

**UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES**

**DUALITY OF VICTIM/VICTIMIZER
IN PERSONAL AND NATIONAL CONTEXT
IN MARGARET ATWOOD'S *SURFACING*
BA thesis**

**RITI LY LUKK
SUPERVISOR: *Jun. Lect.* EVA REIN**

**TARTU
2022**

ABSTRACT

Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing*, first published in 1972, is a novel about a woman's journey both in the physical and metaphysical sense. The thesis explores duality in Atwood's writing focusing especially on the duality of victim/victimizer in *Surfacing*. The aim of this thesis is to analyze how this duality can be perceived as the protagonist expresses her views of herself and Canada and how these views transform in the course of the novel.

The thesis consists of an introduction, two main chapters, and a conclusion. The introduction gives background information on the novel, its importance in the Canadian context, and Atwood's use of duality. The introduction also includes the aim of the thesis. The first main chapter is a literature review that provides an overview of duality in Atwood's writing as discussed in literary criticism, and the thematic dualities of female/male, nature/culture, and victim/victimizer Atwood has used in *Surfacing*. The second main chapter provides an analysis of the victim/victimizer duality in the novel. The chapter is divided into two subchapters that focus on the transformation of the protagonist's view of herself and the transformation of the protagonist's view of Canada respectively. The conclusion summarizes the main findings of the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
INTRODUCTION	4
1 DUALITY IN MARGARET ATWOOD'S WORKS AND THE THEMATIC DUALITIES IN <i>SURFACING</i>	7
Female/Male	9
Nature/Culture	10
Victim/Victimizer	11
2 ANALYSIS OF THE VICTIM/VICTIMIZER DUALITY AND ITS TRANSFORMATION IN MARGARET ATWOOD'S <i>SURFACING</i>	15
2.1 Transformation of the Protagonist's View of Herself.....	16
2.2 Transformation of the Protagonist's View of Canada	19
CONCLUSION	29
REFERENCES	31
RESÜMEE	33

INTRODUCTION

Margaret Atwood's works often explore the question of Canadian identity, whether from the viewpoint of geography, archeology, anthropology, history, or even politics (Gorjup 2006: 140). *Surfacing* is a novel that has significantly contributed to national discussions in Canada and has been relevant to the debates about Canadian identity (Dobson 2009: 27, 28). The novel shines a light on several buried aspects of Canadian history – as one of the central messages of *Surfacing* is the denial of history – and refers to some of the more negative events that have taken place during the development of Canada, from the colonial period to the present (Hogan 2014: 141; Fiamengo 1999: 145). Although fifty years have passed since its first publication in 1972, the topic of Canada's history is once again relevant in light of the discoveries regarding former residential schools that have been made in recent years (Austen 2021).

Sherrill E. Grace (1980: 438) proposes that one of the patterns and dominant forms of Canadian writing is duality – “doubled forms of characteristics.” In *Surfacing*, one of the most discernable dualities Atwood uses is the duality of victim/victimizer (Bouson 1993: 61). Grace (1980: 438) emphasizes that Atwood, among others, does not engage with duality only in the thematic sense but also uses it to “create forms, or patterns, that self-consciously mirror duality.” To exemplify, duality can be expressed through the use of “double narrative voices, doubled texts or texts within texts [or] the dramatization of opposing groups of characters” (Grace 1980: 438). Grace (1980: 439) goes on to point out that the term duality suggests a “condition of necessary coexistence” or harmony “between the two voices in question,” which is impossible to achieve with dichotomies.

Surfacing is a novel about a female protagonist who returns to her family home in the Quebec province in Canada to search for her missing father. On this trip, the protagonist is accompanied by Joe, her lover, and her friends from the city, a married

couple, Anna and David. *Surfacing* begins as a physical journey but quickly develops into a journey into the mind as the protagonist searches for unity in her divided self (McLay 1978: 32, 33). While piecing together the possible details of her father's disappearance, the protagonist is simultaneously trying to piece together her own identity and find a way to help her move on from her past trauma of abortion. According to Stratford (1986: 85), the further the narrative progresses, the more painfully self-aware the protagonist grows and the discoveries the reader makes regarding the "concealed areas of her life and character [match] her own."

The protagonist of the novel is also the narrator, which means that all the information is presented to the reader through her emotions and experiences and is reflected by her own subjective view of both herself and the world around her. At the start of the novel, Atwood provides evidence pointing to the narrator's unreliability, as she seems to have lost touch with reality (Rigney 1987: 40). Moreover, although the narrative of the novel progresses linearly regarding time and space, the first-person narration conveys a certain fragmentation (Rigney 1987: 45; Stratford 1986: 85, 88). *Surfacing* is a story where the protagonist's personal crisis is aligned with a post-colonial cultural crisis scenario in Canada and in which Atwood suggests "a re-visioning of place as a space for negotiation of national and gendered identities" by constructing a "sliding, shifting perspective" (Beyer 1995: 103, 106).

The aim of this thesis is to show how Margaret Atwood explores duality in her writing, focusing on the victim/victimizer duality in Margaret Atwood's novel *Surfacing*, how the duality can be perceived based on the view the protagonist of the novel has of herself and Canada, and how that view undergoes a transformation in the course of the novel. The literature review will provide an overview of duality in Atwood's writing and the different thematic forms of it that Atwood has used in *Surfacing*. The empirical part

will provide an analysis of the instances in the novel where the victim/victimizer duality is present, how it is seen through the protagonist's narration on both a personal and national level, and how it transforms throughout the novel. Although duality is a part of Atwood's writing that has been explored before, I will be adding to the discussion by writing about how the victim/victimizer duality and its transformation in the national perspective reach the reader through the protagonist's personal perspective.

1 DUALITY IN MARGARET ATWOOD'S WORKS AND THE THEMATIC DUALITIES IN *SURFACING*

Duality is an important and highly noticeable aspect of Margaret Atwood's writing. The theme of duality is an element of her works, which is frequently emphasized by critics (Grace 1983: 4). For example, in her collection *The Two-Headed Poems*, Atwood uses the figure of Siamese twins to direct attention to the essential doubleness in the Canadian psyche (Gorjup 2006: 140). Although Atwood's works contain a certain "violent duality," described by critics as either a double focus or a system of oppositional forces, duality for her is never static (Beyer 1995: 101; Gorjup 2006: 130; Grace 1983: 3, 7). In her writing, Atwood offers a dynamic third way as an alternative in order to transcend the divisions and overcome the polarization (Gorjup 2006: 130; Grace 1983: 3, 7; Nischik 2006: 158). Atwood's double vision comes with the recognition of a potential third possibility (Howells 1996: 21). Her characters urge the reader to search for ways of coexisting (Gorjup 2006: 133). For example, according to Gorjup (2006: 140), the two speaking heads sharing one body reinforces Canada's image of a space where similarities and differences must coexist. Gorjup (2006: 137) notes that in her collection *The Journals of Susanna Moodie* Atwood makes the character Moodie recognize the divided world and accomplish a functional arrangement between the two extremes within herself. According to Gorjup (2006: 137), it is the only way towards ascending to another level of perception and Atwood makes the protagonist in *Surfacing* do exactly that. As Rigney (1987: 60) indicates, in *Surfacing*, the outer duality of Canada is reflected in the inner duality of the self and the protagonist can find her sense of identity and sanity only by confronting it.

