of the Party’s ideologies and adhered to them. He maintained a facade of optimism, exhibited hatred when required during events such as the *Two Minutes Hate*, refrained from discussing history erased by memory holes, and did not complain about hunger or food scarcity, instead relying on Victory Gin to alleviate his appetite. This approach mirrors the character in W.H. Auden’s “The Unknown Citizen” (1940: 19), where the citizen is portrayed as exemplary and compliant with societal expectations, yet the question of his personal happiness remains unaddressed. Despite Winston Smith’s ability to conform to the Inner Party’s ideologies and propaganda, he remained plagued by paranoia regarding thoughtcrime and facecrime in Oceania. He struggled to reconcile the logic of past and present, could not suppress his sexual urges, and continued to question the existence of the omnipotent figure of Big Brother. Professionally, Smith was engaged in altering and falsifying historical records, but this did little to mitigate the profound cognitive dissonance he felt. He recalled the suffering of his childhood, spent with his mother and younger sister, and recognized a similar anguish in his present life, where “the past was dead, the future was unimaginable” (Orwell 2017: 31).

As a resident of Oceania, Winston Smith experienced a profound sense of mental imprisonment, with his thoughts, gestures, expressions, speech, and actions all tightly controlled. This mental blockade was particularly apparent when he struggled to write more than the date in his diary. His suppressed thoughts, constrained by the Party’s ideologies, evolved into an “interminable restless monologue” over the years

(idem: 16). Smith developed a pervasive paranoia, convinced that the Party was always ready to get people at any moment through its extensive surveillance and accusations of *thoughtcrime*. This fear led him to mistrust everything, aware that the Party preferred to twist the truth in order to fit its needs. For him, the ultimate threat posed by the Party was not merely death but *total annihilation*, rendering their actions far more profound than death itself.

Winston Smith perceived Goldstein, Oceania's antagonist, as another *angry young man*, a more fervent and rebellious figure. Goldstein was characterised by his vehement criticism of Big Brother and the Party's dictatorship, and his advocacy for fundamental freedoms such as speech, press, assembly, and thought. During the *Two Minutes Hate* directed at Goldstein, Winston Smith found himself engulfed in a surge of anger similar to Goldstein's rebellious fervour, though his own feelings were more passive than Goldstein's. He could not escape participating in the *Two Minutes Hate*, which led him to a conflict of emotions - alternately despising and admiring Big Brother. He soon recognized that this existential anxiety stemmed from his passive approach: he had been merely striving to maintain his sanity rather than deeply confronting his thoughts and emotions. With this realisation, he began to express himself more openly through writing, understanding that, regardless of his loyalty to the Party, he was ultimately destined to face his fate under Big Brother at any time. His conscious attempt at writing in his diary records:

To the future or to the past, to a time when thought is free, when men are different from one another and do not live alone to a time when truth exists and what is done cannot be undone. From the age of uniformity, from the age of solitude, from the age of Big Brother, from the age of doublethink-greetings! (Orwell 2017: 32)

The emotional void in his life, the uncertainty surrounding his survival, the blurred lines between truth and falsehood, the absence of purpose, and the disconnect between his actions and their meaning all contributed to a deep-seated *mute protest* within him against his society. This unspoken discontent finally found expression with Julia's arrival in his life. He moved beyond passive diary writing and began taking decisive actions, drawing inspiration from Julia's *practical cunning*. The angry young man shifted his focus from dismantling minor structures to challenging the entire oppressive regime. He came to realise that hope lay not only with the proles but also within himself, understanding that the only way forward was to revolt against the Party. He elevated his animal instinct to have sex as a potent force capable of dismantling the Party. To him, Julia embodied a similar defiant spirit, sharing his anger at the regime and preferring a personal connection with Winston over allegiance to the Party. Thus, he prioritised emotion over rationality, embracing a revolutionary spirit to preserve his humanity in defiance of the regime. From that point onward, he became a driven man of action, intent on challenging the larger structure of Oceania. No longer plagued by frustration and regrets, he bolstered his resolve by meeting with O'Brien, whom he viewed as a *paragon of intelligence*. Additionally, he gained valuable insights into his society and its capitalist framework, attributed to poverty and ignorance, through Goldstein's book, which O'Brien had provided. This newfound knowledge, along with his plans with O'Brien, initially reassured

