Current Atwood Checklist, 2010  
Ashley Thomson and Shannon Hengen

This year’s checklist of works by and about Margaret Atwood published in 2010 is, like its predecessors, comprehensive but not complete. In fact, citations from earlier years that were missed in past checklists appear in this one.

There are a number of people to thank starting with Desmond Maley, librarian at Laurentian University, and Leila Wallenius, University Librarian. And thanks to Lina Y. Beaulieu, Dorothy Robb and Diane Tessier of the library’s interlibrary loan section. Finally, thanks to the ever-patient Ted Sheckells, editor of this journal.

As always, we would appreciate that any corrections to this year’s list or contributions to the 2011 list be sent to athomson@laurentian.ca or shengen@laurentian.ca.

Atwood’s Works


“Atwood in the Sun?: Canadian Author and (Scotch-Swilling) Icon Fires Back at Us Over Sun TV News (and We’re So Scared!).” Toronto Sun 19 September 2010: Section: Editorial/Opinion: 07. In this Letter to the editor, Atwood responds to several charges leveled at her by The Toronto Sun, a right-wing newspaper owned by a company trying to secure a licence for a new right-wing TV station. The charges came after she signed a petition from the US-based group Avaaz charging that “Prime Minister Stephen Harper is trying to push American-style hate media” onto Canadian airwaves. Eventually, 81,000 people signed the petition. (See reference under LEVANT, Ezra in News section).

“Letter to the editor: Dear Sun Readers, Last week I signed a Twitterpetition and got into a Twitterscrum—silly me, slap wrist, shut mouth—and the Sun and friends published several pieces accusing me of everything but kitten-roasting and causing bubonic plague. Here are some of the spins, smears, and whoppers: Avaaz Sun: George Soros ‘funds’ Avaaz, a U.S. organization. By signing its petition, I have ‘sold out’ to both Soros and the U.S. Fact: Avaaz is international, and funded 100% by members. Once, George Soros gave 5%. False names Sun: The Avaaz petition was stuffed with signatures from people who didn’t sign it. Fact: Someone in Ottawa stuffed; Ex-Quebecor v-p Kory Teneycke has admitted he knew, almost as soon as it happened. The RCMP has been asked to investigate: Maybe it’s fraud. Would you want your name on something you didn’t sign? Al Jazeera Sun: ‘Al Jazeera lover.’ Fact: I was once interviewed by Riz Khan about my writing. Many folks associated with the Sun appear on CBC TV shows. Does that make them ‘CBC lovers’? Travel and drinking habits: Sun: Champagne-swilling jet-setter. Truth: I prefer Scotch, and use public transport. Planes, trains, and buses for work-related and charity events. I offset with Zerofootprint and Offsetters. Political leanings Sun: Leftie pinko Green. Fact: Swing Voter. We look for values, not labels. I offset with Zerofootprint and Offsetters. Did I speak at a pro-separatist rally? Nope, I spoke at a pro-unity rally. (People mess with my Wikipedia.) The actual petition: “As concerned Canadians who deeply oppose American-style hate media on our airwaves, we applaud the CRTC’s refusal to allow a new “Fox News North” channel to be funded from our cable fees. We urge Mr. von Finckenstein to stay in his job and continue to stand up for Canada’s democratic traditions, and call on Prime Minister Harper to immediately stop all pressure on the CRTC on this matter.’ The verbs are ‘applaud,’ ‘urge,’ and ‘call on;’ not ‘ban,’ ‘suppress,’ and ‘censor.’ The ‘Fox News’ comparison is from the Sun’s own CRTC Application # 1. Is it ‘American-style hate media?’ You judge. The CRTC refused Sun TV News’ request for a special licence that forces all cable and satellite distributors to offer the station, thus generating almost automatic income. Application #2—almost the same
deal as #1, but for three years—will be considered. The Sun says it needs this special deal for its 'business plan.' Should it get one? Should anyone? Can I have one too? Am I a proponent of 'censorship'? Nope. Read the petition again. Now Konrad von Finckenstein has said he isn’t under pressure (unlike his fired CRTC deputy), and will judge Application #2 on its merits. Good!

Real censorship includes book burning, murdering, jailing and exiling writers, and shutting down newspapers, publishers, and TV stations. If you are against this, support PEN International and Index on Censorship. Calling the Avaaz petition 'censorship' is beyond cheap. Is it 'censorship' to block trolls on Twitter? No, and it isn't 'censorship' to send back hate mail unopened and refuse material for your own blog, either. Anyone can vent on their own Twitter or blog. And anyone can sign a petition to express their views. Last word. Folks to the left and to the right have been attacking me for 40 years. But smearing me is hardly an argument in support of Sun TV News' special licence. Is that what Sun TV News has in mind: Smear early and smear often? Would you want that to happen to you? Could you afford to sue them? Neither can I.”


“Ten tips for writers’ block, from my blog. 1: Go for a walk, do the laundry or some ironing, hammer some nails, go swimming, play a sport—anything that requires some focus and involves repetitious physical activities. From my blog: 1: Go for a walk, do the laundry or some ironing, hammer some nails, go swimming, play a sport—anything that requires some focus and involves repetitious physical activities. At the very least: take a bath or shower. 2: Read the book you’ve been putting off. 3: Write in some other form—even a letter or a journal entry. Or a grocery list. Keep those words flowing out through your fingers. 4: Formulate your problem, then go to sleep. The answer may be there in the morning. 5: Eat some chocolate, not too much; must be dark (60% cocoa or more), shade-grown, organic. 6: If fiction, change the tense (past/present or vice versa). 7: Change the person (first, second, third). 8: Change the sex. 9: Think of your book-in-progress as a maze. You’ve hit a wall. Go back to where you made the wrong turn. Start anew from there. 10: Don’t get angry with yourself. Give yourself an encouraging present. If none of this works, put the book in a drawer. You may come back to it later. Start something else.”


Every decade sees the death of many celebrated writers, but the list of those who died in the past 10 years is remarkably large and distinguished. Friends and authors pay tribute to some of those they knew and admired. Here is Atwood’s tribute to Carol Shields: “From this valley they say you are going. / We will miss your bright eyes and sweet smile - / For they say you are taking the sunshine / That has brightened our pathway awhile.’ That’s a verse from the old song, ‘The Red River Valley,’ and it’s what popped into my head when I was asked to write something about Carol Shields. The Red River flows through Winnipeg, where Carol lived and taught for much of her writing life; but the song’s key words—bright, sweet, sunshine, even pathway—and its emotional diminuendo, underlying sadness and its quiet stoicism—these evoke her as well. She was not a person who raised her voice. She saw the delightful and also the tragic in the ordinary, the everyday—which is, after all, where most people live, most of the time. Few can write convincingly about joy, but Carol Shields was one of those few. She was a connoisseur of moments, in a way that was almost Japanese: the cherry blossoms are lovelier because they must fall. She could also be very funny, but hers was a humour that had to do with our too-human grasping at beauty and love in ways that overshoot the mark. The pratfalls of her characters come about because they slip in the mud while snatching at butterflies. Tough humour underneath, come to think of it. Really quite ruthless. She didn't raise her voice, but she didn't spare the paring knife, either. I last saw her in the spring, in her lovely house in Victoria. We had tea, and admired the tulips. There they were, perfect for that day, and there was Carol. She had
cancer, but we didn’t mention that shadow. In Carol’s world, shadows do not negate the light. Or vice versa."

*Cat’s Eye* [Sound recording]. Read by Barbara Caruso. Prince Frederick, MD: Recorded Books, 2010. Unabridged. 13 sound discs (15.25 hr.): digital; 4 3/4 in.

*Dancing Girls* [Sound recording]. Read by Laurel Leffkow. Bath: BBC Audiobooks, 2010. Compact disc. 8 sound discs (CD) (9:40 hr.): digital, stereo; 4 ¾ in.


"Don’t Tell Us What to Write." *Index on Censorship* 39.4 (October 2010): 58-63. On why the mark of a truly free society is one that allows writers to speak with their own voice, not for causes, however worthy. Excerpt: “*Formal Invocation to the Reader: Dear (Mysterious) Reader, Whoever You May Be: Whether near or far, whether in the present or the future or even—in your spirit form—in the past, Whether old or young, or in the middle of your life, Whether male or female, or located somewhere along the continuum that joins these two supposed polarities. Of whatever religion, or none; of whatever political opinion, or nothing much definite; Whether tall or short, whether luxuriously-haired or balding; whether well or ill; whether a golfer or a canoeist, or a soccer fan, or the player or devotee of any number of other sports and pastimes; Whether a writer yourself, or a lover of reading, or a student writer yourself, or a lover of reading, or a student forced into reluctant readership by the necessities of the educational system; Whether reading on paper or electronically, in the bathtub, on a train, in a library, school, or prison, under a beach umbrella, in a cafe, on a rooftop garden, under the covers with a flashlight, or in a myriad other manners and possible locations; It is you whom we writers address, always, in your unknown singularity. Oh Reader, live forever! (You—the individual reader—won’t live forever, but it’s fun to say, and it sounds good): We writers cannot imagine you; yet we must. For without you, the activity of writing is surely meaningless and without destination, and therefore it is by its very nature an act of hope, since writing implies a future in which the freedom to read will exist: We conjure and invoke you. Mysterious Reader; and Lo: You exist! The proof of your existence is that you have just read about that existence of yours, right here. There. That’s what we’re talking about: the fact that I could write these words, and that you, via the go-between of paper or screen, can read them. Which is by no means a foregone conclusion: for this is the very process that all governments and many other groups—religious, political, pressure lobbies of all shades and varieties, you name it—would like to harness, control, censor, bowdlerise, twist to their own purposes, exile, or extirpate. The extent to which they can implement this desire is one of the measures on the graduated line that extends from liberal democracy to locked-down dictatorship...." Available from [http://ioc.sagepub.com/content/39/4/58.full.pdf+html](http://ioc.sagepub.com/content/39/4/58.full.pdf+html) (1 August 2011)


"Foreword.” *The Legacy: an Elder’s Vision for Our Sustainable Future*. David Suzuki. Vancouver:
Review of *Anthill* by E.O. Wilson. Excerpt: “What to make of *Anthill?* Part epic-inspired adventure story, part philosophy-of-life, part many-layered mid-century Alabama viewed in finely observed detail, part ant life up close, part lyrical hymn to the wonders of earth, part contribution to the growing genre of eco-lit: yes, all these. But hidden within *Anthill* is also a sort of instruction manual. Here’s an effective way of saving the planet, one anthill at a time, as it were—preserving this metaphorical Ithaca as an ‘island in a meaningless sea,’ a place of ‘infinite knowledge and mystery.’ The largeness of the task and the relative smallness of the accomplishment make *Anthill* a mournful elegy as well: this may be all that can be saved, we are led to understand. But we are also led to understand that it’s worth saving. Despite the seriousness of the warning he means to convey, I believe Edward O. Wilson had a fine time writing his first novel. It shows in the exuberance of the prose, and in the inventiveness of the plot. And—with the exception of small stretches of awkwardness and preachiness—the reader will have a great time reading it.
Certainly I did. For now I must confess: I too was a child pillbug admirer and skink-hunter, and my first novel was about an ant. I wrote it at the age of seven. It was not nearly as good as this one.” Available from [http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2010/apr/08/the-homer-of-the-ants/](http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2010/apr/08/the-homer-of-the-ants/) (1 August 2011).
Excerpt: “The Twittersphere is an odd and uncanny place. It’s something like having fairies at the bottom of your garden. How do you know anyone is who he/she says he is, especially when they put up pictures of themselves that might be their feet, or a cat, or a Mardi Gras mask, or a tin of Spam? But despite their sometimes strange appearances, I’m well pleased with my followers—I have a number of techno-geeks and bio-geeks, as well as many book fans. They’re a playful but also a helpful group. If you ask them for advice, it’s immediately forthcoming: thanks to them, I learned how to make a Twitpic photo appear as if by magic, and how to shorten a URL using bit.ly or tinyurl. They’ve sent me many interesting items pertaining to artificially-grown pig flesh, unusual slugs, and the like. (They deduce my interests.) Some of them have appeared at tour events bearing small packages of organic shade-grown fair-trade coffee. I’ve even had a special badge made by a follower, just for me: ‘They call me a visionary, because I do a pretty convincing science dystopia’ badge.’ They’re sharp: make a typo and they’re on it like a shot, and they tease without mercy. However, if you set them a verbal challenge, a frisson sweeps through them. They did very well with definitions for “dold socks” – one of my typos – and “Thnax”, another one. And they really shone when, during the Olympics, I said that “Own the podium” was too brash to be Canadian, and suggested “A podium might be nice.” Their own variations poured on to a feed tagged #podium: “A podium! For me?” “Rent the podium, see if we like it.” “Mind if I squeeze by you to get onto that podium?” I was so proud of them! It was like having 33,000 precocious grandchildren!...” Available at: [http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/apr/07/love-twitter-hooked-fairies-garden](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/apr/07/love-twitter-hooked-fairies-garden) (or [http://tinyurl.com/y87sp8a](http://tinyurl.com/y87sp8a)) (1 August 2011) and originally published on 29 March 2010 on the *New York Review of Books* Blog [http://www.nybooks.com/blogs/nyrblog/2010/mar/29/atwood-in-the-tweetersphere](http://www.nybooks.com/blogs/nyrblog/2010/mar/29/atwood-in-the-tweetersphere) (or...
Atwood reflects on life as a child growing up in the wilderness. Excerpt: “When I was 11, I helped my father to build our cabin in northwest Quebec. There is no name for the actual spot; look for the town of North Bay and the Ottawa river, then go northeast from there. Before we built the cabin, we lived in tents most of the year. We moved a lot: my dad was a forest entomologist. Spring, summer and fall, when insects are up and about, we lived in the cabin. In winter, when they’re dormant, we lived in rented flats, until my parents bought a house in Toronto in 1946. The cabin was an anchor point for quite a long time. It was part of my childhood. I remember waking up there surrounded by a lot of light and birdsong. It smelled of cedar from the peeled cedar walls, logs and wood smoke from the stove, with an undertone of tar from the oakum stuffed between the logs. All the materials used to build the cabin were from the surrounding forest, apart from the nails, floorboards and roofing. It had three rooms: in the main room there was a table, stove and kitchen counter. There were two bedrooms, but my parents slept in the main room on a pull-out couch. I actually don’t know how they did it. It was a horrible couch. The only transport was by boat. We caught a train to the village, then walked a narrow trail and finally went by motorboat or canoe to the cabin...”


1 videodisc (47 min.): sd., col.; 4 3/4 in. “On the eve of her 70th birthday, Canadian writer Margaret Atwood set out on an international tour criss-crossing the British Isles and North America to celebrate the publication of her new dystopian novel, The Year of the Flood. Rather than mount a traditional tour to promote a book’s publication, Atwood conceived and executed something far more ambitious and revelatory: a theatrical version of her novel. Along the way she reinvented what a book tour could, and maybe should be.” (Cover).