Atwood has set out to raise her readers' cultural self-consciousness (Howells 1996: 23). Hengen (1993: 48) points out that *Surfacing* can be and has been studied through decategorizing or deconstructing the different oppositional pairs that appear in the novel

thematically, such as “American/Canadian, culture/nature, male/female, victor/victim,” as Atwood herself in her writing has been trying to work on revising the categories North Americans use to refer to and accept identity. Using her characteristic doubleness Atwood goes about reconstructing the English-Canadian way of identity creation, outlining a “New World positioning in relation to history, geography and culture” that implies “a continuity between immigration narratives and a contemporary awareness of psychic dislocation” (Howells 1996: 23). In her writing, Atwood demands that both the current and historicized victimization, in the context of the presence of the United States and Canada’s own colonial past, should be acknowledged and challenged (Wynne-Davies 2010: 15). She opens up the narrative of Canadian identity to possible suggestions for refiguration through her use of references to Canadian history (Howells 1996: 36).

Especially in Atwood’s earlier works, duality appears in more forms than just thematically. For Atwood, duality is more than thematic as in her writing process, she is both working “with it” and working “from it”, making it also an object of exploration and a basis for creative method (Grace 1983: 4). Grace (1980: 438) writes that as a modern Canadian writer Atwood, among others, is aware that “the power of form and language hold together the ‘violent dualities’ of life” since voice and form in fiction are “deliberately duplicitous.” However, Atwood does not agree with the idea that the opposing sides must defeat or cancel each other out (Grace 1980: 439, 442, 450). There is a “critical awareness of dichotomies” in Atwood’s works, but at the same time, it is unmistakable that she is also pushing towards duality, a harmonious whole. Although duality is inescapable, if it is accepted and acknowledged, it can be positive (Grace 1980: 444).

Since the start of her career, Atwood has worked towards finding a third way, an alternative to the “either/or” condition (Grace 1983; Gorjup 2006: 137). For Atwood, the line between two strongly divided sides is very important (Gorjup 2006: 131). Atwood sees

that line as a point of contact and as an interactive space where the two sides can engage with one another and through that find a way to come together (Gorjup 2006: 131). According to Gorjup (2006: 131), new possibilities for recreating oneself can arise from that space of engagement.

Howells (1996: 32) describes how the title of the novel itself – *Surfacing* – is a noun created from a verb which indicates “process” and the protagonist’s transformation in the course of the novel is exactly that – a process. As Atwood is working towards a dynamic duality, transcending the oppositions, and finding an alternative way, a number of critics believe that in *Surfacing* the protagonist manages to reach the end of that transformative process and arrive at an alternative, some say even harmonious, point of equilibrium. However, not all critics agree with this wholeheartedly. Howells (1996: 36) describes the ending of the novel as leaving the story off “poised on the point of moving forward.” Moreover, Lecker (1983: 193) argues that although the protagonist herself thinks she has managed to come out of the chaos of contending oppositional forces, the way Atwood has written the ending gives way to the belief that it is all just self-delusion of the highest degree, and the protagonist still remains in a world filled with duality.

Female/Male

One of the most prevalent and easily discernable themes of duality in *Surfacing* is the duality of female/male, specifically the opposition of the female characters and the male characters in the novel. According to Hengen (1993: 45), in *Surfacing*, and also in Atwood’s other earlier novel *The Edible Woman*, the central female characters are deeply affected by narcissistic male figures. The protagonist of *Surfacing* has allowed her identity to be shaped by men and her conception of personal power has also been determined by men (Hengen 1993: 45). She has been defined especially through her connections with the “Americanized” men in her life and her entire “coming to identity” is dominated by those

same men and the exact same connection she shares with them (Hengen 1993: 47, 54). According to Bouson (1993: 48), *Surfacing* illuminates “the pervasiveness of male power” by critiquing rather harshly the male supremacist ideology of “Americanized” men. The Americans in the text embody “the masculine principle of conquest,” “wanton destruction,” and the want for power (Bouson 1993: 48).

Hengen (1993: 45) points out the reason for it being that the men themselves have not yet been able to acknowledge “their own identities and sense of power.” The kind of confusion that can be felt from the male characters of the novel regarding their identities mirrors the state of society and culture in Canada at the time when these novels were created (Hengen 1993: 45). Hengen (1993: 45) goes on to note that “the dramatic cultural upheaval ongoing in Canada /.../ can produce narcissistic personalities while also continuing to ensure the disenfranchisement of talented young Canadian women.” Beyer (1995: 103) describes *Surfacing* as a story about “a young woman’s attempt to construct and articulate a sense of herself as a Canadian and a woman” in a way that would empower her. Furthermore, Hengen (1993: 47) argues that the story of *Surfacing* starts unfolding when the protagonist recognizes her narrow definition and begins to imagine “a way out.” She gains “a clearer sense of self by interacting with contrasting male figures” and deciding to align herself rather with other women and the “less dangerously narcissistic” men (Hengen 1993: 47).

Nature/Culture

According to Lecker (1983: 187), in her novel *Surfacing*, Atwood has made the decision to send the protagonist down an ambiguous, authentic, and even perilous path between nature and culture. Culture, meaning the urban life and American capitalism in the present, can be seen as alienating and depersonalizing (Lecker 1983: 188). Nature, meaning past communal and ancestral heritage with its rituals and myths, keeps the self

whole (Lecker 1983: 188, 189). Culture forces language and stereotypical roles onto the protagonist, while nature keeps her free and able to descend into the dreamlike past (Lecker 1983: 188). The duality of culture and nature is also represented by the different sides of Canada: the urban cities and the great wilderness. The opposition of the two comes out in the context of the protagonist passing city limits and travelling north, which can be seen as moving from the conquered civilized territory into the wilderness (Lecker 1983: 189, 190).