him of his sanity and led him to understand that “sanity is not statistical” (Orwell 2017: 190). As he endeavoured to restore sanity to Oceania, Winston Smith was confronted with the stark reality that the purpose of the party is to make the rational mad residents sane. Captured and arrested by the Inner Party, he was subjected to a meeting with O’Brien, who had previously orchestrated Smith’s understanding of the party’s history and motives. This meeting addressed Smith’s quest for the *why* in several critical ways. First, Smith was made to recognize that his individual mind was flawed, as memory and perspective are inherently subjective rather than objective. Second, the party’s objective was framed as achieving sanity, highlighting that “it is not easy to become sane” (idem: 220). Third, the party’s system was explained as not totalitarian in the conventional sense, with its mandate being “thou art” rather than “thou shall” (idem: 223). The party aimed to demonstrate that Smith’s perceived flaws stemmed from his own *intellectual inferiority*. Despite the extensive psychological manipulation, Smith’s resistance endured until he was subjected to severe violence. His defiance was ultimately broken when he falsely admitted that two and two made five, primarily to escape the inflicted pain.

The *angry young man* was swiftly reduced to nothingness, as his existence was verbally undermined by O’Brien’s declaration “you do not exist” (Orwell 2017: 227). He then demonstrated his party’s motive of power, showcasing its ability to effectuate a perfect conversion of individuals like Winston and Julia, who were deemed to embody *rebelliousness, deceit, folly, and dirty-mindedness* (ibid). Furthermore, Room 101 played a crucial role in this process, deconstructing Smith and reconstructing him to the point where he came to view any resistance to Big Brother and the Party as “the self-willed exile from the loving breast” (Orwell 2017: 260). Ultimately, he started loving Big Brother.

3. The catastrophe induced by the *angry young man* in *Oryx and Crake*

In her brief essay “Writing *Oryx and Crake*”, Margaret Atwood reflects on the connection between the creation of her novel and the historical tragedy of the September 11 attacks (Atwood 2003). Atwood discusses the challenge of crafting a fictional apocalypse while simultaneously witnessing a real-life catastrophe characterised by profound rage, violence, and destruction. This intersection of personal experience and historical events deeply influences her narrative, which centres on a cataclysmic event instigated by a disillusioned young man. The novel portrays a society marred by violence, disorder, and chaos, ultimately leading to widespread devastation and the extinction of humankind. In exploring the pre-apocalyptic world depicted in Margaret Atwood’s narrative, it aligns with Tom Moylan’s concept of a *critical utopia*, where the setting initially appears utopian but is marked by an inherent awareness of its limitations, thus preserving the utopian ideal while acknowledging its inherent flaws (Moylan 1986: 10). The central character, Snowman, previously known as Jimmy, reflects on his life before the cataclysm. He becomes aware of his trajectory towards the apocalypse, which has led him to a state of “existing and not existing” in his current predicament (Atwood 2013: 8).

Jimmy's upbringing was marked by a stark contrast between his parents' attitudes towards their society. His father was pragmatically aligned with the prevailing survival-of-the-fittest mentality, whereas his mother, disillusioned by the deteriorating state of society, expressed a refusal to partake in what she perceived as a meaningless existence (idem: 45). She regarded the scientific experiments conducted at *OrganInc Farms* by the Compounders, the societal divisions, and the pervasive surveillance and control exerted by the Corpsecorps men over the Modules and Compounds, as fundamentally *artificial* (idem: 31). As Jimmy matured, he recognized that his mother's disenchantment with society was shared by his close friend Crake, who grew out to be an influential scientist from the Compound. During their youth, Crake and Jimmy engaged in playing violent online games such as *Barbarian Stomp*, *Blood and Roses*, and *Extinctathon*, and were exposed to disturbing digital content, including electrocutions, live surgeries, executions, and suicides. While Jimmy's mother regarded Crake as "more adult than a lot of adults," Jimmy viewed him as a rational and logical person, noted for his style of *objective communication* (idem: 79). He observed that Crake demonstrated an exceptional understanding of games and media content, approaching them with an analytical mindset beyond mere participation. Crake's demeanour, marked by *cool slouchiness*, and his capacity to remain largely unaffected by his exposures contrasted sharply with Jimmy's own reactions. This nuanced characterization of Crake underscores his complex role in the narrative.