Excerpt: “Stephen Jay Gould. Sigh. Dead now, alas, but what a blazing light he was, translating the findings of science for over 30 years into easily understood essays for the likes of me. Walt Disney fans may remember his piece on ‘The Neotony of Mickey Mouse’, in which he traced the progressively juvenile evolution of rat-like Steamboat Willie into baby-faced Mickey .... Wonderful Life (Vintage), based on the freaky fossils of the Burgess Shale in British Columbia, is Gould’s entertaining thesis about the role of chance in evolution. We’re finely adapted to our present conditions, but a sudden change may mean that some other life form (slugs? slime mould?) may survive us and become ‘intelligent’. Only happenstance, says Gould, that we don’t have five eyes. Pity.”


“One to Give / One to Get.” The Times (London) 6 March 2010: Section: Saturday Review Features: 3. With today’s World Book Day voucher you can buy one book and get another free, to give away. But which book, and who to give it to? asked The Times. Atwood wrote: “One to Give: I would give Seneca’s On Anger to Gordon Brown. Ancient Roman philosophers rightly thought that anger was one of the most important emotions to try to overcome. Seneca devoted an entire
book to the subject. Its enduring value is his suggestion that what causes anger is hope. We are angry because we are so optimistic. Misfortunes alone don’t make us furious; only misfortunes combined with a misplaced belief in their avoidability. A boss who screams mercilessly at an employee mysteriously and implicitly believes in the perfection of human nature. Someone who shouts every time they lose their house keys manifests an equally dangerous faith in a world in which keys simply do not go astray. **One to Get**: D. W. Winnicott’s *Home is Where We Start From* is the best collection of essays I’ve read by a psychoanalyst. The only parenting guide you should consider buying.”


“Of Love and Hope is a celebration of all aspects of life and love and features many of our leading and best loved poets including...Margaret Atwood....100% of the profits raised from sales of this book will be donated to Breakthrough Breast Cancer and Breast Cancer Care.” (Cover).


Excerpt: “Reading: Who will read? What are the benefits of reading? How will texts be dispersed and acquired? These aspects of reading are much discussed: the *New Yorker* and *Fortune* both recently had long articles on e-books, and you can’t go to a writers’ and readers’ gathering these days without somebody asking about them. I was at three related events recently: the Future of Reading conference at the Rochester Institute of Technology, on June 9, Idea City in Toronto, on June 17, and the meeting of the International Short Story in English: The Border as Fiction, on June 19. Here were some of the things I and others said about reading....” Available from [http://marg09.wordpress.com/2010/06/21/reading-literacy-and-the-economy-brain-and-educational-benefits-e-books-and-paper-books/](http://marg09.wordpress.com/2010/06/21/reading-literacy-and-the-economy-brain-and-educational-benefits-e-books-and-paper-books/) (1 August 2011).

“Review: A Wing and a Prayer: Birds Have Always Been Endowed With Symbolic Portent—From Chekhov to Hitchcock to Twitter. We Ignore Their Decline at Our Peril. There Are Glimmers of Hope, but Only If We Act Now Urges Margaret Atwood.” *The Guardian* 9 January 2010: Section: Guardian Review Pages: 2.

Excerpt: “How to justify the ways of men to birds? How to account for their attraction for us? (For, despite Hitchcock’s frightening hunt-and-peck film, ‘The Birds,’ it is mostly an attraction.) Why is Chekhov’s play called ‘The Seagull’ instead of ‘The Sea Slug’? Why is Yeats so keen on swans and hawks, instead of an interesting centipede or snail, or even an attractive moth? Why is it a dead albatross that is hung around the Ancient Mariner’s neck as a symbol that he’s been a very bad mariner, instead of, for instance, a dead clam? Why do we so immediately identify with such feathered symbols? These are some of the questions that trouble my waking hours....” (2859 w.)


German translation of “Review: A Wing and a Prayer...” in *The Guardian* (9 January 2010) on the importance of protecting birds. (1742 w.)


“A Second Chance or a Boot in the Face?: Two Protests, Seemingly Miles Apart, Were About the Kind of Country We Want to Live in,” Globe and Mail 6 July 2010: Section: Comment: A15. Excerpt: “The first protest was a bucolic occasion. On June 6, after an energetic SaveOurPrisonFarms rally in a Kingston church, during which we were meticulously instructed in the behaviour expected of us during a peaceful protest, we ambled along in the sunshine, accompanied by homemade banners, a hay wagon pulled by a tractor, a contingent of smiling nuns, a donkey, and some kids dressed up as sheep and cows. The community—solidly behind our efforts—cheered us on. We even did a tiny spot of civil disobedience as we walked up a driveway to Correctional Services headquarters and carefully taped our petition to the door, avoiding nails so as not to spoil the paintwork. The petition itself was a plea to the federal government not to go ahead with their scheduled closing of Canada’s prison farms—a vital element not only in local food chains but in the rehabilitation, mental health and socialization of minimum-security prisoners. Nobody beat us up, arrested us or tear-gassed us. We did not set any cars on fire or break any windows. The Black Blockers who trashed downtown Toronto during the G20 would have thought us despicably wussy. People are still poring through the fallout from that Toronto protest. Who did what, when, to whom and why? Why—knowing of the dangers of holding the G20 in a fenced-off, emptied-out downtown Toronto—did Prime Minister Stephen Harper not respond to Toronto’s pleas and change the venue? Why were legitimate NGOs blocked from access to the press, within the security-protected playpen? What accounts for the Ontario government’s confused instructions about security laws? Why the beat-up journalists? Why the nonchalance about the Black Bloc rampage? Why the wholesale roundup of bystanders? ...” (914 w.)

“Seven Futures Are Possible. Which Will It Be?: Wiped Out by Nuclear Bombs? Constant War? But the Crystal Ball Also Shows the Path to Peace for Israel and Palestine.” The Times (London) 14 August 2010: Section: Opinion: 19. Atwood’s solution to the intractable Israeli-Palestinian conflict. (1124 w.)


“Stranger than Fiction; Twenty-Five Years after Its Publication, Margaret Atwood Considers the Prescient Nature of The Handmaid’s Tale.” The Times 16 October 2010: Section: Saturday Review Features: 4. Excerpt: “Twenty-five years ago my novel The Handmaid’s Tale was published. That was in 1985, but 1986 in the UK and the United States. I had started this book several years earlier, but had been frightened by it and had set it aside in favour of something less bizarre. But in 1984 I stopped dithering and tackled The Handmaid’s Tale head-on. Writing it gave me a strange feeling, like sliding on river ice—exhilarating, but unbalancing. How thin is this ice? How far can I go? How much trouble am I in? What’s down there if I fall? These writerly questions were reflections of more general questions about the position of women. How thin is the ice on which supposedly ‘liberated’ modern Western women stand? How far can they go? How much trouble are they in? What’s down there if they fall? There’s yet another set of questions underlying the book. If you were attempting a totalitarian takeover of the United States, how would you do it? What form would such a government take? How much social instability would it take before people would renounce their liberties in a trade-off for safety? Since totalitarianism has attempted to control reproduction—limiting births, demanding births, specifying who can marry whom—how would all that play out for women? My rules for The Handmaid’s Tale were simple: I would not put into it anything that humankind had not already done, somewhere, or for which it did not have the tools. As for the strictures on clothing and sexual behaviour, these are so ancient and pervasive that our present freewheeling sartorial era seems like a mere blip. The cover-ups worn by the women in The Handmaid’s Tale have been variously interpreted as Catholic (as in nuns) or...
Muslim (as in burkas). The truth is that they were inspired by the Old Dutch Cleanser figure of my childhood, but they are also simply old.... Out came my own Modest Proposal, then. In the UK reviewers treated it as a yarn rather than a warning: they had already done Oliver Cromwell and seemed to have no fear of re-enacting that scenario. In Canada people asked in anxious Canadian fashion: ‘Could it happen here?’ In the US Mary McCarthy, writing in *The New York Times*, gave the book a largely negative review on the ground that it lacked imagination, and anyway, it couldn’t happen here. But on the West Coast, so attuned to earthquake tremors, switchboards on talk shows lit up like downtown Tokyo, and someone graffitied on the Venice Beach sea wall: ‘The Handmaid’s Tale Is Already Here!’ It wasn’t, quite, not then. I thought for a while that maybe it never would be—that it never would be. But now I’m wondering again. Here follow five of the *Handmaid’s Tale*-related things that have happened in the past 25 years....” (1159 w.)


Of course this piece created some blow-back, so on 3 October 2010, Atwood referenced a Save the Children UK release which described the problem she was trying to address. She added that “The intent of my article was to locate a problem about which both entrenched sides could agree, thus replacing the prevailing shouting with something resembling a human conversation. Hopefully, both could agree that alleviating the condition of these Area C children is a worthy common goal.” The original article as well as her response are available from [http://www.haaretz.com/weekend/week-s-end/suffering-of-palestinian-children-is-something-both-sides-can-agree-on-1.314309](http://www.haaretz.com/weekend/week-s-end/suffering-of-palestinian-children-is-something-both-sides-can-agree-on-1.314309) (1 August 2011). Later, Gerald Steinberg debunked the news release that originally inspired Atwood’s comments. See News section.


Inspired by Elmore Leonard’s 10 Rules of Writing. *The Guardian* asked other writers for their rules. Here are Atwood’s: “1 Take a pencil to write with on aeroplanes. Pens leak. But if the pencil breaks, you can’t sharpen it on the plane, because you can’t take knives with you. Therefore: take two pencils. 2 If both pencils break, you can do a rough sharpening job with a nail file of the metal or glass type. 3 Take something to write on. Paper is good. In a pinch, pieces of wood or your arm will do. 4 If you’re using a computer, always safeguard new text with a memory stick. 5 Do back exercises. Pain is distracting. 6 Hold the reader’s attention. (This is likely to work better if you can hold your own.) But you don’t know who the reader is, so it’s like shooting fish with a slingshot in the dark. What fascinates A will bore the pants off B. 7 You most likely need a thesaurus, a rudimentary grammar book, and a grip on reality. This latter means: there’s no free lunch. Writing is work. It’s also gambling. You don’t get a pension plan. Other people can help you a bit, but essentially you’re on your own. Nobody is making you do this: you chose it, so don’t whine. 8 You can never read your own book with the innocent anticipation that comes with that first delicious page of a new book, because you wrote the thing. You’ve been backstage. You’ve seen how the rabbits were smuggled into the hat. Therefore ask a reading friend or two to look at it before you give it to anyone in the publishing business. This friend should not be someone with whom you have a romantic relationship, unless you want to break up. 9 Don’t sit down in the middle of the woods. If you’re lost in the plot or blocked, retrace your steps to where you went wrong. Then take the other road. And/or change the person. Change the tense. Change the opening page. 10 Prayer might work. Or reading something else. Or a constant visualisation of the holy grail that is the finished, published version of your resplendent book.”


Atwood one of several authors asked to nominate books of science fiction that got away. Excerpt: “We contains the rootstock of two later streams—the creepy, too-smiley Utopia, as in Brave New World, and the Big Brother Dystopia, as in 1984. It isn’t well known because it hasn’t been available in an up-to-date translation until recently. OUTLINE: Set in the 26th century in a glass-enclosed city of absolute straight lines, ruled over by the all-powerful Benefactor, the citizens of the totalitarian society of OneState live out lives devoid of passion and creativity—until D-503, a mathematician who dreams in numbers, makes a discovery: he has an individual soul.”


As the Hay festival kicks off, with world-class authors being interviewed on stage all week, The Guardian invited writers to follow the example of Nadine Gordimer, one of the star billings this year, and ask themselves questions journalists never ask…Atwood: “Why are you such a pushover for everyone who wants you to do stuff for them? I was the child who refused to eat her Easter rabbit-shaped cookie because I wanted to talk to it. I should just have learned early to bite the heads off quick. Otherwise the rabbits start telling you their tales, and then it’s game over. Will you never learn? Apparently not. I still seem to get into the merde, as a result of being too naive. I think novelists are the people who don’t really know what people are talking about much of the time. That’s why they write novels—to try to find out. Do you really go around in a corset, high heels, and a whip, subjugating men, as a 1989 cartoon depicted you? Not any more. Too old for it. So are the men, poor things.”


The Year of the Flood [Sound recording]. Read by Lorelei King. Bath: BBC Audiobooks, 2010. Compact disc. 1 sound media player (12 hours 25 min.): digital; 8 x 5 cm.


Poem included as part of an editorial by Elsie Walker called “New Life.” Excerpt: “I hope the reader will forgive me for beginning this editorial in a more-than-usually personal way. In having my first baby—Charlotte Hope—I have lately made the biggest adaptation of my life and it leads me to re-conceptualize everything, including the contents of our journal. My personal process of adaptation reminds me of a poem by Margaret Atwood. The poem is about a guardian (a mother?) teaching a young child about the world. It is called ‘You Begin.’” The editorial itself runs 250-253.


Adaptations of Atwood’s Work


“To swim again, I dive below the page
The lines snapping taut, fish lucid with bait
Each hook primordial, the mask she wears
My vision doubled, all barbed insights cached
In breaths dissolving through ghostly strata
Darkness unlit and void of oxygen
Bottomless, flooding landscape and nation
The wilderness and what she’s made of it
Everything we’d forget but once recalled
Births, wood lore, pictographs, viewpoints, fathers
Dam sites we thought we could drain and reclaim
The lake portaged into is where she drowned
Us, the sinking unnamed familiars split
Away from those we were; I’m still down here.”

Quotations

“[Quote].” Cape Times (South Africa) 6 December 2010: 12. “Sons branch out, but one woman leads to another.”

“[Quote].” Carleton Place (ON) 22 January 2010: 01. An article, “Statements from Celebrities Hoping to Raise Funds for Haiti Aid,” quotes Atwood: “Some things are maybes and others are musts. Haiti relief is a must. Don’t hesitate. It could be you.”


“[Quote].” Herald Sun (AU) 30 November 2010: Section: Yourtime: 51. A collection of quotes about mothers, including Oscar Wilde’s “All women become like their mothers. That is their tragedy. No man does. That’s his.” Atwood’s: “Because I am a mother, I am capable of being shocked as I never was when I was not one.”

“[Quote].” The Independent 15 October 2010: Section: News: 2. In an article titled “The News In 140 Characters; We Follow Them, So You Don’t Have To As Read On Twitter,” The Independent includes an Atwood tweet: “At Planet in Focus screening of In The Wake of the Flood, 60-woman Echo Choir & Orville Stoeber belted out 2 G[od’s]Gardener Hymns …. “

“[Quote].” International Herald Tribune 11 February 2010: Section: Sports: 11. In an article about Canada’s changing mindset concerning sports, Charles McGrath commented that: “In a famous attack on the national mythology, the novelist Margaret Atwood said that what passed for heroism in her country was mere survival. She wrote, ‘Canadians are forever taking the national pulse like doctors at a sickbed: The aim is not to see whether the patient will live well but simply whether he will live at all.’”