However, in the novel, the proposed distinction between nature and culture does not become entirely clear because the protagonist sees herself as “between the spatial and temporal antitheses” and her personality has been formed as a combination of the two sides (Lecker 1983: 188). According to Lecker (1983: 188, 189), this could in a way indicate that there is no difference between nature and culture anymore. However, Kapuscinski (2007: 116) describes the protagonist as “seeking a third position as *deus ex machina*” which would give her the opportunity to follow “an alternative to traditions of violence and vulnerability.” The protagonist seeks to find a new way of life “in harmony with her human and non-human surroundings” (Kapuscinski 2007: 116). She attempts to “see beyond the binate options” regarding nature and culture that she could not previously conceptualize (Kapuscinski 2007: 116). Alternatively, Hogan (2014: 142, 143) notes that the protagonist can be seen as a place and “a figure for Canada.” This in a way combines the nature/culture duality in the protagonist herself.

Victim/Victimizer

Although the protagonist’s journey in *Surfacing* can be analyzed as a quest for self-definition, Tolan (2007: 41) observes that her quest is rather an attempt to escape into innocence. However, in Atwood’s literary world, no one is innocent, especially not even the children (Rigney 1987: 44). In *Surfacing*, all of Atwood’s characters are never mere

victims but true participants in the games of cruelty (Rigney 1987: 44). Rigney (1987: 48) discusses the connection between personal and national victim/victor duality narratives. In the protagonist's view of the world, men appear to be destroying women as "groups and nations destroy and oppress other groups and nations" (Rigney 1987: 48). The protagonist in *Surfacing* can be seen as a female victim (Gorjup 2006: 139). As a result of internalizing her status as a victim, she herself assumes the role of a victimizer to in a way compensate for her victimhood (Gorjup 2006: 139). However, the role of the victimizer comes with its own sickening effect and produces guilt in the person (Gorjup 2006: 139). In this case, neither position feels victorious. In *Surfacing*, the protagonist is forced to create alibis like a criminal pleading for innocence in order to evade the inescapable confrontation with her own guilt (Rigney 1987: 40).

When the protagonist of the novel becomes aware of her own complicity in her abortion, she must recognize that she has similarly also killed a part of herself (Rigney 1987: 40). By accepting her responsibility regarding that act, the protagonist can begin regaining her identity and taking back her humanity (Rigney 1987: 45). Ultimately, being human is unavoidably connected to being guilty and responsibility lies in the self (Rigney 1987: 47-48). Moreover, McLay (1978: 43, 44) maintains that through accepting her guilt, the protagonist no longer views others as the enemy and can acknowledge their humanity, their limitations and fallibility, similarly to her own. The protagonist must also realize that she has the "power to act and to be held responsible" (McLay 1978: 44). Gendered and national victimization and victim positions are closely connected to one another for Atwood and are present in her writing as the female body and the map of Canada often become interchangeable (Wynne-Davies 2010: 14). With this in mind, regarding delivering the message of the novel, the protagonist and Canada become one.

Atwood has touched on the topic of the Canadian identity and victimhood also in

her literary critical work *Survival*. In *Survival*, she elaborates on “basic victim positions” that can be observed in Canadian writing (Beyer 1995: 99). The “basic victim positions” are the following: denying the fact that one is a victim; acknowledging that one is a victim, but using fate or a higher power to explain it; acknowledging that one is a victim but refusing to accept that role as inevitable; being a creative non-victim (Atwood 1972: 38-39). Moreover, Hengen (1993: 46) expresses that Atwood's writing has often emphasized the idea of “the great Canadian victim complex.” Accordingly, the protagonist of *Surfacing*, similarly to Canada, has tried to at first define herself as innocent (Hengen 1993: 46). However, that kind of definition of oneself comes with not accepting the power everyone has (Hengen 1993: 46). Fiamengo (1999: 147-148) maintains that “the narratives of Canadian innocence” – victim fantasies where the marginalized are falsely regarded as good and true – are as dangerous as not having a national identity at all. Likewise, perpetuating “the victim fantasy” creates the opportunity to escape the anger and shame that inevitably comes with acknowledging responsibility (Fiamengo 1999: 148). Hengen (1993: 61) states that “innocence must be joined to power to redefine both.”

Furthermore, Hengen (1993: 46) quotes Atwood describing the “third thing” she worked on thematizing in *Surfacing*, about which she says that “the ideal would be somebody who would neither be a killer nor a victim, who could achieve some kind of harmony with the world.” But the kind of “creative harmony” – rather than a “destructive relationship” – can exist only in a cultural setting that tolerates it (Hengen 1993: 46). Hengen (1993: 63) articulates that “the goal in Atwood’s work is consistently a reclamation of both sides of the pairs of opposites structuring her texts – American/Canadian, male/female, culture/nature, evil/good, power/victimage /.../ – [to] ultimately complete social renewal.” That social renewal, however, can happen only when the second term, the ‘victim’ side of the pairs “gains prominence and receives sustained

attention” (Hengen 1993: 63).

To conclude, duality is a significant aspect of Margaret Atwood’s writing. She uses it not only thematically but also as an object to explore in her writing and as something on which to base her creative method. However, as one of the main aims, Atwood has had with her writing, is deconstructing set ideas and inspiring the reader to reevaluate their former attitudes, the duality in her works is also not concrete but undergoes dynamic transformations and strives for an alternative, more harmonious state. In *Surfacing*, Atwood uses various dualities to create the story, for example, female/male, nature/culture, victim/victimizer. The women in the novel are shown to be victims of the men in their lives. Nature is competing with culture in terms of importance in the modern world. The Canadian wilderness and the Canadian urban life meet and clash with one another in the protagonist of the novel. Moreover, the themes of power, guilt, complicity, and responsibility in regard to the victim/victimizer duality in personal and also cultural context come together in the protagonist in a similar way. It is stressed that especially the victim/victimizer duality is not one-dimensional as there is the possibility to cause harm with one’s victim position as well. Furthermore, Atwood advocates for change in social attitudes regarding the view of Canada as a victim, to reclaim both sides of the duality, and to create harmony. The above literature review will serve as a basis for the empirical part of the thesis.