In the post-catastrophic world, Snowman was uniquely positioned to perceive the pervasive influence of Crake, manifesting in concepts such as *Crakedom*, *Crakiness*, and *Crakehood*, which permeated the remnants of society. While Snowman was referencing Crake and Oryx to the Crackers as the architects of a new world and new species, he now perceives a more nuanced understanding of Crake's motives. The *angry young man* persona that dominated Crake's adolescence becomes clearer to Snowman in retrospect. He began to comprehend the concepts of the *Great Rearrangement* and the *Great Emptiness* that Crake had envisioned, gaining insight into Crake's profound disillusionment with the inherent despair and suffering of human existence. This realisation underscores Snowman's growing grasp of Crake's intricate legacy and his own place within the altered world. Unlike the archetypal angry young man who grapples with his middle-class frustrations, Crake has emerged as a privileged figure of the elite, residing in the *Paradise* Compounds after completing his higher education. As a member of this exclusive enclave, Crake bore his *own scars* and *dark emotions* regarding humanity and survival. Crake's father, a humanist dedicated to promoting human welfare, was ultimately captured and killed by corporate forces. His efforts were largely unacknowledged by society. In light of his father's tragic fate, Crake adopted a calculated and detached approach to societal issues, while maintaining a profound commitment to the planet. His approach was marked by a dispassionate objectivity, extending even to his views on love, which he dismissed as merely a "hormonally induced delusional state", and sex, which he regarded as a "mechanical joke" (idem: 225-335).

In his capacity at the Institute, Crake introduced Jimmy to the scientific projects he spearheaded as emblematic of the *wave of the future*, revealing the underlying

secret units integral to these initiatives. For Jimmy, these revelations appear as an enigmatic *phantasmagoria*, while for Crake, they are corrupting sources of mankind that should be ultimately discarded. In his research facility known as *Paradise*, Crake concentrated on two principal concepts: human immortality and human sexual gratification. He also engaged in the practice of altering individuals' identities by erasing their pasts and providing them with new personas. To Jimmy, Crake appeared as a figure of immense power and influence, described metaphorically as *the alpha wolf*, *the silver-black gorilla* and *the head lion*. This portrayal contrasted with Crake's true ambition, which was not merely to secure a prominent position within the Compounds but to effectuate a radical transformation for the planet through "the elimination of one generation" (idem: 261). Beyond the constructed environment of the Compounds, Crake established his own distinct artificial setting, complete with a fabricated sun and moon, to facilitate the creation of a new humanoid species. This endeavour was the culmination of seven years of intensive research. The resulting beings were designed with features and traits that Crake deemed essential, while deliberately excluding the characteristics he believed had "plagued humanity" (Atwood 2013:358). Crackers were a humanoid species characterised by their anti repellent skin, short lifespan, rapid growth, disease immunity, and benign nature. Their society was devoid of violence, rape, murder, jealousy, love, and lust. Their reproductive process was distinctive, involving four males and one female, and was conducted openly. This process stood in stark contrast to the covert practices, desires, and pleasures typically associated with human reproduction. These creations were intended to serve as idealised *floor models* of his critical utopian vision.

Despite Crake's considerable scientific achievements, his personal relationships revealed a contrasting dimension of his character. His triangular romantic partner, Oryx, viewed him as detached from everyday concerns, stating, "Crake lives in a higher world...He lives in a world of ideas. He is doing important things. He has no time to play" (idem: 368). While society, friends, and even his lover perceived Crake as a serious and intellectual scientist preoccupied with his ideas, they underestimated his true intentions. Crake's objectives were not merely to benefit humanity but to fundamentally alter the planet's condition. Contrary to the perception of him as a man driven by a *colossal ego*, Crake was, in fact, a misanthropic environmental advocate. Ultimately, Crake's vision culminated in the creation of the *Red Death*, a genetically engineered virus designed to eradicate the human population. On the day of the virus's release, Crake ended Oryx's life and was subsequently killed by Jimmy, thus enabling Jimmy to assume the role of the "King of the Crackery" (idem: 389).