“[Quote].” New York Times 31 October 2010: Section: BR: 27. Article by Leanne Shapton on Canadian trees includes Shapton’s favourite quotes by Canadian authors about that country’s “leafy heritage,” including this one from Cat’s Eye: “Along the edges of the forest, where there’s open sunlight, there are chokecherry trees. The red chokecherries ripen and turn translucent. They’re so sour they dry up the inside of your mouth.”


“[Quote].” Toronto Star 17 April 2010: Section: Living: L3. “When Canadians are awarded things, they look behind them to see if it was meant for somebody else”: Atwood, accepting an award in New York, February, 1997.

“[Quote].” Toronto Star 25 May 2010: Section: Greater Toronto: GT2. David Lewis Stein, writing on a changing Toronto: “I think Margaret Atwood captured this feeling of always being surprised by the new city growing up out of the old city when she wrote: ‘We are all immigrants to this place, even if we were born here.’”

“[Quote].” USA Today 29 January 2010: Section: News: 1A. Article by Eric Brady discussing changing Canadian perceptions of themselves in sports starts with: “On the road to heaven, there are two signs. One says: Heaven. The other says: Panel Discussion on Heaven. All the Canadians follow the second sign. Novelist Margaret Atwood wrote a generation ago that this was the first joke
about Canada she ever heard. At long last, it is out of date...."

"[Quote].” Word Strumpet 28 December 2010. Writing on her blog (http://www.wordstrumpet.com ), Charlotte Dixon passes on Atwood’s writing secret: “Years ago, I heard Margaret Atwood speak. She announced that she was going to share the secret to writing, and that, indeed, there really was a secret. The audience, composed largely of writers and readers, hushed, thrilled to be present at such an important moment. ‘The secret to writing revealed! ‘It's conflict,’ Margaret Atwood hissed. It was a pleasant hiss, but a hiss nonetheless.”

Interviews

“Big Think Interview with Margaret Atwood.” Big Think [Website] 23 September 2010. An extensive interview live—and transcribed—about the following topics: Writing About the Apocalypse (3:55); The Challenge of Speculative Fiction (3:58); How to Tweet Like Margaret Atwood (4:17); How Twitter Is Like African Tribal Drums (3:29); Margaret Atwood’s Creative Process (4:56); Learning to Hide the Exposition (3:10); Understanding Canadian Humor (1:26); Three Reasons to Keep Physical Books (3:16); The Neurology of Reading (3:30); Why We Tell Stories (5:04). Available at http://bigthink.com/margaretatwood (1 August 2011). Excerpt from the humor section: “Question: What is the biggest misconception Americans have about Canadians? Margaret Atwood: That it's always cold. Let me see, what else might they have... you tell me. 'I'll tell you a Canadian joke and see if you get it. So it's not my joke, it's a joke by somebody called Nancy White who said, 'What does a Canadian girl say when you ask her if she'd like some sex?' She says, 'Only if you're having some yourself.' So one of the Canadian jokes is that Canadians have this ultra-politeness, which is not always true.”


AJAYI, Akin. “Atwood’s Tale,” Jerusalem Post 13 May 2010: Section: Features: 13. Interview in connection with the awarding of Israel’s Dan David Prize to Atwood. While the focus is on The Year of the Flood, a number of other titles are discussed. In the end, Atwood insists that she is “not a pessimist. ‘No, no, of course not, not at all. Pessimistic people don’t write books. The books may be pessimistic in their content, but simply to write a book is an optimistic act.’ How so? ‘Well, first of all you believe that you are going to finish it. Second, that you’re going to get it published. Third, you believe that someone’s going to read it. Fourth, you believe that the reader will like it. How optimistic can you be?’” (1974 w.)

ANDERSON, Becky. “Interview with Margaret Atwood.” CNN International [Web Site] 29 January 2010. On why she was at the Davos World Economic Forum: Excerpt: “ATWOOD: You know, there’s a lot of people who find it very curious. They say that’s a nice girl like me doing in a place like this, being a writer and all. But they always incorporate creative people into this event. And I’m here because they give out three or four Crystal Awards every year. And one of them was very kindly given to me. ANDERSON: Oh, Margaret, there are an awful lot of people in Davos with you with an awful lot of money. Are you going to try and tap anybody up for anything? ATWOOD: Oh, you mean have I hit them up for cash? (LAUGHTER) ATWOOD: Not yet. I wouldn’t mind some nice donations to Bird Life International, but I haven’t gone about that yet. And I think PEN International could really use the money to human rights for writers. ANDERSON: Let’s get on to some viewer questions, shall we? Thomas Bateman writes and he says he’s noticed that female authors, it seems, are less concerned with promoting feminist issues than they have been in the past. And he asks you whether you think this demonstrates a decline in concern for women’s issues? ATWOOD: Writers of fiction have never been easy to corral within single issues because writers write about human beings in all their variety. I think there’s also some sense, which came up today, that with all the spotlight on women, not unmerited, men have been somewhat neglected. And we have to start thinking about the fact, for instance, that they are outnumbered now by women in universities and women’s energy power is coming up. How is that going to affect men, their relationship to women, because you can’t change one without changing the other? I think that’s going to be a big new subject for both men and women writers. ANDERSON:
Oh, so what you’re saying is that the men want us to feel sorry for them, is that right, Margaret?

ATWOOD: I don’t—no. They put up no hands. They were not clamoring and whining. I’m doing that for them. ANDERSON: So what advice would you give, Susie Werherson asks, to an aspiring writer? ATWOOD: What advice would I give to an aspiring writer? Read and read and read and write and write and write. I do run a blog online and my contributors have been putting in a lot of comments on my writers’ block blog. They have a lot of good suggestions to offer. I mean you might try prayer. (LAUGHTER) ANDERSON: Renee comments: “You’ve written so many books,” and asks, “Does the writing just well up out of you or is it a hard journey every time you sit down and write?” ATWOOD: No, not yet. So my feeling about that is it’s a blank page every time. And it’s just as blank every time you start a book. And you’ve got just as much panic and anxiety as—possibly more, because when I wrote my first book, nobody was looking. ANDERSON: A question from me before we get onto our last viewer question, Margaret: anything exciting in the offing so far as novels are concerned? ATWOOD: Well, I don’t know about the exciting. Let’s hope it will be exciting. Yes, I am working on something and let’s suppose I finish it in time to have it published in two years. ANDERSON: And, lastly, Sara Uckun asks, “Are any of your works autobiographical?” ATWOOD: It’s all gone through my head. So whether I’ve made it up or not, I suppose you could say it’s got some connection with me. My DNA is on every page.” Available from: http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1001/29/ctw.01.html (1 August 2011).


Interview in connection with Atwood’s upcoming lecture at the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD) in Atlanta. Excerpt: “Oh, would you just look at us with all the Twittering and the Facebooking, engaging and interacting and communicating with all of you. Aren’t we so modern? ‘Well, maybe not so much. Charles Dickens got a lot of reader feedback,’ noted the distinguished author Margaret Atwood. ‘He published in serial. These kinds of manifestations are not entirely new. Twitter is like a telegram that goes around the word and everyone can participate.’ It’s mesmerizing, really, how elegantly this poet-novelist-environmentalist-commentator flays away the pretensions of modern society. ‘When we first started writing texts—I won’t call them books—when we first did that, which is pretty recently in human history, reading was done out loud,’ she said. ‘When people started reading books to themselves, secretly, that was suspicious.’ ‘It’s almost like being a violin player,’ she said, discussing with us the process of reading and interaction. ‘The real moment of violin playing is when the reader reads the books. I still write with a pencil. I never really learned how to type. I went the wrong way in high school. I didn’t take typing, I took home economics. So I can set your zipper but touch typing, I didn’t learn.’ Unlike some authors, who solicit feedback constantly on social media sites, Atwood keeps to herself until she has what she feels is a complete work, then begins showing it to a select group of first readers. ‘I start the same way everybody else does,’ she added. ‘With a blank page.’"


Excerpt: “Why do women fascinate you? I’m fascinated by people—men and women both. Primarily I’m interested in good fiction—hard-line feminism is what some people read into my work. I myself don’t start with theory, though some people imply theories from the things I write. You can’t squash real characters into tight political ideologies without truncating them. Women take up more space in my work because I have easier access to them, being one myself. Women are not a monolithic lump, but the kinds of dilemmas they face are different from those of men. Their specific problems vary according to such things as culture, socio-economic status and language, but there are some things they do have in common. Anything to do with the reproductive system, for instance—men don’t menstruate, to put it bluntly. What is your opinion of human nature? Our behaviour is often determined by the situations we find ourselves in. Most people would rather do good than evil—we get more of a neurological kick out of doing good. But what if ‘good’ options aren’t available? What if you’re starving and the choice is to starve or steal? People hate having their choices limited and being forced into doing bad things. I’d say that we
are a caring and sharing species but we can be sadly affected by our available choices. How people are treated also matters. If people are treated nicely as children they will be nice to others. **Do you consider yourself an activist?** Not in the professional sense. Professional activists are paid for what they do, and that’s all they do. I’m hardly that. I make the odd speech, write the odd op-ed: that’s about it. I haven’t often been a political party member, though I’ve been a Green, and I did join the Conservative Party of Canada so that I could vote for an organic farmer as leader, but he didn’t win. The first organization I was part of was the Writers’ Union of Canada, which we started when Canadian writers had no idea what they were supposed to be paid for their books and there was little communication among them. Where does ‘activism’ come from? I think that fairness is built into the human programme. Whether you’re upset by political oppression, climate change issues, or the economic system your first reaction is that this isn’t fair. It’s a feeling before it’s a thought. This seems to be how humans work—‘fairness’ is one of the first notions that a child develops. **What motivates you to write?** You may as well ask what makes a doctor work at the hospital. It’s what I do. I started writing in high school, before I knew any better. I probably carried on because I was insufficiently socialized! Then I was told—in the late 50s and early 60s—that women weren’t supposed to write, that they were devoid of talent, but the horse was already out of the barn. The important postwar writers were the Mailers, the Updikes, the Roths—the writing scene then was monolithically male. There were a few women—Sylvia Plath and Anne Sexton—but look what happened to them. People in the 1960s were seriously asking me, not whether, but when, I’d be committing suicide. It was as if the only serious woman writer was a dead woman writer. Happily, things have change.”

**DIXON, Guy.** “Margaret Atwood; As The Year of the Flood Comes Out in Paperback, the Author Ponders the Fine Line Between Writerly Imagination and On-the-Ground Activism.” *Globe and Mail* 26 July 2010: Section: Globe Review: R3.

Excerpt: “What is the draw for you to return not only to this dystopian future but to dystopias in general, as you did with *The Handmaid’s Tale*? I’ve been involved with this for a long time [as a reader and student] and finally felt I was able to tackle it when I wrote *The Handmaid's Tale*. I finally felt I was able to write a book in this genre without falling into a lot of the traps of that kind of writing. And also, of course, you don’t write those kinds of books without
an impetus. The impetus for that one was the combination of 17th-century theology and the late 20th-century resurgence of it that was taking place in the United States. **And the impetus for *Oryx and Crake* and *The Year of the Flood***? Well, as you know, I grew up amongst biologists.

I follow the biological plot line [of scientific advances]. They’ve just succeeded in building an artificial, but biological, lung. I collect these kinds of stories. Not in any systematic way, but I’m aware of them. I read *Scientific American* [magazine]. I read *New Scientist*. *Discover* is another one. One of the things people are working on now, and were working on in 2001 when I was actually halfway through *Oryx and Crake*, is the ability to create diseases. We can do that now. You can create a disease to which nobody has any immunity. The only reason people have not let them loose yet is that nobody has any immunity. You’ll destroy your own side. They are not effective biological weapons in that sense. The blowback factor is too great. So we have that capability. What is it that would inspire somebody to actually do it? What else are we working on? That intersection, if you like: What could we do? What are we in fact working on now? People thought when I wrote *Oryx and Crake* that I made all this stuff up. I actually hadn’t. *Year of the Flood*? Granted I stretch it a bit, but these things are quite doable. You’ve described *The Year of the Flood* as the blueprint for a possible future, a warning. Is it correct to describe this as a form of activist writing? What is activism? I’m not an activist by nature. I’m a rabbit in the Eastern astrological chart, and we like to stay in our burrows and lead quiet lives. In the Western astrological chart, I’m a Scorpio, and we like to spend our time in the toes of shoes, and we’re quite happy there unless somebody puts their foot in. [laughs] I mean, some people are professional activists. That would be Naomi Klein and other people. It’s their métier. It’s their business. So I would say that it’s not activist writing in that sense, since there is no ‘one thing’ that I want the reader to do. I don’t want you to come out from the book and sign a petition. I don’t want you to invent a disease that will wipe out humanity. There are, though, elements of satire, such as the religious sect in the book, God’s Gardeners, turning the energy-saving habit of not taking elevators into a religious dictate, or the Secret Burger restaurant that serves meat of highly suspicious origin. Utopias, dystopias—which are actually the flipside of each other—they always have a satirical element, either explicit or implied, because you cannot really write about the future: We actually don’t know what’s going to be in the future. **But do you believe that dystopias are actually possible?** Mine are. Yes, absolutely. **Surely if [George Orwell’s] 1984 came to pass, wouldn’t people rise up against that?** You’ve never lived through a real dictatorship if you say that. Have you ever seen the film called *The White Rose*? It was a group of people under the Nazis, who tried to oppose them. They all ended up on meat hooks. When you know you’re in a real police state is when the police shoot. With the recent G20 protests [in Toronto], if they had actually shot people, we would know that something had really fallen off the cliff. That’s why Kent State was so deeply shocking to people. It just wasn’t supposed to happen.”