2 ANALYSIS OF THE VICTIM/VICTIMIZER DUALITY AND ITS TRANSFORMATION IN MARGARET ATWOOD'S *SURFACING*

In the empirical part of the thesis, I will analyze the victim/victimizer duality that is present in Margaret Atwood's novel *Surfacing*, how the duality is seen through the protagonist's narration on both a personal and national level, and how it undergoes a transformation in the course of the novel. Coral Ann Howells (1996: 31) argues that the protagonist realizes that her story "is always multiple and subject to changing perceptions." As there is "transformational possibility within the self and /.../ the nation" in the novel (Lousley 2018: 424), there is potential for the protagonist's attitudes towards herself and Canada to undergo a significant change, which will be explored in this chapter of the thesis based on textual evidence from the novel *Surfacing*. In the same way that the protagonist "must recover the painful memories that disprove her innocence" so she would be able to live in honesty, Atwood proposes that Canada must also "recover from its historical amnesia" by confronting its past (Fiamengo 1999: 152). As the protagonist is the narrator, everything is presented to the reader through her lens, which allows for the assumption that even the words of the other characters are in a way coming from the protagonist and still represent her perspective of the world around her. The instances for the analysis were chosen based on relevance to the topic, specifically where the narrator expresses some type of opinion through the text or where the situation alludes to her view of herself and of Canada as a country or Canadians as people.

The analysis is divided into two subchapters: the transformation of the protagonist's view of herself and the transformation of the protagonist's view of Canada. The first subchapter discusses the protagonist seeing herself as a victim in personal contexts, specifically in her interpersonal relationships in the past and present, the change in perspective and how the protagonist discovers herself to be the victimizer, and how the

transformation of her view of herself concludes. The second subchapter focuses on the national context and how the protagonist sees Canada as a victim of the actions of the United States of America and Americans, for example, regarding nature and the Canadian wilderness. The subchapter will go on to discuss as well how Canadians, especially the protagonist herself, show similar capabilities to act as the victimizers, and how the transformation of that perspective concludes.

2.1 Transformation of the Protagonist's View of Herself

From the beginning of the novel, the protagonist unconsciously reveals that she suffers from a deep-seated dualism in all areas of her life, such as the contrast between city and wilderness and the hostility between “me” and “them” (Stratford 1986: 85, 86), which alludes to the fact that the protagonist could also be experiencing duality on the victim/victimizer level. The existence of dualism in the case of the protagonist is confirmed in the novel when the protagonist shares what her friend Anna – who has travelled to the protagonist's childhood home with her – reads from her palms. Anna questions whether the protagonist has a twin as “some of [her] lines are double” (Atwood 1998: 4), indicating that there could possibly be two versions of the protagonist – one who is a victim and one who is a victimizer.

The novel begins with the protagonist having a set one-dimensional view of herself. The protagonist does not view herself as an actor, an agent in action (Tolan 2007: 41). She does not think she holds any power and therefore she sees herself as a victim in various aspects of her life. She establishes her view of herself by saying that she feels “deprived of something /.../ unless [she has] suffered” (Atwood 1998: 11). From her words, it appears that her attitude towards herself clearly shows a person who is used to being a victim to the extent that she thinks she cannot feel completely at peace unless she is enduring the victimization that comes with being the victim and placing herself in the victim position.

On the one hand, she does still suffer from the actual trauma she has from her relationships, especially with men, and therefore her feeling as a victim is valid. On the other hand, as the story unfolds, the protagonist comes to realize and reveals to the reader what the more realistic account of her past is.

A major aspect of the protagonist's life regarding her sense of being a victim is her interpersonal relationships. Firstly, she has claimed the role of a victim regarding her relationship with her parents. Her mother has died, and it is later revealed that so has her father. The protagonist's reaction to those tragedies is once again seeing herself as a victim, as she makes it clear that she blames her parents for leaving her alone in the world. The protagonist says, "But I'm not mourning, I'm accusing them." (Atwood 1998: 176). Considering her father's disappearance, at first, the protagonist states that she is "furious" with her father for "vanishing" and leaving her in an unresolved situation with no possible answers (Atwood 1998: 58). As McLay (1978: 36) highlights, the protagonist denies her parents the liberty to change – "they have no right to get old" (Atwood 1998: 5) – while she herself can still keep the freedom to be human, shift and grow as she chooses, when and where she chooses. Consequently, even in the case of the somewhat untimely death of her parent(s), she finds a way for her to feel like a true victim.

Moreover, the protagonist feels that she has been especially victimized by the men who have impacted her life and who she has had relationships with. At the beginning of the novel, the protagonist presents herself as a young woman who has been married and divorced and had a child who she does not see anymore. She seems to have a lot of trauma and baggage from that relationship and presents herself as a victim of bad treatment from her former husband. She sees the demise of that relationship and her supposed divorce as serious as losing a limb: "A divorce is like an amputation, you survive but there's less of you" (Atwood 1998: 29). She views herself as thoroughly victimized also because of a

situation the protagonist illuminates to the reader as her child having been taken away violently, “exported, deported” (Atwood 1998: 45).

However, as the story unfolds, the reader is made aware of the fact that the child is not currently alive nor has ever been a truly living being as it was aborted instead of it being carried to term and then birthed. The protagonist goes even as far as to say that “[the child] was [her] husband’s” and that him imposing it on her made her “feel like an incubator” for the entirety the fetus spent growing in her (Atwood 1998: 30). In this case, the husband is shown to be using the protagonist, and he seems to have been making her do what he wanted with no regards to her wishes or feelings. Therefore, it becomes clear that he is surely the victimizer in this relationship. Furthermore, the protagonist expresses the idea that she “couldn’t have brought the child” into the world because she “ha[d] never identified it as [hers],” leaving her no choice but to go through with aborting the child (Atwood 1998: 30). In this case, she seems to have been completely stripped of any control over the situation and she seems to have no power of choice or say in what happens to her body. All of this further drives home the impression that her victimizer ex-husband has made her assume her now deep-rooted victim position.

But cracks start appearing in the protagonist’s protective layer of victimhood as she becomes overwhelmed with the “sense of her own terrible complicity” (Fiamengo 1999: 145). Through the self-revulsion that she experiences, comes the transformed belief that she is indeed not powerless after all (Fiamengo 1999: 145). Firstly, the protagonist starts acknowledging and admitting to her own part and responsibility in what happened to the deteriorated relationship with her parents. She says, “I couldn’t go there, home, I never went there again, I sent them a postcard. They never knew /.../ why I left” (Atwood 1998: 145). She took the possibility of deciding whether to accept their daughter and her life decisions away from her parents. If she is a victim when she loses her power to make

decisions for herself, then her parents are as well.