4. Conclusion

Through the characters and their experiences, Orwell and Atwood provide critical insights into the ways dystopian societies manipulate and control their populations. In George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake*, surveillance operates as a central mechanism of control, though it manifests in markedly different ways. Orwell's narrative presents a regime of overt

surveillance, where the Party's monitoring is explicit and unrelenting, epitomised by the omnipresent figure of Big Brother. Conversely, Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* depicts surveillance through a more insidious and pervasive influence, where control is exerted subtly, through the manipulation of societal norms and consumer culture rather than through overt observation. Both novels examine the deep-seated anxieties and disillusionments arising from such regimes, revealing how different forms of surveillance impact personal freedom and societal norms. In both Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Atwood's *Oryx and Crake*, the dystopian settings are depicted through two markedly distinct approaches to technology and control. Orwell's narrative portrays technology as a transparent tool, explicitly designed to monitor and enforce discipline among the populace. The omnipresent surveillance apparatus of Oceania, embodied by Big Brother, serves as a constant reminder of the regime's watchful eye, ensuring that the inhabitants are acutely aware of their subjugation and the mechanisms of control. In contrast, Atwood's dystopian world operates through a more insidious use of technology and science. The societal control exercised by the corporate conglomerates in *Oryx and Crake* is subtle, causing the manipulation of individuals and society in ways that are not immediately apparent to the individuals affected.

Both authors utilise characters embodying the *angry young man* archetype to illuminate the underlying discontent and resistance within these dystopian regimes. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Winston Smith is presented as a rational protagonist, grappling with the pervasive influence of Big Brother and the distortions of reality propagated by the Party. His growing awareness of the regime's manipulations, particularly through the revelations in O'Brien's text, fuels his anger and resistance. Despite his fervent opposition to the Party's ideologies and his commitment to Julia, his eventual capture and subsequent torture in Room 101 strip him of his resolve. The profound psychological and physical torment he endures obliterates his defiance, leading to a complete relinquishment of his former beliefs and rendering his resistance futile. The ultimate erasure of his anger and ambition underscores a pervasive *sense of helplessness*, encapsulating the theme of totalitarian dominance. In Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake*, the antagonist Crake exhibits a distinctive approach in expressing his discontent compared to Winston Smith in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Crake's strategy is marked by a calculated passivity, maintaining a facade of quietude while meticulously surveilling the multifaceted layers of society—spanning the Compounds, Modules, and Pleeblands. His discontent, driven by a profound disdain for humanity, ultimately culminates in a catastrophic event aimed at eradicating the human species and initiating the rise of a new humanoid species.

Crake's method diverges significantly from Winston Smith's efforts in Oceania. Whereas Smith seeks to undermine the totalitarian regime by aligning himself with O'Brien, whom he perceives as a potential ally against the Party, Crake operates independently. As a prominent scientist within the Compounds, Crake wields considerable influence and devises his own plans for societal transformation, contrasting with his father's position, which was characterised by suspicion and mistrust of the corporate elites. Crake's radical actions reflect his

contempt for both the corporate elite and the general populace, positioning him as a figure whose ultimate resolution lies in the complete eradication of humanity rather than its reform. His portrayal as an *angry young man* culminates in the extinction of humankind, which represents his perceived solution to the flaws he identifies in the human society. In stark contrast, Winston Smith's trajectory results in a profound transformation. After enduring severe psychological and physical torture in Room 101, Smith's resistance is obliterated, and he is ultimately reconciled with the regime, embracing Big Brother and relinquishing his previous dissent. Smith's final acceptance of the Party's ideology reflects his tragic surrender to the totalitarian regime's power, where his earlier rebellious stance became nothing but a "cruel, needless misunderstanding" (Orwell 2017:260). Winston Smith's transformation from a frustrated individual into an "angry young man" is significantly influenced by his relationship with Julia. Initially, Smith's discontent remains largely confined to his solitary existence, where his frustrations are expressed in isolation. It is only through his connection with Julia that he evolves into a figure of active rebellion against the oppressive regime. In contrast, Crake, as depicted in Margaret Atwood's narrative, embodies the archetype of the *angry young man* from the outset. His disillusionment with society is evident from the beginning, and he demonstrates a mature, if not cynical, perspective on his surroundings. Crake's character is marked by an inherent cunning and a pronounced self-interest, distinguishing him from Smith's more reactive form of dissent.