Interview by phone on occasion of paperback edition of the book. The show included calls from fans. Excerpt: “FLATOW: Let’s see if we can get some of your fans in 1-800-989-8255. Let’s go to Mark in South Bend, Indiana. ... MARK: Awesome. Hi, Margaret. I love your new book. It’s amazing. I love how like similar it is to—you can notice things going on in real life that are so similar to that book. It’s amazing how you weave like fiction and nonfiction. I was wondering if you could, like, turn me on to some other writers that kind of write maybe at least similar stuff to like what you have or anything that—any other authors you can turn me on to. That would be awesome. ...Ms. ATWOOD: Which part of it do you want, the disaster part or the dystopian part or the strange sciency part? Strange sciency part, probably—actually, there’s a great online thing called asknature.com.... And it’s involved in a whole new movement called Biomimicry. In fact, there’s a book called “Biomimicry” which you can look up as well. And there’s—okay, how does nature do things? FLATOW: Mm-hmm. Ms. ATWOOD: For instance, how does nature make colors or how does nature cause liquids to move through tubes, et cetera? And the people involved in biomimicry are re-engineering things we thought we knew about, like fan blades. It turns out that a humpback whale fin gives you a much more efficient design for a fan blade than the one we’ve got now. So stuff like that. You might enjoy exploring that. But if you want a really good jaunt through the future of an unattractive kind, you might try “Riddley Walker.” R-I-D-D-L-E-
Margaret Atwood is listed on our website. Last year, you did an eco-conscious book tour. Ms. ATWOOD: I did. FLATOW: Were you just trying to offset your carbon footprint then on the tour? Ms. ATWOOD: Well, we offset our carbon footprint through an outfit called Zerofootprint, which you can find not only on our website, called www.yearoftheflood.com, but you can also find it online, zerofootprint, all one word, and it gives you a calculator by which you can calculate how much carbon you have been putting out there and what you need to do to offset it. And for part of the tour, the publisher offset it, and for the rest it we had to calculate—and in fact, I’m even a bit behind on the calculations. And we couldn’t factor in everything. For instance, they said, well, how much energy does the theater that you’re putting this event on in [consume]? What sort of lights does it have? Of course I had no idea. FLATOW: It’s very hard doing carbon footprint. Full interview available from Lexis-Nexis. Also available on http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyid=129324791 (1 August 2011).

HARRIS, Marjorie. Thrifty: Living the Frugal Life with Style. Toronto: Anansi, 2010. Includes interviews with Atwood on several topics: on laundry (pp. 116-117), on materialism (pp. 3-4), on recycling (p. 94), on storing clothing (pp. 33-34) and on the general topic of thrift and frugality (pp. x-xi).

KLEFFEL, Rick. “Authors Find Fertile Mix of Science and Religion.” National Public Radio (NPR) 1 January 2010: Morning Edition. Joint interview between Atwood and Karen Armstrong, a religious scholar who has studied the history of belief. Excerpt: “KLEFFEL: In [Armstrong’s] latest book, The Case for God, she looks at the relationship between science and religion. The current conflict between the two, with Darwin’s theory of evolution as a flash point, is not in keeping with historical interpretations of scripture. Ms. KAREN ARMSTRONG (Religious scholar): Darwin came along and found a natural explanation for life itself. Now, this wouldn’t have been a big deal. In the past, Saint Augustine had laid down an important principle that said if a scriptural text contradicts science, you must give it an allegorical interpretation. KLEFFEL: Armstrong is looking at lessons of the past, while Margaret Atwood extrapolates from the past to create a vision of the future. One of Atwood’s best-known novels adapted into a movie is The Handmaid’s Tale, set in the future in which America has become a Christian fundamentalist theocracy. Atwood believes that science fiction became necessary when the contradictions between objective reality and religious orthodoxy became too difficult to ignore. Ms. MARGARET ATWOOD (Novelist): Those things that we used to just believe in all the time went to Planet X where they are alive and well. Angels with flaming swords, the burning bush that speaks, you know, all of those really quite science fiction things in the Bible. KLEFFEL: Karen Armstrong says her research into the history of religion demonstrates that science and religion are two very different kinds of knowledge. Ms. ARMSTRONG: Religion is not answering our scientific questions about how did the world come into being. That’s a question for science. Religion is asking us to consider these problems that always occur to human beings: Why is life so filled with pain? What is the nature of happiness? What is the meaning of our mortality? KLEFFEL: Armstrong sees the role of religion as a guiding force for ethical behavior. Margaret Atwood brings that notion to life in her newest novel, The Year of the Flood. It’s set in a dystopian near future where genetic engineering has ravaged much of the planet. The survivors have created a new religion. Ms. ATWOOD: This group, which is called God’s Gardeners, has taken it possibly to an extreme that not everybody will be able to do. They live on rooftops in slums on which they have vegetable gardens. And they keep bees. And they are strictly vegetarian, unless you get really, really hungry, in which case you have to start at the bottom of the food chain and work up. And they make everything out of recycled castoffs and junk. So they’re quite strict. KLEFFEL: Atwood points out that the beginnings of her religion of the future have already appeared in the present. Ms. ATWOOD: Indeed, we now have the Green Bible among us, which I did not know when I was writing this book, which has tasteful linen covers, ecologically correct paper, the green parts in green. Introduction by Archbishop Tutu. And a list at the end of useful things you can do to be a more worthy green person. KLEFFEL: Atwood created a new pantheon of saints, including Rachel Carson, Al Gore and Dian Fossey, the murdered conservationist, as well as hymns, which have been brought to life by Orville Stoebel. (Soundbite of song, “Today We Praise Our St. Dian”) Mr. ORVILLE STOEBER (Singer): (Singing)
Today we praise our Saint Dian, whose blood for bounteous life was spilled. Although she interposed her faith, one species more was killed. KLEFFEL: Atwood’s environmentally based religion gets to the core of Armstrong’s understanding of faith. Ms. ARMSTRONG: The creation story was therapeutic. It was telling us how to be creative ourselves and, indeed, to keep the cosmos in balance. Men and women and gods had to work together to keep this fragile ecostructure together. KLEFFEL: Karen Armstrong’s philosophical ecosystem is reflected in Atwood’s futuristic religion. But even though God’s Gardeners feels like a real religion, Margaret Atwood is not ready to step up to the pulpit. Ms. ATWOOD: Well, not quite in the same way that L. Ron Hubbard did. I don’t have any adherents yet. But, who knows?” Full interview available from Lexis-Nexis.

LAHIRI, Bulan. “At Home in a World of Ideas [Web].” The Hindu (English) 1 August 2010.

Excerpt: “Margaret Atwood looks up from the book she is signing, her mischievous blue eyes sparkling with good humour, and urges me to ask her questions as she multi-tasks! At the moment, the grand dame of Canadian literature couldn’t be busier. Fuelled by rave reviews of her dystopian masterpiece, The Year of the Flood, and the chart-busting success of Payback and its uncanny foretelling of the financial meltdown, she is in serious demand. She is short on time but has agreed to a meeting at the office of the publishing company she helped set up, the House of Anansi Press, in downtown Toronto. She breezes in, dressed in black, long pink scarf flapping, and launches straight into a book-signing spree. I am struck by how small and frail, how delicately chiselled and feminine she is. Somehow this comes as a surprise, although I am uncertain about what I was expecting. I recall the chillingly brilliant opening lines of her Power Politics, ‘you fit into me like a hook into an eye; a fish hook, an open eye,’ but before I can delve deeper into the apparent contradiction between the writer and her craft, a cup of coffee interrupts my brief reverie and I find myself, unsurprisingly, addressing a well-spring of quotable quotes: Atwood’s conversation is witty, exceptionally intelligent and interspersed with a ready, infectious laugh. And now, the Nobel? My dear. Writers don’t write in order to win prizes. They write for their unknown readers. One should live without any expectations in the prize department, just as one should not get too set on winning when gambling, a thing I sometimes do. Do your readers in India get to meet you in person sometime soon? We’ve been to India three times—each time was wonderful in a different way, and there are so many parts of that exceptionally varied land that I’ve never seen. But realistically, I am now over 70, and will have to cut down on activities that are becoming too strenuous. However, there are now new technologies, perhaps by video conference? Norman Mailer appeared in Edinburgh from his New England living room. When you look back at your extraordinary life and career, what impresses you most? I’m Canadian, and we’re not supposed to find ourselves impressive. Any ‘famous’ Canadian who starts putting on airs will be quickly punctured. But I suppose it’s a little astonishing to me that a country that appeared to be such a cultural backwater in the 50s, when I was starting out, is now so active, and has produced so many writers of international stature. What about your life do you most fondly recollect? Like most people who had good childhoods, it’s my childhood that I recall most fondly. I think I was very lucky to grow up the way I did in unusual and isolated circumstances, with not many ‘material’ things; but these circumstances actually fostered reading and writing, and I had a family that valued story-telling and books. Any major regrets? We all have lives we might have lived had things been a little different. I do regret not being taller, or an opera singer, but there wasn’t much I could do about either. Let’s go back a bit to the beginning. What made you take up writing as a career? My first novel was about ants! There wasn’t much action in it, but it was a good writing exercise….My aunt tells me I wanted to be a writer when I was five…. When I was about six or seven, I stopped writing and started painting, and then around 16 started to write again. Did success come early? If not, what gave you the confidence to keep at it? My first book of poems got rejected and rightly so. I think they were very bad. I used to do a lot of writing poetry, fiction, non-fiction. I did a lot, actually. Puppet shows, high school skits, acted in Ben Johnson’s ‘The Silent Woman.’ I designed the programme, printed the posters a lot like the old Mickey Rooney shows. I kept writing. My first published book of poems, Circle Game, won the Governor General’s Award for poetry. Four hundred and twenty copies were initially printed, which was quite good for poetry. Confidence wasn’t my problem; stupidity was! My expectations were quite low. If you don’t see the dangers coming towards you,
In defence of Wuthering Heights, ‘It was published, it became a phenomenon. There have been four reprints since October 2009. It has consistently been the number one bestseller, with about 2,500 to 3,000 copies sold in North America alone. One never really knows where ideas come from.

In Payback, you’ve dealt with felicity with such a wide range of issues: did a lot of research go into the book? Were you worried about experts questioning some of what you have talked about? I’ve been around for quite a bit now; one picks up a lot as you go along. The older you get, the more things accumulate. I got a research assistant to check out some stuff for me, but the ideas were already there. This was for a public broadcasting series and of general interest to people. Writers are great generalists—it’s amazing how much you can pull out of the attic. This is not a book on economics, it’s about human behaviour. About getting the balance even. Children constantly say ‘that’s not fair.’ I think that’s very fundamental to human nature. Payback: how was the idea born? When I was first asked to do the Massey Lecture Series, I said ‘no.’ I was looking at two other literary lecture series for Oxford and Cambridge universities. And then an interesting incident happened. The publishing company I’ve long been associated with was about to lose the series, and I told CBC they couldn’t take it away from Anansi. When Payback was published, it became a phenomenon. There have been four reprints since October 2009. It has consistently been the number one bestseller, with about 2,500 to 3,000 copies sold in North America alone. One never really knows where ideas come from.

In high school tests there were these geometric drawings one attempted to view from different angles. I had been noticing these advertisements in the subway on debt that set me thinking. Even in the 19th-century historical novel, money was important. In Jane Austen, debt features consistently. In Wuthering Heights, Heathcliff goes away poor and comes back having earned a fortune to extract the house from its previous owner. Mill on the Floss is about money. I used the 19th-century novel for my illustrations because more people know them. That was a time of great social movement. Male fortunes were made in an instant. American wealth would marry English aristocracy to move upwards on the social ladder. There was no social safety net. The consequences of debt failures could be extreme. In Flaubert’s Madame Bovary, the defence in court saying that she was punished for her behaviour was a red herring. What happened was that she overspent. Had Emma Bovary learnt double-entry book-keeping and drawn up a budget, she could easily have gone on with her hobby of adultery! There was so much material I could have used...the German or Russian novel...I didn’t even go there. I used Scrooge because everybody knows him. Scrooge and Dr. Faustus. For Faustus free-spending is damnation, for Scrooge it’s salvation. You are often described as a feminist writer. Do you see yourself as a feminist? Do you know what that means? What would a feminist voice be like? Betty Friedman? Do you think women are better than men? Society is a pyramid; people at the top do better. Men and women, both. In the 1960s and 1970s, any woman who had done anything was thought to be a feminist. I don’t think people really know what they mean by ‘feminist.’ You’ve been so prolific in fiction and non-fiction both. Do you work concurrently on several things? How do you decide what to work on and when? Compared to Joyce Carol Oates, I’m slow. When I was growing up, there was no electricity. You worked with a kerosene lamp at night. The cone of concentration, that’s the secret of everything. I don’t have a routine although I would love to have one. Were I to have a ‘don’t interrupt’ sign on the door, no one would pay any attention. There are these Henry James-like images of a writer. When I start to think, I clear out the junk. ‘Oh-oh’, the family is wont to say, ‘she is in-between books. She is going to redecorate!’ It’s nice, the world of ideas: the real world is too difficult. The end of a book is always hard. The separation anxiety. The author saying goodbye to the book and the reader. That moment between the writer, reader and the book that’s important. The Blind Assassin had a prophetic element to it. And now, Payback and The Year of the Flood. Where do these clairvoyant instincts come from? It’s happened four times. In Nature, there are early indications of happenings. When earthquakes happen, snakes come out of their holes. You can feel the vibrations if you pay attention to these things. I am very nosey and curious. I also read a lot. In fact, I read anything. Hello, People magazines. I start with the back pages of newspapers and often watch stories migrate from the back to the front. The little things—there’s a lot there. Right now I can tell you about several

---

1 Ed. Note: Friedan?
things that will happen. Solar panelling that isn’t even visible will be commercialised. Clothes lines will come back, as well as inside drying-racks. Why should anyone spend money to dry clothes when the air can?  

If the prophecies are ignored yours and others’, when and how do you think payback time will come? For one, oil will diminish by 2022. Travel, food it'll affect the way we live. Earthquakes happen when tectonic plates readjust themselves. We ought to choose the gradual, less painful way. As a species we are approaching the magic moment...you know the little conundrum about the test tube full of amoeba food? You put one amoeba in at noon. The amoeba divides in two every minute. At midnight, the test tube is full of amoebas and there’s no food left. At what moment in time is the tube half full? At one minute to midnight! That’s when the amoebae are saying, ‘We are fine, there’s half a tube of food left’. That’s the magic moment we’re at, and if we don’t take care of it ourselves, it will be taken care of for us!  

What are you working on now? What is your next book about? I never tell. Any new projects? I don’t like to reveal what’s inside the egg before it hatches. I’ve had too much experience with eggs for that. But I am working on a series of lectures, the Ellman Lectures, for Emory, this October on the subject of science fiction. They will appear as a book, to be called In Other Worlds.  

Writer, poet, activist: Is there anything else that you still look forward to doing? Planning the perfect funeral. [Sorry. I couldn’t resist. But people have started offering their seats to me on the subway, so one must face the fact that sooner or later one will topple over.] A footnote: I’m not really an ‘activist’. Like any Scorpio (Western horoscope) or Rabbit (Eastern horoscope), I prefer a quiet life in a cosy burrow. But I get dragged in because things that seem extreme to others often just look like common sense to me.  

I’ve been listening mesmerised and I have so much more to ask, but she has a flight to catch. Margaret Atwood iconic author, inventor (of the Longpen), mother, visionary... but the most haunting image that she leaves me with is that of a soft, strong woman who suddenly whirls around as she is led to a waiting car to ask ‘and how will you get back home.’” Available from http://www.hindu.com/it/2010/08/01/stories/2010080150020100.htm (1 August 2011).  