Regarding her relationship with her supposed “husband” who turns out to be fake, the protagonist confesses that he was just a normal man who was both selfish and kind “in the average proportions” (Atwood 1998: 195). She seems to recognize her own fault in the situation as she admits she was not prepared for the lies and “needless cruelties” that an average relationship would involve (Atwood 1998: 195). Moreover, as for the abortion, slowly but surely the protagonist comes to the realization that she was an accomplice in the abortion she underwent before the narrative present of the novel. She says, “I killed it. It wasn’t a child but it could have been one, I didn’t allow it” (Atwood 1998: 144). She even informs the reader that the facts she presented earlier and what she had shared with her friends have not been the whole truth as she has had a difficult time accepting the reality (Atwood 1998: 144-145). According to McLay (1978: 40), the protagonist’s admission of her complicity in the affair and abortion she had in her past marks the beginning of her restoration of self. By the end of this transformation, she comes to accept her own humanity, her own guilt and fallibility, which helps her move past the idea of seeing everyone around her as the enemies (McLay 1978: 43).

2.2 Transformation of the Protagonist’s View of Canada

As the protagonist shares with the reader a possibility of having a dual view of herself, it very much also alludes to there being a possible dual view of Canada – as both a victim and a victimizer. From the very first page of the novel, in the protagonist’s view, Canada is a victim. The protagonist and her friends see the United States as bearing all the responsibility for Canada’s problems (Fiamengo 1999: 147). Howells (1996: 26) describes that in the early 1970s Canada is “suffering the effects of civilization where the trees are dying of acid rain blowing up from the United States and the area is invaded by tourist roads bringing week-end fishermen and hunters.” The protagonist describes what she sees

happening in nature, in the Canadian wilderness, “the white birches are dying, the disease is spreading up from the south” (Atwood 1998: 3). She mentions in passing a “pit the Americans hollowed out /.../ spruce-covered” but that “the thick power lines” running into it give away the fact that it is really “concrete bunkers” and “underground apartment buildings”, and how there is a possibility that some generals and ordinary soldiers “could easily still be living in there” (Atwood 1998: 5). Thus, when the protagonist mentions the disease coming from the south, she means that America is the culprit, the victimizer, referring, on the one hand, to Americanization in the social, political, economic, and cultural sense – still prevalent in the world today – and on the other hand, to the ecological and environmental destruction and pollution that the United States of America have unleashed on the Canadian nature. Regarding military action, Lousley (2018: 415) elaborates on Agent Orange – “the chemical used by the USA in its strategy of environmental warfare, which was produced and tested in Canada, despite the nation officially not participating in the [Vietnam] war.”

Although the novel mentions Americans – “Yanks” – and encounters with supposed Americans many times, the only confirmed American the reader learns about is Bill Malmstrom, “a member of the Detroit branch of the Wildlife Protection Association of America” (Atwood 1998: 94). Bill Malmstrom seeks to acquire the protagonist’s parents’ property on the Lake. He says, “We have a branch in this country, quite flourishing little branch” (Atwood 1998: 94). By being this representation of Americans, Bill Malmstrom in a way confirms the protagonist’s earlier claims of a disease spreading to Canada from the south. Malmstrom explains to the protagonist that his association wishes to make an offer on her parents’ land because they are planning to create “a kind of retreat lodge, where the members could meditate and observe /.../ the beauties of nature” (Atwood 1998: 94). This sounds not very offensive or possibly victimizing at all until Malmstrom’s offhand

comment potentially incriminates or uncovers the association's true intentions with the property. Malmstrom goes on to say that the association's "place on Lake Erie is /.../ giving out," quite possibly referring to overexerting the land and nature there, perhaps for example, by overfishing or overhunting, as those are the activities he says the members would be able to do when coming to the property of the protagonist's parents (Atwood 1998: 94). This solidifies the protagonist's view of Americans as the victimizers who are physically invading and destroying Canada's natural resources (Wynne-Davies 2010: 15).

One of the most gruesome examples of victimization in the novel happens when the protagonist discovers a dead bird – a heron – that has been killed and hung upside down from a tree (Atwood 1998: 116). As the heron is a part of Canadian nature, this violation has been committed in a way also against Canada itself. The protagonist elaborates that the bird cannot be eaten, so it was most probably killed for sport (Atwood 1998: 117-118). The protagonist goes on to compare the display that the hung heron puts on to "horned and fanged heads, sawed off and mounted on the billiard room wall, stuffed fish, trophies," which are the physical reminders that can be found in the world of people's careless infliction of violence for fun, sport, and entertainment (Atwood 1998: 118). Objects like these are also physical reminders of the power one has exerted over another living thing – these are the trophies of victimizers. Moreover, the protagonist blames the "Americans" for this kill (Atwood 1998: 117, 118). She asks, "Why had they strung it up like a lynch victim?" (Atwood 1998: 118). Lousley (2018: 415) argues that concluding that the perpetrators are Americans from this brief description can in part be justified "so long as one assumes that only the USA and not Canada has a history of racialized terror and extra-judicial killing." However, the protagonist's own justification would probably be that she had heard about similar negative encounters with the numerous people from the United States. The protagonist mentions possible overfishing and illegal transport of trout, chasing

around and killing other birds – specifically loons (Atwood 1998: 122-123).

In a similar fashion, the protagonist often mentions that the victimizers she encounters use violence as a form of entertainment. Throughout the entire book, the protagonist shares her views that portray Americans as people who are fans of engaging in mindless vandalism and using violence as a form of entertainment. She describes killing the loons as a “senseless killing /.../ a game” (Atwood 1998: 123). The protagonist gives it an explanation that “after the war [Americans had] been bored” (Atwood 1998: 123). She also sees Americans as “happy killers” with “no conscience or piety” to restrain them (Atwood 1998: 128-129). She mentions one of the Americans throwing his cigar butt over the side of the boat into the lake – effectively littering (Atwood 1998: 63), reiterating the recklessness, thoughtlessness, and carelessness she notices about the Americans. Furthermore, the protagonist shares her attitudes towards the ones she believes to be victimizing her home country Canada by declaring that one group of the Americans she personally encounters are exactly the kind to use dynamite while fishing if they could get away with it because their aim is to catch more than they can eat as they do it for entertainment purposes rather than to get sustenance (Atwood 1998: 63).