Both authors portray their dystopian societies as deeply flawed. In *Oryx and Crake*, Atwood portrays a world characterised by consumerism and hedonism, driven by unchecked corporate power and a blend of totalitarianism, while in *Nineteen Eighty Four*, Orwell presents an outwardly disciplined utopian society, which was in fact fundamentally dystopian and irrational. These oppressive conditions incite the anger of their protagonists, who confront the injustices and insensitivities they experience. In George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty Four*, the narrative offers a critique of a totalitarian regime through the perspective of a socialist, while Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* examines corporate dystopianism through the actions of an antihumanist. Winston Smith, in Orwell's novel, harbours animosity towards the regime, but also exhibits a nuanced understanding of the oppressed individuals around him, feeling both empathy and pity for their helplessness. In contrast, Crake's resentment in Atwood's work extends beyond the corporations to include a broader disdain for humanity's ignorance and irresponsibility, holding both people and their destructive behaviours accountable for the state of the world.

The figures of Winston Smith and Crake, both representing the *angry young man* archetype, are placed in distinct dystopian worlds, and each is characterised by differing motives and approaches. Smith aspires to be a hero, striving for resistance and redemption, whereas Crake embraces a more villainous role, seeking to impose his own vision upon the world. The juxtapositions elucidate the divergent trajectories of these characters and their interactions with oppressive systems, offering insights into the complex interplay between personal resistance and systemic constraints.

References

- Atwood, Margaret. January 2003. "Perfect Storms: Writing Oryx and Crake", in *Book-of-the-Month Club/Bookspan* [Online]. Available: https://shirbegi.weebly.com/uploads/1/3/8/2/13820171/writing_oryx_and_crake_1.pdf [Accessed 2024, July 12].
- Atwood, Margaret. 2013. *Oryx and Crake*. London: Virago Press.
- Auden, Wystan Hugh. 1940 January 6. "The Unknown Citizen" in *The New Yorker* [Online]. Available: <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1940/01/06/the-unknown-citizen> [Accessed 2024, July 23].
- Booker, M. Keith. 1994. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Hargreaves, Tracy, Alice Ferrebe. 2012. "Introduction: Literature of the 1950s and 1960s" in *The Yearbook of English Studies* 42, pp. 1-12.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1988. *Public and Parliamentary Speeches – Part I – November 1850 – November 1868*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press [Online]. Available: <https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/kinzer-the-collected-works-of-john-stuart-mill-volume-xxviii-public-and-parliamentary-speeches-part-i> [Accessed 2024, July 10].
- Moylan, Tom. 1986. *Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination*. London: Methuen.
- Orwell, George. 2017. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. India: Penguin Classics.
- Orwell, Sonia, Ian Angus (eds.). 1968. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, vol.4*. London: Seeker & Warburg [Online]. Available: https://ia802204.us.archive.org/32/items/in.ernetdli.2015.86561/2015.86561.The-Collected-Essays-Journalism-And-Letters-Of-George-Orwell-Vol-Iv_text.pdf [Accessed 2024, July 19].
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 2004. Oxford University Press. [Online] Available: doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/95563. [Accessed 2024, July 25].
- Paul, Leslie. 1951. *Angry Young Man*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd. [Online]. Available: <https://libcom.org/history/angry-young-man-leslie-paul> [Accessed 2024, August 1].
- Scott, John Daniel. 1954 1 October. "In the Movement" in *The Spectator* [Online]. Available: <https://archive.spectator.co.uk/page/1st-october-1954/3> [Accessed 2024, 18 July].
- Stock, Adam. 2018. *Modern Dystopian Fiction and Political Thought: Narratives of World Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Weiss, Samuel. 1960. "Osborne's Angry Young Play" in *Educational Theatre Journal*. 12 (4): 285–288. doi:10.2307/3204555. JSTOR 3204555.