LEOPOLD, Todd. “Margaret Atwood and the End of Humanity.” CNN.COM [Web Site] 17 February 2010. Interview about The Year of the Flood. Excerpt: “Though Atwood deals with some weighty issues, Flood—like her other works—has some wickedly humorous touches, particularly in the product names and slang of the future society. The corporate security force is called the CorpSeCorps; the firms have names such as HelthWyzer and Seksmart. People wear the tresses of MoHairs, an animal bred for its pelt, and drink at Happicuppa, a Starbucks gone mad. It’s a cleverness borne of necessity, says Atwood. ‘I have a need for a word, then I have to find the word,’ she says. And it’s not always easy: ‘What you have to do if you’re putting a product or a corporation into a book, is you have to search and find out if there is one or not already. And if there is one already, you have to change yours so it’s not the same.’ In Oryx and Crake, she says, she had created an assisted-suicide channel called NightyNight. Unfortunately, in real life, that name belonged to a children’s sleepwear company. ‘You don’t want a situation in which you name an assisted-suicide television program after a children’s sleepwear company,’ she says.” Full text available from Lexis-Nexis or at http://articles.cnn.com/2010-02-17/entertainment/margaret.atwood.flood_1_oryx-and-crake-handmaid-s-tale-margaret-atwood? s=PM:SHOWBIZ (1 August 2011).  

MAHONEY, Elisabeth. “G2: TV and Radio: Radio Review.” The Guardian 11 November 2010: 24. Report of Atwood interview on Radio 4. “Excerpt: ‘It seems astonishing,’ Jenni Murray said on Woman’s Hour (Radio 4), that it is 25 years since the publication of Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale. And it does, not least because her dystopian vision sounds as fresh and urgent as ever. Atwood... is such a sage. In the first few minutes, she referenced a number of oppressive regimes across the world and throughout history. Women’s rights have not had a smooth progress, she reminded us: ‘It’s more like a very twisty, winding road—sometimes things getting better for women, and sometimes things getting really quite a lot worse.’ Yet her delivery is deceptive, slow and rather flat. You can zone out a bit and then come back to find she’s saying something ultra-prescient or terrifying. To people who say the book’s reality could never happen,
she said coolly. ‘All of this kind of thing can happen anywhere, given the right amount of social disruption and turmoil.’"

MCGRUM, Robert. “Go Three Days Without Water and You Don’t Have Any Human Rights. Why? Because You’re Dead: With Almost 50 Books to Her Name, the Formidably Intelligent Margaret Atwood Has Never Minced Her Words. But One Year on From the Copenhagen Summit, Not Even Her Dark Imagination Could Have Predicted the Bleak Situation the World Now Faces. Here, She Talks about Cowardly Politicians, Thinking Machines—and Why She’s Inventing Superheroes.” The Observer (EN) 28 November 2010: Section: Observer Magazine Pages: 18.

Extensive, fresh interview: Excerpt: “Atwood firmly resists the suggestion that she might be an icon of Canadian literature. ‘What does that mean?’ she counters in her distinctive prairie monotone, somewhere between a drone and a drawl. ‘I don’t like being an icon.’ A thin ironic smile. ‘It invites iconoclasm. Canada is a balloon-puncturing country. You are not really allowed to be an icon unless you also make an idiot of yourself.’ ...Cyberspace, it seems, is where she is most at home these days. A long time ago, in fact less than a year—‘but time goes all stretchy in the Twittersphere, just as it does in those folk songs in which the hero spends a night with the queen of the faeries and then re-turns to find that 100 years have passed and all his friends are dead’—Atwood was advised by the people who were building the website to promote her new novel, The Year of the Flood (2009), that it should include a Twitterfeed. ‘A what?’ I said, innocent as an egg unboiled. Should I know of Twitter? I thought it was for kiddies. ’...Is she, I wondered, not something of a Victorian in her prodigious output and range of interests? ‘Oh yes,’ she replies unfazed. ‘Victorian literature was my subject at Harvard.’ Now, finally, we are beginning to approach the origins of her best work. The Handmaid’s Tale is the embodiment of Atwood’s aesthetic approach, in which she places ‘science’ as much as ‘fiction’ at the heart of an urgent creative matrix. In the first place, she does not make a fetish of literature. ‘Human creativity,’ she instructs, ‘is not confined to just a few areas of life. The techno-scientific world has some of the most creative people you’ll ever meet. When I was growing up, I never saw a division. For instance, my brother [a senior neurophysiologist specialising in the synapse] and I both have the same marks in English and in the sciences.” ‘ (3093 w.)


Interview in advance of Atwood’s appearance in Portsmouth on Sept. 21, where she would be appearing on Writers on A New England Stage. There, she would talk about the paperback release of her newest book, The Year of the Flood. The interview focuses on the contents of the book. Available from Lexis-Nexis.

MEDLEY, Mark. “‘A Stroke of Lunacy’: Margaret Atwood’s Reinvention of the Book Tour Is Documented in Ron Mann’s In the Wake of the Flood.” National Post 13 October 2010: AL1.

Excerpt: ‘Margaret Atwood visited Japan last month, the last leg of a worldwide book tour for her most recent novel, The Year of the Flood. As with other places she’s visited during the tour, instead of simply doing a reading, a troupe of local actors was recruited to stage scenes from the book. The two Japanese productions—one at Meiji Gakuin University and the other at the Canadian Embassy—were boosted by the presence of composer Orville Stoeber, who flew in from Los Angeles for the events, along with Toronto director Alisa Palmer and a trio of Canadian singers. The actors performed in Japanese, the singers sang in English and Atwood narrated in her mother tongue accompanied by ‘a Mini-Me speaking Japanese,’ as the writer describes it, beside her. Still, the 70-year-old author wasn’t sure if the production would be lost in translation. ‘I did wonder ahead of time: What are the Japanese going to make of this?’ she says over coffee last week at L’Espresso Bar Mercurio in Toronto. ‘But apparently it was a big hit from the feedback that we got.’...Mann only learned of the tour days before the first scheduled performance, in Edinburgh, Scotland. When she told him no one was going to be filming, Mann arranged to have a crew document the stops in Edinburgh and London. When the tour reached Canada, Mann accompanied Atwood cross-country, though ACTRA rules prevented them from filming any of the performances except those in Sudbury and Kingston, Ont., the entirety of which will appear on the DVD. ‘It would have been fascinating to have a record of all of them,’ Atwood says. ‘Because really it was everywhere from ‘We can’t possibly go on,’ to ‘This is astonishing!’ Astonishing or not, Atwood vows she’ll never embark on another tour this extensive, or elaborate,
again. Besides, she doesn’t think it could be done with any book. ‘We couldn’t have done it ... if it had been, for instance, James Joyce’s Ulysses—we can’t make an all-singing, all-dancing Ulysses.’ While the movie is framed by the book tour, the film explores Atwood’s deep and long-standing fascination with birds, which she calls the planet’s ‘canary in the coal mine.’ One scene in the film finds Atwood on a train, hunched over her laptop, lecturing her publicist about the migratory paths of birds over Ontario’s Pelee Island, where a wind farm was supposed to have been built. Atwood and her partner Graeme Gibson are joint honorary presidents of BirdLife’s Rare Bird Club, and 100% of the film’s proceeds go to the organization. ‘Ninety-seven percent of human charitable giving goes to humans,’ she says. ‘Of the remaining 3%, half of it goes to dogs and cats. That leaves 1.5% for the rest of nature. That’s a serious imbalance.’...Though the novel offers a pessimistic portrait of the future, the film offers hope. At one point near the end of the documentary, Atwood visits Sudbury, a city rejuvenated in the years since her youth. ‘I remember it when it was a complete barren wasteland,’ she says. ‘It was over-logging, forest fires, and then the smelters. And it was nothing. Nothing. Zero. Nothing at all. And they brought it back.’ ‘It’s a hopeful message,’ Mann adds, ‘We can turn things around.’"

MONK, Katherine. “In the Wake of Margaret Atwood: Documentary About Famed Author Follows Her Fight to Save the Planet.” Ottawa Citizen 10 October 2010: C10.
Excerpt: “It’s not my movie. It’s Ron Mann’s,” says Margaret Atwood in response to the very first question, an opening lob about whether or not In the Wake of the Flood was everything she hoped it would be. Atwood backs away from these facile questions like someone who’s just been presented with a gift that ticks: quietly, surely and with the tiniest hint of an audible smile. She’s got MacGyver smarts: She can defuse even the most explosive topics with a snip of her trenchant wit, and she can fashion prescient prose from the loose ends, failed experiments and a slop pile of technology. This is the landscape she explores in her latest novel The Year of the Flood, a book that picks up the same themes as Oryx and Crake, as it pokes away at the carcass of our current civilization. The characters in these books are survivors of an apocalyptic event that nearly wiped out the entire human species. Left to survey the wasteland of what was, these new Adams—and a handful of Eves—should be transformed souls, but they are not. They haven’t transcended in the wake of tragedy. Their human flaws have only become more pronounced as fear crushes reason. ‘I think (my books) are a laugh-a-minute,’ says Atwood, brushing off any suggestion the work is disturbing. ‘I was always fond of Franz Kafka, who, apparently, when he read his work out loud, laughed his head off. We seldom think of him that way, but that’s how he thought of himself.’...Atwood says she’s highly aware the human race is staring into the abyss of extinction—like the sweet songbirds that already flew ahead—but she’s not in any position, nor does she have any desire, to wave a flag and beat the revolutionary drum. ‘I’m a writer. I write fiction,’ she says, yet again stating the obvious in a way that makes the inquisitor feel moronic. ‘I am not a (professional) activist.’ Atwood recaps the Nature chapter in her famous thematic survey of Canadian literature, Survival, and points to its prophetic accuracy. ‘In that chapter, I said we’re so used to thinking of nature as big and strong and powerful and something that is going to kill us, but that is going to change.... We’re going to see it as something fragile and in need of care. And that is, in fact, what’s happened.’"

Excerpt: “Was the moon landing a hoax? Think about it. And now think about this: Margaret Atwood, the Canadian Queen of Letters, arguably the greatest authoress this nation has ever produced, just might believe the Apollo 11 moon shot that marked ‘one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind,’ was one big giant scam. Or, then again, maybe Ms. Atwood was just kidding....This much we know. In a 2009 interview with Spartan Youth Radio, a radio podcast program produced by students at Espanola High School, in Espanola, Ont., near Sudbury, Ms. Atwood, or Peggy to those who know her best, gets to talking about the old days, when she was a girl, and how Sudbury, in her imagination, with its treeless landscape and blackened rocks might as well have been the surface of Mars...or the moon. Enter Spartan’s intrepid young reporter, Madeline Lemire, age 16 at the time, who fires a question worthy of a journalism degree at the literary legend that sends Ms. Atwood wandering down conspiracy theory lane. Ms. Lemire:
‘I was told, recently, that you are one of the believers who is of the opinion the moon landing was filmed.’ (a.k.a. faked.) And over it goes to the esteemed author. And...Ms. Atwood sounds just like she always does: monotone. Flat as a book cover. Judging from her never-changing tone it is impossible to discern if she is kidding around with a kid. But Ms. Lemire took her words, and still does, to be genuine. ‘She was entirely serious with everything she said,’ insists the avid-Atwood admirer who was so nervous before the face-to-face interview that she could not sleep. ‘The woman is very intelligent and she has given a lot of thought to her answer and she genuinely believes that the moon landing was faked.’ So what is it that Ms. Atwood said? ‘The question about the moon landing is why we haven’t been back?’ she muses in the interview. ‘It was done in an age where computers were as big as a couple of rooms. If you even look at the [2001: A Space Odyssey] HAL the computer, and I think that movie came out in the late ’60s, HAL the computer is huge. We didn’t yet have microchips. So I just wonder, how did they do that? Why haven’t they done it again if it was so easy?’ Ms. Lemire reasons, quite reasonably, that having been there and done that once, perhaps there was no need to go back. ‘President Bush said we’re going back or words to that effect and then people calculated how long it would take or how much money it would cost to actually do that. It was a long time and a lot of money,’ Ms. Atwood replies in the interview. ‘Just wondering... just wondering about the belt of deadly radiation that people had to go through to get to the moon. And those strange shadows and why the flag rippled and a few things like that.’ Ms. Lemire finishes her line of questioning with a million-dollar flourish: So, why a hoax? ‘Well,’ says Ms. Atwood, ‘if it was [a hoax], and the jury is open and we’ll never know, but it was a space race with Russia, a space and arms race that was going on at the time.’ Spartan Radio’s possible scoop of a lifetime stayed buried, for the most part, until very recently. Ms. Atwood has been trading Twitter broadsides with Sun-Media columnist Ezra Levant of late, and raised the ire of the right-wing blogosphere by signing an Avaaz petition calling for American-style, right-wing ‘hate news’ to be denied a broadcasting licence in the form of Sun News TV. The ever-motivated bloggers of the right naturally retaliated by trolling for all the dirt they could find on Ms. Atwood. In due course they unearthed Ms. Lemire’s would-be Pulitzer Prize—almost a year after it aired. Ms. Atwood is currently travelling. But she did take a minute to reply to a query from the National Post questioning whether she believed the moon landing was faked, or if she was simply having a patch of fun with the high school crowd in Espanola. ‘It’s a running joke and also a running conspiracy theory that the moon shot took place in Sudbury, there’s another running joke that the Russian space stuff was filmed under the Moscow central subway station,’ Ms. Atwood writes. ‘If you’re asking whether I believe either of these, on the whole, no, because too many people were involved—surely you couldn’t keep ALL of them from leaking. But the questions about the computer technology needed to do something this complex remain with us—what were they using, in those days before microchips? How heavy was it?’