As the protagonist herself mentions in the novel, the victim position comes with being – or at least feeling like one is – powerless (Atwood 1998: 197). In opposition, the victimizer position comes with power, or at least is perpetuated by prominent shows of power. The protagonist’s storytelling lets the reader know that the Americans are very much the victimizers by mentioning their demonstration of power and describing ways in which they try to assert their dominance over the protagonist and her Canadian companions. The protagonist says, “I hear a whine, motorboat /.../ it /.../ becomes a roar, homing in on us, big powerboat /.../ it skids in beside us, its wash rocking us sharply” (Atwood 1998: 63). When talking to the protagonist and her friends, one of the Americans

is described to be “yell[ing], teeth bared, friendly as a shark” (Atwood 1998: 63). This affirms the protagonist’s view of America and Americans as something or someone menacing, eager to be perceived as a predator. The protagonist goes on to describe their motorboat even as souped-up, emphasizing the power it exudes (Atwood 1998: 63). The protagonist adds another layer to her description of her attitudes to the Americans and of her past experiences with them when she divulges that, “On the way back we hug the shore, avoiding the open lake in case the Americans take it into their heads to zoom past us close as possible, they sometimes do that for fun, their wake could tip us (Atwood 1998: 64).” Her use of the expression “do that for fun” once again reiterates the view of the reckless and careless behavior Americans exhibit when visiting and exploring Canada, and while they are enjoying and entertaining themselves in the Canadian wilderness. Furthermore, when sharing her reasoning regarding the dead heron, the protagonist muses, “why didn’t they just throw it away /.../ To prove they could do it, they had the power to kill” (Atwood 1998: 118). The victimizers are once again shown through the words of the protagonist to be strengthening their dominating position over the victims by putting on significant displays of power.

The changing attitudes and views about Canada are revealed to the reader in the course of the story, similarly to the way the protagonist’s view of herself is shown to transform side by side with it during the events of the novel. As the protagonist herself is “something like a figure for Canada” (Hogan 2014: 142), her becoming aware of her own complicity regarding situations in her personal life and feeling an overwhelming self-revulsion regarding the guilt that comes with it leads her to also re-evaluate “the great Canadian victim complex” (Fiamengo 1999: 145; Kapuscinski 2007: 95). Through the character David, the protagonist is reminded of the reality of Canada’s history and history of Canadian politics, when David offers the following idea, “Do you realize /.../ that this

country is founded on the bodies of dead animals?” (Atwood 1998: 36). The protagonist specifically mentions him bringing up “dead fish, dead seals, and historically dead beavers” to illustrate his point (Atwood 1998: 36). David even announces that “the beaver is to [Canada] what the black man is to the United States” (Atwood 1998: 36), referring to the conquests that led to colonizing Canada and the fur trade that is the foundation on which Canadian nationhood has been built (Fiamengo 1999: 143). At the same time, in part, he manages to ignore the fact that “the exploitation of native peoples and resources” was the root of the Canadian economy, that colonizing North America meant appropriating “aboriginal territory,” and that the United States is not the only nation on the continent that is guilty of perpetuating “racial violence” (Fiamengo 1999: 143). However, the protagonist shares her childhood memories of picking blueberries, “I was remembering the others who used to come. There weren’t many of them on the lake even then, the government had put them somewhere else, corralled them, but there was one family left.” (Atwood 1998: 85-86). These thoughts that the protagonist has, reveal to the reader the dual possibility of Canada clearly being the victimizer with regard to the native peoples.

Throughout the novel, the protagonist frequently criticizes the behavior of a few people who she believes to be from the United States. Based on these few people, she in turn makes assumptions about Americans as a whole. The protagonist further categorizes all Americans as victimizers because of the actions and violence against nature perpetrated by a few people she has witnessed or encountered. In that way, the protagonist’s own actions can be taken as a representation of what Canadians themselves are like. As the protagonist herself also inflicts violence on living organisms, it can be said that she has been victimizing Canadian nature and wilderness as well. Although she points out the terrible thoughtless destruction by the Americans and their use of violence as a form of entertainment, she at times has shown the same thoughtlessness and violent tendencies.

Therefore, her behavior could also be viewed as a possible Canadian behavior similarly to what she expresses to the Americans.

Bouson (1993: 48-49) suggests that the protagonist both “fears being victimized” and “also secretly identifies with the victimizers.” One instance where the protagonist is the one inflicting violence and being the victimizer is her encounter with a mosquito, “A mosquito lights on my arm and I let it bite me, waiting till its abdomen globes with blood before I pop it with my thumb like a grape” (Atwood 1998: 70). Here, the protagonist is shown to be entertaining herself with mindless violence. Furthermore, she herself is now the one exercising her power and asserting dominance over another living organism. While the protagonist feels guilty for not saving the animals her brother tortured in their childhood (Fiamengo 1999: 150), she also harbors the guilt of torturing leeches with her brother by throwing them “on the campfire” (Atwood 1998: 132), though she admits that she “didn’t mind that so much” (Atwood 1998: 132). Once again the protagonist shows that she is as capable of killing for fun as the Americans she has strongly opposed.

When the protagonist takes her friends fishing, she goes about the entire process very calmly and clinically. There is no doubt or hesitation about the somewhat violent process that fishing actually is, which includes hooking on worms and even a frog with what Anna calls cold-blooded attitude (Atwood 1998: 61). The protagonist proceeds to tell the reader a story from her childhood of her praying to catch only the fish that were willing so if they got caught and consequently died, she would not be the one responsible for their deaths. In a way that implies her being once again quite glaringly not willing to acknowledge her role as the victimizer – the one inflicting violence on other living beings – though the protagonist hesitates and gains a conscience when it comes to killing the actual fish. She tries to get David to kill the fish they managed to catch with the frog bait as she’d “rather not kill it” herself (Atwood 1998: 62). When David fails to do so, the

protagonist once again approaches the situation with clinical calmness and precision, “I step down on it with my foot and grab a knife and whack it quickly with the knife handle, crushing the skull” (Atwood 1998: 62). Only after the fact does she say, “I feel a little sick, its because I’ve killed something, made it dead” (Atwood 1998: 62). Only after recognizing her violating acts against nature “as *violence*”, the protagonist begins to realize her responsibility (Kapusinski 2007: 111). During her second time fishing with her companions, the protagonist shows her changed attitude and confesses, “I couldn’t anymore, I had no right to. /.../ We were committing this act, violation, for sport, amusement or pleasure recreation they called it, these were no longer the right reasons.” (Atwood 1998: 121).

The victim and the victimizer become one and the same when the protagonist becomes aware of the fact that the Americans she has been “wish[ing] evil toward” (Atwood 1998: 125) – “Let them suffer, /.../ tip their canoe, burn them, rip them open. /.../ My arm wanted to swing the paddle sideways, blade into his head: his eyes would blossom outward, his skull shatter like an egg” (Atwood 1998: 125-129) – are actually not the opposing side but belong to their own camp and are as Canadian as the protagonist and her companions are themselves. The “invading alien” is revealed to be the “uncanny double of the self” (Lousley 2018: 414). One of the “Americans” says, “I’m from Sarnia and Fred /.../ is from Toronto” (Atwood 1998: 129). The protagonist thought she saw an American flag on the supposed Americans’ boat, but it turns out to be just a sticker in blue, white, and red colors (Atwood 1998: 129). As a surprise to the protagonist, the explanation for the existence of the sticker is rather more cultural than national, as one of the men says, “I’m a Mets fan”, and the sticker itself states, “GO METS” (Atwood 1998: 129). However, the fact that the supposed Americans are Canadian does not change the protagonist’s view much. Since she sees them as responsible for killing the heron, it does not matter what

country they are from. She muses, “they’re still Americans, they’re what’s in store for us, what we are turning into (Atwood 1998: 130).” She describes the “American” way of life as a virus that gets into people’s brains and changes them cell by cell from the inside (Atwood 1998: 130). Wynne-Davies (2010: 15) explains that Atwood’s writing conveys that this “American” disease seems to be transmuting the Canadian people “into a race that destroys itself, denying their roles as victims.” This forces the reader to consider both/neither Canada and/nor the United States as the victimizer. Here, Atwood demonstrates that the strong opposition between Canada and America does not stem only from the cultural and economic domination of the United States but is also “a metaphor for a set of economic environmental and political practices” that belong equally to Canada as well (Fiamengo 1999: 151).

To conclude, by the end of the novel, the protagonist’s view of herself has undergone a transformation. Guedon (1983: 109) suggests that what she has gone through is a healing process and she has as a result gained acceptance of herself and reality. She has acknowledged both her role as a victim and victimizer. The reader is made very aware of her realizations when the protagonist clearly states, “This above all, to refuse to be a victim. Unless I can do that I can do nothing. I have to recant, give up the old belief that I am powerless and because of it nothing I can do will ever hurt anyone. A lie which was always more disastrous than the truth would have been.” (Atwood 1998: 197). The protagonist has recognized how her former way of thinking and view of herself and Canada has been harmful and she has started to take responsibility for her actions that were taken because of that. She has also started to acknowledge the responsibility Canada has to take for its conduct. As Lousley (2018: 415) states, in *Surfacing* “[i]t turns out there is no self-evident way to distinguish Americans from Canadians, and hence occupiers from the

occupied, or aggressors from victims.” The victim/victimizer duality is shown to be dynamic, emphasizing the idea that victim and victimizer are not terms that exclude each other, but rather can and will often exist together, whether in regard to one person, a nation, or a country.

CONCLUSION

The thesis explored how Margaret Atwood uses duality in her writing. The aim of this thesis was to analyze how the victim/victimizer duality is present in the novel *Surfacing*, how the duality can be perceived based on the view the protagonist of the novel has of herself and Canada, and how that view transforms in the course of the novel. In the literature review, an overview of duality in Atwood's writing and the different thematic forms of it – female/male, nature/culture, victim/victimizer – that Atwood has used in *Surfacing* was given. The empirical part provided an analysis of the instances in the novel where the victim/victimizer duality is present, how it is seen through the protagonist's narration on both personal and national level, and how it transforms throughout the novel.

At the beginning of the novel, the protagonist's view of herself is very one-dimensional. She sees herself as a victim in all aspects of her life. For example, on a personal level, she feels that she has been victimized by men and her parents in her interpersonal relationships. She has experienced various traumas in her life, such as a failed relationship with a married man and going through an illegal abortion. Similarly, the protagonist feels that Canada has been a victim, for example, of America and Americans. Although both the protagonist and Canada have been victims and therefore the protagonist has the right to see herself and Canada in that position, the story in *Surfacing* is not so superficial and straightforward.

As the novel has been created from duality and with various dualities in mind, neither the protagonist nor Canada can be victims in all situations. Throughout the novel, the protagonist comes to realize that her view of herself as a victim does not account for reality. She becomes aware that the same sense of reality applies to Canada. The reader is presented with the transformation of the protagonist's attitudes as she becomes overwhelmed with the guilt stemming from her own complicity.

The protagonist begins to acknowledge her and Canada's role as a victimizer and takes accountability while urging Canada to do the same. Coming to terms with the actuality of her past has possibly helped her start truly processing her trauma and reconciling the hurt she has experienced, which can be witnessed at the end of the novel through the seemingly more harmonious way of seeing herself that the protagonist then presents to the reader. The same balance is shown to be true also regarding Canada in the national context. The protagonist and Canada are no longer stuck in the extreme one-dimensionality as the protagonist has accepted that there is duality in herself and Canada. This is important because not realizing one's power as a victim makes it possible to cause further hurt oneself. As no one is innocent (Rigney 1987: 44), ignoring the reality of both sides and the complicity that inevitably comes with it can result in both committing atrocities and then ignoring the consequences, which has regrettably happened in Canadian history (Austen 2021).

This thesis has shown the intricacy and significance of the themes of victimhood and complicity in the context of Canada and how *Surfacing* is a novel that allows for an in-depth discussion of these themes. It also emphasizes the overall importance of writing about victims and victimizers in various contexts. *Surfacing* could be further analyzed regarding, for example, the character of Anna and her victimization, or the various references to the victimization of Canada's First Nations in the novel.

REFERENCES

- Atwood, Margaret. 1972. *A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*. Toronto: Anansi.
- Atwood, Margaret. 1998. *Surfacing*. First Anchor Books Edition. New York: Anchor Books. (Original work published 1972).
- Austen, Ian. 2021. How Thousands of Indigenous Children Vanished in Canada. *The New York Times*, June 7. Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/07/world/canada/mass-graves-residential-schools.html>, accessed May 23, 2022.
- Beyer, Charlotte. 1995. From Violent Duality to Multi-Culturalism: Margaret Atwood's Post-Colonial Cultural and Sexual Politics. In Jørn Carlsen (ed.) *O Canada: Essays on Canadian Literature and Culture*, 97-108. Aarhus University Press.
- Bouson, J. Brooks. 1993. *Brutal Choreographies: Oppositional Strategies and Narrative Design in the Novels of Margaret Atwood*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Dobson, Kit. 2009. Ambiguous Resistance in Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing*. *Transnational Canadas: Anglo-Canadian Literature and Globalization*, 27-39. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Fiamengo, Janice. 1999. Postcolonial Guilt in Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing*. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 29: 1, 141-163.
- Gorjup, Branko. 2006. Margaret Atwood's poetry and poetics. In Coral Ann Howells (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Margaret Atwood*, 130-144. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grace, Sherill E. 1980. Duality and Series: Forms of the Canadian Imagination. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, 7: 4, 438-451.
- Grace, Sherill E. 1983. Articulating the 'Space Between': Atwood's Untold Stories and Fresh Beginnings. In Lorraine Weir (ed.) *Margaret Atwood: Language, Text and System*, 1-16 UBC Press.
- Guedon, Marie-Francoise. 1983. *Surfacing: Amerindian Themes and Shamanism*. In Lorraine Weir (ed.) *Margaret Atwood: Language, Text and System*. UBC Press.
- Hengen, Shannon Eileen. 1993. *Margaret Atwood's Power: Mirrors, Reflections and Images in Select Fictions and Poetry*. Toronto: Second Story Press.
- Hogan, Patrick C. 2014. National Identity, Narrative Universals, and Guilt. In Mark J. Bruhn and Donald R. Wehrs (eds). *Cognition, Literature, and History*, 134-149.