Focus on The Year of the Flood: Excerpt: “Q. How did you get on your dystopia jag? Atwood: ‘What can I say? I was born in 1939. We were losing the war at that time. It looked very, very bleak. I couldn’t have known, I was too young, but there’s an atmosphere that kids pick up on. After the war, we were still pretty possessed by it, and I remember reading Churchill’s history of the war.’ Q: You also read Orwell? Atwood: ‘I read George Orwell probably as soon as 1984 came out, and read Animal Farm when I was a child, thinking it would be like Winnie the Pooh, and I didn’t know it wasn’t. I thought the pigs were real pigs and the horses real horses, and I was just wracked by it....’ Q: So you can’t see yourself ever writing a utopia? Atwood: ‘I don’t believe in a perfect world. I don’t believe it’s achievable, and I believe the people who try to achieve it usually end up turning it into something like Cambodia or something very similar because purity tests set in. Are you ideologically pure enough to be allowed to live? Well, it turns out that very few people are, so you end up with a big powerful struggle and a mass killing scene.’ Q: How do you move people forward without holding up a myth of utopia? Atwood: ‘By going slower, more gradualist, by increments, more progressive, that’s what we have to hold onto because otherwise you descend into anarchy, chaos, criminality, and totalitarianism of a different kind: in order to keep you safe, we have to obliterate your civil rights.’ Q: How fragile is the fabric of democracy? Atwood: ‘The fabric of democracy is always fragile everywhere
because it depends on the will of citizens to protect it, and when they become scared, when it becomes dangerous for them to defend it, it can go very quickly.’ Q: In your dystopias, many people quickly come to accept the totalitarian government as normal. Why? Atwood: ‘What is their choice? After I wrote Handmaid’s Tale, people came up to me and asked why weren’t there any protests. And I said, “You don’t understand totalitarianism.” A real totalitarianism doesn’t fool around with protests in the streets.’ Q: I saw a line of yours where you said, “I don’t write pretty books.” Atwood: ‘No, sorry. I don’t know whether there are any really pretty novels. There are novels that end well, but in between there are human beings acting like human beings. And human beings are not perfect. All of the motives a human being may have, which are mixed, that’s the novelists’ materials. That’s where they have to go. And a lot of that just isn’t pretty. We like to think of ourselves as really, really good people. But look in the mirror. Really look. Look at your own mixed motives. And then multiply that.’ Q: Do you think everyone has the potential to be a fascist? Atwood: ‘Well, that’s one of those questions, “Does everyone have the potential to be a cannibal: if you were stuck on a lifeboat and your choice was dying or eating somebody else, which one would you do?”’ We do not know how we’d behave. But a lot of people facing fascism didn’t become fascists. I don’t happen to believe that we are all monsters.’ Q: Yet you like to set up lifeboat situations. Atwood: ‘I think we’re in a lifeboat situation. Not in the United States yet, but a lot of people in this biosphere are in lifeboat situations right now.’

VOGEL, Charity. “Margaret Atwood’s Artistic Advantage; The Author Famous for Her Futuristic Tales Credits the Power of Nature, Reading and Answering the Question of ‘Why?’.” Buffalo News (NY) 21 February 2010: Section: Spotlight: F3.

Interview in advance of an address at the University At Buffalo’s Center for the Arts the following month. Excerpt: “Atwood...calls herself a strong believer in the power of a broad-based liberal arts education for today’s students—even in a 21st-century world that seems to be growing faster and more technology-driven every day. ‘Those who have it do better than those who don’t have it,’ said Atwood, speaking to The Buffalo News by phone from her home in Toronto. ‘If you educate someone to be only a technician, they’re going to pop awake at 35 and say, ‘Why am I on the planet? Who am I really? I don’t want to be just an interchangeable cog.’ All those questions that have been bothering mankind for 10,000 years. The whole human being,’ said Atwood, ‘is what a liberal-arts education addresses.’” Although much of Atwood’s current writing anticipates the future—as does her adoption of newer communication technologies such as Twitter and the online blog—the lauded author has a quick response to the suggestion that, someday down the road, perhaps the only format her books will be available in will be electronic. ‘That will not happen,’ she said succinctly. ‘I guarantee you that.’ How can she be so sure? Atwood, gazing back over a career edging into its fifth decade, thought for a moment and then responded thoughtfully, and precisely. ‘If you have something in only one form, it’s extremely vulnerable,’ she said. ‘If you want it to be more permanent, you need to keep it in another format besides that. Something you want to keep and treasure—you will have it in the form of a paper book.”


News


Atwood was supposed to have a cameo role singing in the hockey musical, The Score, but after the film ran on for a couple of hours, and had to be trimmed to about 90 minutes, her part was cut. According to the Director, the scene in question was long and not essential. Among others who were in that scene and also cut: ex-Leaf Eddie Shack and songwriter Dan Hill.

“Atwood’s Coffee Is (Really) for the Birds; Buy Author’s Brew by the Cup or Pound at Balzac’s Coffee.” Toronto Star 28 July 2010: Section: Living: E7.

Excerpt: “Bird-loving author Margaret Atwood has stepped away from the printed word to help create a bird-friendly coffee. The Atwood Blend will be the featured brew at the Balzac’s Coffee chain in August for $1.60 a cup. It’s already being sold at the chain’s four coffee shops and its
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Atwood to be one of all-female speakers at the 11th annual ideacity conference hosted by Moses Znaimer. Excerpt: “Over the years, the most consistent comment made about ideacity, indeed about all such gatherings, is that ‘there are not enough women on stage,’ said Znaimer as he launched the conference. He told of how, just after he thought it would be ‘an interesting stunt to kick off the second decade of ideacity with an all-woman roster,’ he bumped into author Margaret Atwood and noted foreign affairs expert Janice Stein and sought their opinions on the notion. ‘They hated it,’ he recounted, adding that Atwood, who will appear at ideacity on Thursday, said ‘I only play on the A-team.’”
“Escritora Margaret Atwood se declara muy preocupada por el cambio climático.” EFE Newswire - Relevantes de LatinoAmerica 17 February 2010.
Atwood in Cuba to speak and to launch book Excerpt: “La escritora canadiense Margaret Atwood, Premio Príncipe de Asturias de las Letras en 2008, dijo hoy en Cuba que está ‘muy preocupada’ por el cambio climático y el agotamiento de recursos como los alimentos. Atwood habló hoy también de la escasez de agua potable, el daño a los océanos, la pesca indiscriminada y el comportamiento humano, en la XIX Feria Internacional del Libro de La Habana, a la que asiste como una de sus principales invitadas. ‘La única verdad es que si destruimos la naturaleza, nos morimos. Probablemente la naturaleza no va a lidiar con este problema’, afirmó Atwood en un encuentro con escritores y lectores en el que estaban la Nobel de Literatura sudaficana Nadine Gordimer y el ministro cubano de Cultura, Abel Prieto. La canadiense, de 70 años, presentó “El quetzal resplandeciente y otros relatos,” edición cubana de 67 cuentos que abordan desde la supervivencia del planeta hasta el romance, con toques de humor e ironía. ‘La naturaleza no nos necesita. Nosotros somos los que la necesitamos. La naturaleza se las ingenia bien sin nosotros’, afirmó.” Available from Lexis-Nexis.
“Exhibitionism; A Peek at What’s Showing around Town.” Santa Fe New Mexican 11 June 2010: Section: Pasatiempo: PA-64.
Excerpt: “Klaudia Marr Gallery presents Weep and Wonder, a series of oval portraits by Jennifer Nehrass. The portraits are based on the 12 maidens killed by Odysseus in Margaret Atwood’s The Penelopiad, a retelling of the classic Greek myth of Penelope and Odysseus, but many of the doomed maidens in Nehrass’ surreal portraits are painted in modern guise. The show opens Friday, June 11.”

Excerpt: “Beloved Canadian author Margaret Atwood has received the World Economic Forum’s Crystal Award 2010 in Davos, Switzerland. The award honours artists who have used their art to improve the state of the world. ‘I am very honoured to have been given the Crystal Award this year,’ Atwood... said. ‘The future of the planet will depend on a great deal of human creativity, and it is heartening to see an organization focused on economies recognizing the contributions made by artistic creators and thinkers. After all, language, music and visual art are a part of the human heritage that is much older than economies as we know them today. They are who we are, while money is a neutral tool that enables us to do what we imagine.’ The Crystal Award pays tribute to the decisive role that culture and arts play in the creation of global understanding and peace.


Excerpt: “Writing to friends in Hong Kong last month to thank them for supporting her husband, Liu Xia cited words from a speech that Atwood delivered in April on receiving an award from PEN America, an organization that works to defend free expression. ‘Atwood spoke of how silence and secrecy allow the worst horrors to breed,’ she said, ‘and how sooner or later the hidden stories in a society have to come out.’ Atwood then went on to say, ‘The messengers in such cases are seldom welcome—yet they are necessary and must be protected.’ ‘Of course,’ said Liu Xia, ‘my husband is one of those messengers.’”


Excerpt: “Green Leader Elizabeth May was pleased that delegates at her party’s convention in Toronto this month decided to keep her as leader and move to having leadership reviews following elections, as opposed to fixed terms for leaders. This puts the Green party in line with the other national political parties. One of the highlights of May’s time in Toronto was a fundraiser with Graeme Gibson and Margaret Atwood. May says Atwood is not an ‘out’ Green party supporter but ‘she is a supporter of me getting elected.’”


The article presents the favourite animal books of selected people in conservation, television and literature in Great Britain. Novelist Alan Titchmarsh selected The Tale of Peter Rabbit, by Beatrix Potter. Naturalist Nick Baker chose Duncton Wood, by William Horwood. Television presenter Bill Oddie selected The Wind in the Willows, by Kenneth Grahame, while BirdLife International Honorary President Atwood chose Wild Animals I Have Known, by Ernest Thompson Seton.


Story about the success of Karen Solie as a prize winner notes in passing that Atwood did not win the $20,000 Trillium Book Award which went to Ian Brown’s memoir The Boy in the Moon. Atwood was nominated for The Year of the Flood.


Article notes that 18 November was Atwood’s 71st birthday—and on that date: “1626 St Peter’s Basilica in Rome is consecrated by Pope Urban VIII, 1820 US Navy Captain Nathaniel Palmer discovers the frozen continent of Antarctica, 1928 Mickey Mouse makes his US debut in the first successful sound-synchronised cartoon, Steamboat Willie, 1966 US Roman Catholic bishops scrap the rule against eating meat on Fridays, 1987 the results of an opinion poll indicate that more than 160,000 white South African adults plan to leave the country within five years, 1993 South Africa signs an interim constitution that will bring democracy in April 1994, 1996 Russia’s new space probe to Mars fails shortly after blast-off and comes crashing back into the Pacific Ocean near Easter Island, 2009 Guards aboard the Maersk Alabama use guns and a sound blaster to repel the second pirate attack in seven months on the US vessel.”


One of 10 individuals selected as a “National Builder of the Decade” by Globe writers. Excerpt: “Birthplace: Ottawa Age: 70. Margaret Atwood first made her mark as a poet, most notably with The Circle Game, for which she earned her first Governor-General’s Literary Award in 1966. Since then her talent and influence have spread into many fields, making her one of our most
estemed literary exports and an international cultural superstar. Let us now praise a famous woman. Or should that be women? Margaret Atwood has done so much so well so often that you could be forgiven for thinking she had cloned sundry selves to accomplish it all. While she has been the Energizer Bunny in our cultural landscape for decades, Ms. Atwood seemed to step up her game in the last 10 years, simultaneously deepening her art, increasing her popularity and spreading her influence. Indeed, she’s such an unavoidable, almost elemental presence that sometimes she’s in danger of being taken for granted. What Ms. Atwood has, at 70, that other artists don’t is resonance. Not only did she take care of business on the artistic front, including three top-notch novels—among them The Blind Assassin, winner of the 2000 Man Booker Prize—she brilliantly embodied Percy Shelley’s notion of poets as ‘the unacknowledged legislators of the world.’ Whether working on behalf of International PEN and Amnesty International, protesting environmental degradation, ‘mirroring the gigantic shadows which futurity casts upon the present,’ or tweaking Stephen Harper, Ms. Atwood has been the public intellectual par excellence of the new century. This was perhaps most tellingly exemplified by 2008’s Payback: Debt and the Shadow Side of Wealth, both a highly popular cross-country lecture series and a phenomenally successful book that once again demonstrated Ms. Atwood’s timeliness while wittily elucidating the myriad sources of our current economic discontent. Somewhere in there, she also found time to serve (twice) as a judge for the Scotiabank Giller Prize, mentor new writers (most notably Vincent Lam), help launch the Griffin Poetry Prize and write for both stage (The Penelopiad) and opera house (the libretto for The Handmaid’s Tale). And, lest we forget, there’s the LongPen, that quirky long-distance autographing device Ms. Atwood invented to bridge the digital/hard-copy divide. Margaret Eleanor Atwood’s star enters the century’s second decade older, of course, but high, undiminished and uneclipsed. Has there ever been a Canadian artist who has so consistently combined commercial success with critical acclaim and intellectual clout? ‘A voice is a human gift,’ she once observed. ‘It should be cherished and used. ... Powerlessness and silence go together.’ Based on her voluminous and enduring accomplishments, it’s clear Ms. Atwood has no intention of surrendering to the sound of silence any time soon.” Later Jody Spark reacted negatively to the honour “Margaret Atwood a nation builder of the decade (Focus, Jan. 2)? The same Margaret Atwood who said she was going to vote for the Bloc Quebecois—a party whose sole reason for existence is to divide the nation—in the last federal election? Some nation builder.” (Globe and Mail 5 January 2010: A14). The next day Phillip Siller wrote in, noting: “The writer of the letter criticizing Margaret Atwood’s inclusion in the list of the decade’s nation builders (Picking the Nation’s Best. Or Not - Jan. 5) must be unaware of the federal statute requiring her name to be included in every list of Canadians not involving hockey.” (Globe and Mail 6 January 2010: A16).


Excerpt: “[Atwood’s ]... surprising talent [as a draughtswoman and fashion designer ] has emerged in an exchange over Twitter, which saw the Canadian writer contacting two readers who had expressed admiration for her work, and offering to design ‘superhero comix costumes’ for their avatar alter-egos, @kidney-boy and @DrSnit. ‘They both have excellent Twitter names—suitable for superheroes—and were comix fans, and were discussing Comic.com, as I recall,’ she told the Guardian. ‘I just thought it would be fun to draw some superhero costumes for them, as their names were so evocative, so I asked them what magic powers they would like to have.’ The resulting designs, complete with ‘flying magic kidney helpers’ and a suitably chilling enemy, ‘the Paniac,’ show the creator of The Handmaid’s Tale and Oryx and Crake has lost none of her imaginative powers. ‘DrSnit has an autoimmune disease and wanted freedom from pain, so I gave her a magic wand encircled by TYLENOLS, a magic word, and a pain-linked Enemy to be overcome,’ Atwood said. ‘Kidney Boy is a nephrologist, and he wanted the ability to insert kidneys into his dialysis patients, plus ‘the flying-around thing.’ I think I made his boots a little big, but I am assured these are good ‘sh*t-kicking’ boots for the Emergency Room.” The exchange began when Joel Topf, a clinical nephrologist in Detroit who tweets as @kidney-boy, messaged Melissa Travis, a writer and comedian in Atlanta. Atwood retweeted the message, and then, to their surprise, messaged them both. On 9 October, Dr Snit, as imagined by Atwood, duly appeared by
Twitpic. Dressed in a scarlet basque and an orange cape, the doctor was trampling underfoot ‘her arch-enemy’ the Paniac, a creature resembling a slug with spines. Kidney Boy, wielding an ‘instant scalpel,’ arrived this week, though he is as yet monochrome. ‘Choosing colours—purple, orange, red?’ the author tweeted Topf. ‘Boots too large? Hope you like . . . ’ She said last night that they ‘are both thrilled with their new outfits.’

ANDERSON, Jason. “Summer Camp with Margaret Atwood; Ron Mann Pays Tribute to the Author’s Unconventional Brand of Activism in His New Film at Planet in Focus.” Toronto Star 8 October 2010: Section: Entertainment: E4.
Interview with Ron Mann about The Year of the Flood tour. Excerpt: “Saving the world from ecological collapse is a task that requires all kinds of tools and tactics. So who’s to say that it’s such a strange idea for a Canadian literary icon to raise funds and awareness for the protection of bird habitats by turning her latest book tour into a travelling amateur theatrical? Ron Mann certainly doesn’t think it’s so weird for Margaret Atwood to turn her attentions to a ‘summer-camp production.’ ‘That’s how Margaret originally conceived of this,’ says the Toronto filmmaker of the events that were staged in lieu of conventional readings for Atwood’s 2009 novel The Year of the Flood. ‘There was an element of summer camp in the idea, which was: ‘We have actors, we have singers, let’s put on a show!’ And she was like the counselor in charge of putting the production together.’”

Excerpt: “Margaret Atwood’s newest book, The Year of the Flood, is a visionary imagining of the future after a natural disaster has obliterated most human life. It’s a finalist for the 23rd annual Trillium Book Award, and organizers hope you’ll read it while drinking a beer called Devil’s Pale Ale 666, or a wine called Kacaba Vineyards 2009 Rebecca Rose. The ‘read local, drink local’ scheme matches each of the 17 Trillium finalists with an Ontario wine and an Ontario craft beer based on their characteristics. Organizers from the Trillium Book Award worked with the Ontario Craft Brewers and the Wine Council of Ontario on the pairings. They announced the literary nominees and showcased them with the beverages at a party Tuesday at the new Thompson Toronto Hotel. For The Year of the Flood, they say Kacaba Vineyards 2009 Rebecca Rose (sold only at the winery) ‘is a sipping wine, very suitable to reading an intense book like Atwood’s, but we caution the reader, because it goes down quite easily.’ Devil’s Pale Ale 666, meanwhile, is ‘a dark, smooth and thoughtful brew of six malts, six hops and 6 per cent alcohol. This creates a rich but nicely balanced brew with a witty edge.’”

Report of the opening act of the Portland Arts & Lectures series. Excerpt: “Atwood and Le Guin are feisty and opinionated. They’ve written almost 100 books between them, and they didn’t do it by wasting time. They’re friendly but firm and aren’t shy about expressing themselves. When Le Guin, who played the role of interviewer, asked Atwood whether the human race is doomed, Atwood briskly replied, ‘I think it’s going to hit a bumpy patch,’ and proceeded to list a few of the reasons why. …Atwood is a committed environmentalist and a bit of a character. The author of The Handmaid’s Tale and The Blind Assassin brought a large hat on stage that she said was made of newspaper, plastic, cardboard and duct tape, among other things. She also sang a hymn, ‘The Mole Song,’ from her most recent novel, The Year of the Flood. Atwood sang on key, despite Le Guin’s attempts to distract her by adding ‘bum, bum’ at the end of each line. The audience helped her finish the last line—for God has found them gooood—also mostly on key.” Available from Lexis-Nexis.

When singer Elvis Costello boycotted Israel, Barak contrasted his position with that of Atwood who had decided to come to Tel Aviv to accept the Dan David Prize earlier in the month. Excerpt: “Leaving nothing to instinct, and still keeping her conscience clean, Atwood noted that ‘cultural boycotts serve no good purpose if one of the hopes for the future is that peace and normal exchanges and even something resembling normal living conditions will be restored.’ She also perceptively added that ‘moderates who want to promote dialogue always get hammered twice as much, as they get stones thrown at them from several directions at once.” See also her comments on this topic in ITZKOFF article, below.
Excerpt: “Toronto’s Annex neighbourhood will dispatch two distinguished ambassadors a few blocks east this week, when Margaret Atwood walks to the Toronto Reference Library to be interviewed by The Globe’s Ian Brown on the subject of ‘writing in a time of calamity.’ How to survive by telling stories, as told by a noted survival expert.” [Ed. Note: There is no written report of the interview; it is however, available in five parts on YouTube http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h4hf94ItVA (1 August 2011).]
Excerpt: “Lakefield Literary Festival Regionalism runs deep at the annual Lakefield Literary Festival, founded to celebrate the heritage of Susanna Moodie, Catharine Parr Trail and Margaret Laurence, all writers with strong links to Ontario’s Kawartha Lakes region. This year’s event, taking place at various places in the village of Lakefield, pairs such headliners as Margaret Atwood and Linden MacIntyre with local favourites Drew Hayden Taylor, John Boyko and Charles Foran. Lakefield, Ont.: July 16-18; $15 to $50; www.lakefieldliteraryfestival.com.”
BOLAN, Sandra. “Filmmaker Enjoyed Inside Look at Margaret Atwood.” *Stouffville Sun-Tribune* (ON) 17 March 2010: 01.
Interview with Stouffville writer and director Joel Gordon who saw a completely different side of Ms. Atwood when he worked on the documentary *Turning Pages: The Life and Literature of Margaret Atwood*. Excerpt: “She’s an extremely generous person,” Mr. Gordon said, who spent the majority of 2006 and 2007 working on the documentary. The documentary goes where no other film, article or book on Ms. Atwood has gone before—her year-round residence in Toronto and her summer home on Pelee Island. Mr. Gordon was also given access to her friends and family, including her daughter Jess who has never granted an interview before this, according to Mr. Gordon. Mr. Gordon and Atwood first met back in 2005 when he worked on the video component of her LongPen creation, which enabled people to see her remotely autograph books. In getting to know Ms. Atwood, Mr. Gordon thought she would make a great subject for a documentary. ‘Many people advised me it would be an impossible feat,’ he said. But he asked her anyway. ‘She said “let’s talk about it, let’s have some tea in a café” and that’s what we did,’ he said. ‘She thought that I was the right person to do this biography.’ Although the documentary is three years old, it has not been updated and Mr. Gordon doesn’t want it to be. ‘You can never really capture the entirety of a person’s life in a documentary, only something poignant about them and I think I captured that,’ he said.”
On Earth Day, April 22, Atwood was announced to speak at a Climate Rally held in Washington’s National Mall, along with Reverend Jesse Jackson; film director James Cameron; AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka; Olympic gold medalist Billy Demong; producer and Sting’s wife Trudie Styler.
Excerpt: “The abrupt departure of cool, clean hero of the right, Kory Teneycke, from the Sun TV News team was a shocker....When making the announcement, the former spokesman for Our Glorious Leader Stephen Harper said, according to this newspaper, that ‘controversy over Sun TV, which he acknowledged he helped fuel, is hurting the project’s chances of acquiring the regulatory approvals it seeks.’ ... With all the murky shenanigans, there are 10 things you should know. 1. Margaret Atwood won, Kory Teneycke lost. Atwood connected the issues of the federal government’s hostility toward arms-length federal bodies to Sun TV’s application for a cushy licence. And it stuck....”
Report of conversation between the two authors at the Portland Arts and Lectures Series 2010.
Excerpt: “Pairing Margaret Atwood with Ursula K. Le Guin was smart: they come from similar backgrounds, both attended Radcliffe in the pre-Second Wave years, both are very prolific writers of indefinable genre fiction, and they’ve evidently been friends for years. Seated on little divans in front of over 2,000 people (yes, “only in Portland,” I know), they seemed like two old school chums swapping gossip even when they were deconstructing modern realism and debating
whether or not the human race is doomed. The effect was intimate, convivial—Le Guin giggling uncontrollably, for example, when Atwood discussed how writing is like building a boudoir for the reader. Atwood making endless Twitter jokes.” Available at http://urbanhonking.com/spacecanon/2010/09/24/margaret_atwood_ursula_k_legui/ (1 August 2011).

Excerpt: “Author Margaret Atwood also used Twitter this week to urge Canadians: ‘Pls write MPs 2 help developing countries have affordable meds.’”

Review of a stage production of Murder in the Dark, an adaptation of five of Atwood’s short stories sown together by writer/director Tony Grelis. The play was originally performed at the Sydney Fringe Festival (AU). [Ed. Note: The actual text of this production is unavailable.]

According to Haynes, “Euripides is the Ancient ... Margaret Atwood. Euripides was the author of some of the greatest tragedies yet written: The Bacchae, Hippolytus, and Medea. He was accused of misogyny because he presented women doing things that they shouldn’t: falling in love with their stepsons (Phaedra), joining cults and going mad (Agave), and killing their children (Medea). Euripides also stands accused of being too clever by half, in Aristophanes’ Fros. But that is precisely why he is so brilliant, and why his stories sing through the centuries. If we can’t relate to every story from the ancient world (how many of us have accidentally killed our father and married our mother?), we can always find a way in to a Euripides play. Medea is the scorned wife left for a younger model, Phaedra is the fading beauty, Electra the bitter daughter, torn apart by her parents’ destructive relationship. These women’s reactions may be more extreme than most of us, but we can’t help but understand the emotions that drive them. Margaret Atwood may seem a more obvious tie-in with Homer since her Penelopiad offers a retelling of his Odyssey from the perspective of Odysseus’ long-suffering wife, Penelope. But her characters are so complex, her stories so full of inevitability and surprise, and her women so well drawn, that she is closer to the tragedian. Their mutual love of language also unites them: Euripides’ poetry was so admired by the Ancient Sicilians that they gave freedom to Athenian men they had captured in war if they could quote large chunks of it. Besides, Euripides is always disguising himself as a woman, at least in Aristophanes’ plays. He was destined to be reincarnated as one.”

Excerpt: “Margaret Atwood opened this week’s International PEN congress with a blistering attack on the idea that writers should feel obliged to ‘do’ anything. ‘People are always lining up to tell writers their duty,’ she said. She proposed answering this unsolicited advice with a T-shirt bearing the message: WRITE YOUR OWN BOOK! The theme of the congress was ‘The Environment and Literature: What Can Words Do?’ Several hundred writers from 90 countries descended on the Shinjuku district of Tokyo—setting for the film Lost in Translation—to answer the question.”

Excerpt: “On the occasion of my one and only meeting with Canada’s most celebrated writer, I learned how to take snuff. Ninety-five percent of the writing life is secluded slogging, and mostly I like that, sometimes love it, but as a night’s vacation I also love these moments of public silliness, these brief conjunctions with affluence—in this case a Hogwartsian high-table dinner at a college at the U of T where I am writer-in-residence for the winter months (it’s February 2004). Dessert in the library, port, Madeira, and snuff being passed around. By chance I’ve been seated beside Ms. Atwood. ‘Have you ever taken snuff, Steven Heighton?’ She is reading the vellum-cardboard name tag by my plate. ‘Never,’ I say. ‘Watch carefully. Some of my friends were hooked on the stuff back in the seventies.’ She reaches into the snuff-bowl, takes a small pinch of red powder—
this is raspberry-flavoured snuff, they've announced—and sets it in the shallow concavity formed at the base of her thumb when she makes a fist. (Or maybe she opens her small hand, stretching the thumb and index finger away from each other—I can’t honestly remember.) Whatever the technique, she lifts the hand to her nose and snorts up a line. I can do that, I think. I reach in and pincer a large clump of this stuff. Aiming to impress her, likely. Writers of her generation, I’ve heard, tend to think my generation lacks joie de vivre. And perhaps savoir vivre. Of course, their generation has had two extra decades to colour in their stories. And, sadly, nothing magnifies a writer to storied proportions—an Acorn, a MacEwen—like premature death."

HUME, Mark. “It’s Going to Be Bigger Than Clayoquot Sound; The Looming Fight Over the Great Bear Rainforest Will Once Again Put B.C. at Ground Zero of the Global Environmental Movement.”

Atwood among many who signed a petition opposing development of million-dollar pipeline through environmentally-sensitive land.

HURLEY, Michael. “Kingston Protesters Stand Up for Their City’s Prison Farm; They Are Furious That Harper Wants to Shut Down Such a Successful Rehabilitation Program.”

"What they do is nuanced, by which I mean it is about human beings, not about propaganda positions." Hutchison suggests that Atwood is the true identity of mystery writer Inger Ash Wolfe, author of several mysteries including The Taken. Reason: in an interview Wolfe suggested that she chose to hide her true identity so that the books she writes under a pseudonym won’t be judged in the context of her other novels.

ITZKOFF, Dave. “Margaret Atwood Accepts Israeli Prize.”

The Dan David Prize is as an award for people “who have made an outstanding contribution to humanity, in each of the three time dimensions: past, present, and future,” and has previously been given to Tony Blair, Al Gore, Tom Stoppard, Amos Oz and Yo-Yo Ma. Before the awards ceremony, Ms. Atwood had been urged by Palestinian groups and writers from other countries not to accept the prize as a protest of Israel’s policies toward the Gaza Strip and its artists. But Ms. Atwood was not persuaded, telling Bloomberg News, “We don’t do cultural boycotts.” She added: “Artists don’t have armies. What they do is nuanced, by which I mean it is about human beings, not about propaganda positions.”

KNELMAN, Martin. “How a Book Tour Turned into a Crusade for Birds.”

“Late last year on the day after she turned 70, Margaret Atwood made an unforgettable appearance in Sudbury, resplendent in a Red Riding Hood parka. This was Day 100 of her marathon book tour for her latest novel, The Year of the Flood—a scary parable about looming..."
environmental disaster. It turned out to be a special day for Atwood, for Sudbury, for environmentalists, for birds everywhere—and thanks to the extraordinarily persistent and talented veteran documentary director, Ron Mann—for lovers of another endangered species, great Canadian cinema. Though I called it ‘unforgettable,’ this event would indeed have been forgotten if Mann had not only overcome all kinds of obstacles to film an occasion that turned out to be surprising, hilarious, revealing and inspiring all at once—and a perfect climax....” The story behind the creation of In the Wake of the Flood, Ron Mann’s film recording Atwood’s book tour promoting environmental causes as well as The Year of the Flood.

LENNON, J. Robert. “Exquisite Amusements.” The Walrus 7.8 (October 2010): 68-69, 71-72. “Atwood’s best-known novel, The Handmaid’s Tale, is a harrowing, dystopian metafiction about a concubine living in a phallocentric, theocratic dictatorship of the near future. It has proven a sturdy text in American colleges, but the flip side to authors having a ‘Big Book’ is the burden of always being associated with it, above and beyond everything else they have written. Atwood’s larger career rewards careful and obsessive examination, however, and, since 1985 her stylistic range has been extraordinary, her interests diverse. The writer discusses Atwood’s career since the success of The Handmaid’s Tale.” (Magazine).