- New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Howells, Coral Ann. 1996. *Margaret Atwood. Modern Novelists*. Houndmills and London: Macmillian Press Ltd.
- Kapuscinski, Kiley. 2007. Negotiating the Nation: The Reproduction and Reconstruction of the National Imaginary in Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing*. *English Studies in Canada*, 33: 3, 95-123.
- Lecker, Robert. 1983. Janus through the Looking Glass: Atwood's First Three Novels. In Arnold E. Davidson and Cathy N. Davidson (eds.) *The Art of Margaret Atwood: Essays in Criticism*, 177-203. Toronto: Anansi.
- Lousley, Cheryl. 2018. Spectral Environmentalisms: National Politics and Gothic Ecologies in *Silent Spring*, *Surfacing*, and *Salt Fish Girl*. *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, 25: 2, 412-428.
- McLay, Catherine. 1978. The Divided Self: Theme and Pattern in *Surfacing*. In John Moss (ed.) *The Canadian Novel Here and Now*, 32-44. Toronto: NC Press Limited.
- Nischik, Reingard M. 2006. Margaret Atwood's short stories and shorter fictions. In Coral Ann Howells (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Margaret Atwood*, 145-160. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rigney, Barbara Hill. 1987. 'Border Country': *Surfacing* and *the Journals of Susanna Moodie*. *Margaret Atwood (Women Writers)*. Houndmills and London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Stratford, Philip. 1986. *All the Polarities. Comparative Studies in Contemporary Canadian Novels in French and English*. Toronto: ECW Press.
- Tolan Fiona. 2007. *Margaret Atwood: Feminism and Fiction*. Amsterdam: BRILL.
- Wynne-Davies, Marion. 2010. *Margaret Atwood*. Tavistock, Devon: Northcote House Publishers, Limited.

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL
ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

Riti Ly Lukk

Duality of Victim/Victimizer in Personal and National Context in Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing*

Ohver/ohvriks tegija duaalsus üksikisiku ja rahvuse kontekstis Margaret Atwood'i romaanis „Pinnaletõus“

Bakalaureusetöö

2022

Lehekülgede arv: 33

Annotatsioon:

Bakalaureusetöö eesmärgiks on analüüsida duaalsuse esinemist Margaret Atwoodi 1972. aastal ilmunud romaanis „Pinnaletõus“, keskendudes eelkõige ohver/ohvriks tegija duaalsusele üksikisiku ja rahvuse tasandil läbi peategelase jutustuse. Töö uurib, kuidas antud duaalsus väljendub peategelase kuvandis iseenda ja Kanada kohta ning kuidas need seisukohad muutuvad romaani käigus.

Töö koosneb neljast osast: sissejuhatausest, kahest peatükist ja kokkuvõttest. Sissejuhatus tutvustab romaani ning selle tähtsusest Kanada kontekstis ja duaalsuse kohta Atwoodi teostes. Sissejuhatuses esitatakse ka töö eesmärk. Esimene peatükk on kirjanduse ülevaade, mis vaatleb, kuidas avaldub duaalsus Atwoodi teostes ning kuidas Atwood on „Pinnaletõus“ rakendanud järgnevaid duaalsusi: naine/mees, loodus/kultuur ja ohver/ohvriks tegija. Teine peatükk on empiiriline osa, mis keskendub ohver/ohvriks tegija duaalsusele. Peatükk on jagatud kaheks alapeatükiks, mis keskenduvad peategelase seisukohtadele ja sellele, kuidas kujuneb ümber tema kuvand vastavalt endast kui üksikisikust ja Kanadast kui rahvusest. Kokkuvõtte sisaldab põhilisi tööst tehtud järeldusi.

Romaani alguses on peategelase kuvand väga ühemõõtmeline. Ta näeb nii ennast kui Kanadat ohvrina. Üksikisiku tasandil on peategelane enda arvates ohver näiteks suhetes meestega ja oma vanematega. Kanadalasi ja Kanada loodust näeb peategelane aga Ameerika ja ameeriklaste ohvrina. Romaani käigus jõuab peategelane arusaamisele, et kuvand, mis tal senini on olnud, ei vasta reaalsusele. Kuvandi ümberkujunemine toimub, kui peategelane hakkab endale tunnistama, et nii tema kui ka Kanada on käitunud ohvriks tegijatena ning ta võtab vastutuse oma tegude eest. Romaani lõpus on peategelane leppinud temas valitseva duaalsusega ning tema kuvand ohvri ja ohvriks tegija rollidest on tasakaalus.

Märksõnad: kanada kirjandus, duaalsus, üksikisik, rahvus, ohver, ohvriks tegija

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Riti Ly Lukk

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) minu loodud teose

Duality of Victim/Victimizer in Personal and National Context in Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing*

mille juhendaja on Eva Rein

reprodutseerimiseks eesmärgiga seda säilitada, sealhulgas lisada digitaalarhiivi DSpace kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.

2. Annan Tartu Ülikoolile loa teha punktis 1 nimetatud teos üldsusele kättesaadavaks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace kaudu Creative Commons'i litsentsiga CC BY NC ND 4.0, mis lubab autorile viidates teost reprodutseerida, levitada ja üldsusele suunata ning keelab luua tuletatud teost ja kasutada teost ärieesmärgil, kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.
3. Olen teadlik, et punktides 1 ja 2 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.
4. Kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei riku ma teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse õigusaktidest tulenevaid õigusi.

Riti Ly Lukk

24.05.2022

Autorsuse kinnitus

Kinnitan, et olen koostanud käesoleva bakalaureusetöö ise ning toonud korrekselt välja teiste autorite panuse. Töö on koostatud lähtudes Tartu Ülikooli maailma keelte ja kultuuride kolledži anglistika osakonna bakalaureusetöö nõuetest ning on kooskõlas heade akadeemiliste tavadega.

Riti Ly Lukk

Tartus, 24.05.2022