LEVANT, Ezra. “Atwood’s Free-Speech Flop: Author Gags on Own Principles by Demanding Sun TV News Be Censored.” Toronto Sun 12 September 2010: Section: Editorial: 07. Excerpt: “There is no journalist too odious for her to defend, and no controversy that would cause her to boycott a cultural event. As she told a gala in her honour this April, ‘once censoring begins, who shall be in control of it, and where will it stop?’ Amen! So imagine how bad the Sun must be—I’m talking about this newspaper, dear reader!—for Atwood to sign a petition demanding that a TV news channel proposed by Sun Media be stopped by the Canadian government.”

LEVY-AJZENKOPF, Andy. “Atwood Accepts Major Israeli Literary Prize.” Canadian Jewish News 40.19 (13 May 2010): 3. Atwood’s reaction to pressure NOT to accept major prize in Israel which she shared with Indian novelist Amitav Ghosh. Excerpt: “In an interview with Bloomberg News prior to the award ceremony, Atwood said: ‘We don’t do cultural boycotts,’ adding that ‘I would be throwing overboard the thousands of writers around the world who are in prison, censored, exiled and murdered for what they have published.’ In an open letter to Atwood last week, Rob Maguire, editor of Saskatoon-based Art Threat magazine, called on her to reject the prize so as not to lend support to an Israeli government that ‘systematically abuses the human rights of Palestinians.’ Numerous similar letters were written to Atwood and Ghosh in the months prior to their acceptance of the prize. In April, Toronto filmmaker John Greyson—who led the campaign to boycott the Toronto International Film Festival last year because of its special focus on films about Tel Aviv—asked Atwood to decline the prize in order to recognize ‘the growing boycott movement which is trying to achieve peace in the region.’ In another letter, from the Gaza-based Palestinian Students’ Campaign for the Academic Boycott of Israel (PSCABI), Atwood was told not to accept the prize because she would be ‘giving a slight and inadvertent nod to Israel’s policy of ethnic cleansing and genocide.’ But in a joint response to their detractors posted on Atwood’s blog after their win, Atwood and Ghosh said they were no one’s pawns. ‘The letters we have received have ranged from courteous and sad to factual and practical to accusatory, outrageous, and untrue in their claims and statements; some have been frankly libelous and even threatening. Some have been willing to listen to us, others have not: they want our supposedly valuable ‘names,’ but not our actual voices.’ In their joint acceptance speech, Ghosh and Atwood said novelists don’t deal in absolutes. ‘Both of us were urged by some people and groups not to come to Israel on this occasion. We were told that no artist should attend any cultural event here—no matter how hopeful and moderate such an event might be—considering the unequal, unjust, and harsh and dangerous conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories,’ Ghosh said. Atwood continued: ‘Propaganda deals in absolutes: in yes and no. But the novel is a creature of nuance: of perhaps, of maybe.... [W]hen we said we felt the urgent necessity of keeping doors open, we were informed that we were deluded, and worse.’ Attempting to put their positions on the Israel-Palestinian issue into context, the novelists said they hoped that all people who ‘truly want a chance for Palestinian people to be able to live a decent life, to be compensated for what they have wrongfully lost, and for the destruction of their infrastructures—and all those who hope
Is all wish and an — “I am very honoured to have been given the Crystal Award this year, I really did,” she says. ‘There were witnesses.’ The book was The Gift, by the American literary scholar Lewis Hyde. Published in 1983, it argues with sinuous elegance that art is most effectively consumed within a ‘gift economy,’ where the point is the spiritual or moral value of the transaction and so, ultimately, the betterment of society. A novel, which Hyde calls a ‘transformative gift,’ is especially important. Byng liked the book so much, he bought the UK rights and reissued it in 2006 with glowing cover quotes from Atwood, Zadie Smith, and David Foster Wallace. Fast-forward to May this year and a publishing conference in Bloomsbury, where 400 delegates were divided into groups and instructed to discuss World Book Day. Did the event, launched in 1995 by Unesco to promote reading, need a makeover? Byng thought so. ‘It was felt the children’s book side of it was too dominant,’ he says from behind his book-strewn desk in Canongate’s new London office in Notting Hill. ‘It’s a brilliant initiative whose centrepiece is the giving of 11 million £1 book tokens to kids. But it needed to be made more relevant to adult readers.’ So Byng suggested complementing World Book Day with World Book Night....”

To help this fundraiser, Atwood was one of several celebrities who donated an artbook and books signed by their authors. Available from Lexis-Nexis.

Atwood presented with the Crystal Award at the 2010 World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. Excerpt: “I am very honoured to have been given the Crystal Award this year,” Atwood said in a statement. ‘The future of the planet will depend on a great deal of human creativity, and it is heartening to see an organization focused on economies recognizing the contributions made by artistic creators and thinkers.’ She added, ‘Language, music and visual art are a part of the human heritage that is much older than economies as we know them today.”


MCLAREN, Leah. “Learning the Write Stuff: A Prestigious British Publisher Has Founded Its Own Writing School, and It’s Coming to Canada. Leah McLaren Previews Its Mixture of Harsh Truths, Helpful Advice and Lovely Food.” Globe and Mail 5 July 2010: Section: Globe Review: R1. Excerpt: “Faber Academy Sussex—one of many courses offered by the storied British publishing house. A three-day course with a hefty price tag (admission is $640, including lunch and snacks), the ‘Academy’ is intended to give aspiring writers a literary experience which, like a good book, both educates and delights. Part workshop, part retreat, part literary tourism, the Faber teaching model has proven so successful in Britain and Europe it is now expanding across the pond, starting with Canada. The Faber Academy Toronto is slated to open this fall with two longer courses. Writing A Novel - taught by Miriam Toews (A Complicated Kindness, The Flying Troutmans) and featuring guest appearances by Michael Redhill, Anne Michaels and Margaret Atwood—will start classes in late September....”

O’CONNELL, John. “I Am Evangelical About Books”; Interview ; Jamie Byng, the Maverick Publisher Who Signed Obama, Wants to Give Away A Million Free Books, Writes John O’Connell.” The Times (London) 4 December 2010: Section: Saturday Review Features: 9. Profile of Byng, owner of Canongate Books, sparked by his give-away project that was in its turn inspired by Atwood. Excerpt: “You could say it started in October 2005, at the Frankfurt Book Fair—the largest annual publishing jamboree in the world. The managing director of Canongate, Jamie Byng, was launching his Myths series of reinterpretations of ancient tales; Margaret Atwood was helping him. Atwood had written a version of the myth of Penelope and Odysseus, The Penelopiad, and she recommended a book to Byng. Actually, it was more forceful than that—she made him swear to read it. ‘I really did,’ she says. ‘There were witnesses.’ The book was The Gift, by the American literary scholar Lewis Hyde. Published in 1983, it argues with sinuous elegance that art is most effectively consumed within a ‘gift economy,’ where the point is the spiritual or moral value of the transaction and so, ultimately, the betterment of society. A novel, which Hyde calls a ‘transformative gift,’ is especially important. Byng liked the book so much, he bought the UK rights and reissued it in 2006 with glowing cover quotes from Atwood, Zadie Smith and David Foster Wallace. Fast-forward to May this year and a publishing conference in Bloomsbury, where 400 delegates were divided into groups and instructed to discuss World Book Day. Did the event, launched in 1995 by Unesco to promote reading, need a makeover? Byng thought so. ‘It was felt the children’s book side of it was too dominant,’ he says from behind his book-strewn desk in Canongate’s new London office in Notting Hill. ‘It’s a brilliant initiative whose centrepiece is the giving of 11 million £1 book tokens to kids. But it needed to be made more relevant to adult readers.’ So Byng suggested complementing World Book Day with World Book Night....”
They are who we are, while money is a neutral tool that enables us to do what we imagine.’

....The Crystal Award, first initiated in 1995, is intended to honour artists who have made a significant cultural contribution to improving life on Earth. It has previously been granted to actor and writer Emma Thompson, cellist Yo-Yo Ma and dancer Mallika Sarabhai, among others. The award, designed in the form of a Swiss mountain crystal, is presented in the presence of all participants and media attending the prestigious forum.”

POSNER, Michael. “Surviving the Nazis Helped Make Her Unstoppable; She Lost a Son in a Death Camp, Then Went on to Have Two Daughters and Build a New Life in Toronto.” Globe and Mail 5 March 2010: Section: Obituaries: S6.

On hearing about death of her old friend and real-estate agent, Atwood tweeted: “So sad: Brave & kind Fanny Silberman, model 4 ‘Lily’ in ‘The Entities’ story in my book Moral Disorder, has died in Toronto. A bright star.” The mother of Canadian Supreme Court Justice Rosalie Abella, Silberman died at her home after a long illness. She was 92. Later, the obit notes that: “In Atwood’s short story, The Entities, the Fanny character (Lillie) is described as the antithesis of the typical real estate agent. ‘There was nothing sharp-edged or chic or brisk about her.’ She drove her car, an old white Ford, peering over the top of the steering wheel, ‘like someone in a tank turret. ... She didn’t speak of the camp she’d been put into, nor of the lost baby. Why speak? What difference would it make? Who’d want to hear. Anyway, she’d been luckier than most. She’s been so lucky.’”


Author sneers at Atwood’s desire to protect birds from the installation of wind turbines near Point Pelee.


Atwood against the possible installation of energy-saving wind turbines off Point Pelee because of their possible effect on birds. Excerpt: “The [objection] that seems to have gotten the most traction is the effect on bird and bat migration—a major tourist attraction for Point Pelee, which sees more than 300 bird species pass through in the spring. (That’s also what’s attracted the attention of Ms. Atwood, a noted bird enthusiast with a home on Pelee Island, the popular destination about 18 kilometres from shore.) Given the tendency of turbines to make mincemeat of things airborne, it doesn’t require great imagination to figure out what would happen.”


Excerpt: ‘It was Margaret Atwood’s poem ‘Marrying the Hangman’ that inspired Stranger Theatre’s production of The Hanging of Françoise Laurent, featured at the SummerWorks Festival Aug. 5 to 15. Its writer/director Kate Cayley stumbled upon Atwood’s 1970s poem about the young servant girl sentenced to death in Montreal for stealing a pair of gloves. At the time, in 1751, a woman could escape execution if she could persuade the hangman to marry her. However, there is no hangman in her case. Instead, while in prison, Laurent hears the voice of a young soldier in the cell next to hers, whom she convinces to become a hangman and marry her. ‘In order to avoid her death, her particular death, with wrung neck and swollen tongue, she must marry the hangman. But there is no hangman, first she must create him, she must persuade this man at the end of the voice, this voice she has never seen and which has never seen her, this darkness, she must persuade him to renounce his face, exchange it for the impersonal mask of death, of official death which has eyes but no mouth, this mask of a dark leper.’ ‘So goes the poem. Yet the theatre company’s offering is a departure to that of Atwood’s. ‘Margaret Atwood was interested in her as a victim,’ said Cayley of Laurent. ‘We were interested in her as triumphant, a dangerous and fighting figure....’”


When Daisy Goodman, chair of the Orange Prize for Women’s Fiction, complained that she had to plough through so many sad books—“If I read another sensitive account of a woman coming to terms with bereavement I was going to slit my wrists,” she says, “there was very little wit and no
jokes”—Robson commented that the reason she was sad was that the books she was reading weren’t sad—just bad. Reacting to Goodman’s comment, “A lot started with a rape,” she moaned, “I prefer a little foreplay.” Robson offered up “a selection of bleak first sentences with no foreplay. They are all the start of masterpieces or near masterpieces, some contain no jokes at all.” One example: “Ten days after the war ended my sister Laura drove a car off a bridge.” The Blind Assassin by Margaret Atwood.

SELINGER-MORRIS, Samantha. “Surprises and Home Truths: Destination Canada.” Sydney Morning Herald (AU) 18 September 2010: Section: Traveller: 12. Notes that Balzac’s Coffee has teamed with the Booker Prize-winning Canadian author, Margaret Atwood, to create a “bird-friendly” organic coffee blend, with proceeds going to the Pelee Island Bird Observatory in southern Ontario.

SEMLEY, John. “Margaret Atwood’s Got Issues and Ron Mann’s Got ‘Em on Tape.” Torontoist 13 October 2010. Interview with Ron Mann, director of the film In the Wake of the Flood, a film which chronicles Atwood’s book tour to promote The Year of the Flood as well as birds. Available from Lexis-Nexis.

SERRA, Laura. “Read for the Cure Fundraiser; Bookworms Burrow into the Liberty Grand and Raise $40,000 for the Cancer Research Society.” Globe and Mail 4 December 2010: Section: Globe Toronto: M2. Excerpt: “On Nov. 30, book club members arrived in droves to hobnob with authors Margaret Atwood, Karen Connelly and Joy Fielding for the fourth annual Read for the Cure held at Liberty Grand. Sound like stuffy library talk? Ms. Atwood wouldn’t have it. Canada’s queen of fiction showed her true colours by telling tales of tweeting while she was researching The Year of the Flood in New York and then—get this—proceeded to sing a hymn from the novel.”

STEINBERG, Gerald. “Margaret Atwood Duped by NGO Propaganda.” Canadian Jewish News 40.43 (4 November 2010): 10. Excerpt: “Margaret Atwood is highly respected for her writing and her devotion to human rights. She’s not a hard-core Israel basher and is usually careful, both in her writing and her political stands, including opposition to the unmoral boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) campaign. But this wasn’t the case for a recent article attacking Israel for the ‘suffering of Palestinian children.’ Atwood’s authorship reflects the degree to which anti-Israel NGO propaganda has infected even the most well-meaning people. On Sept. 17, Atwood published an article in Haaretz headlined ‘Suffering of Palestinian Children Is Something Both Sides Can Agree On.’ In it, she blamed Israel for malnutrition of Palestinian children in Area C, the portion of the West Bank under Israeli control, which she said is ‘higher even than that in Gaza, and many kids are not only developmentally stunted, but are dying from related illnesses.’ It’s libels like this that feed the effort to demonize Israel. Atwood’s mistake was to believe the claims in a Save the Children-UK (STC-UK) publication (Life on the Edge), published in October 2009. In June 2010, STC-UK issued a press release linked to the report, headlined, ‘Children in West Bank Facing Worse Conditions than in Gaza.’ The text included the claim that ‘Areas of the West Bank under complete Israeli control have plummeted into a humanitarian crisis worse than Gaza.’ Such accusations—like others from political NGOs such as HRW and Amnesty international—are highly misleading, but Atwood fell victim to the ‘halo effect.’ STC-UK has a record of using humanitarian frameworks for anti-Israel propaganda, and this is another example. The press release is completely misleading, as the statistics didn’t concern the general condition of West Bank children, but focused on a very small group....”

TILLER, Joel. “Group Equates Edmonton Elephant’s Habitat with Solitary Confinement.” Globe and Mail 2 February 2010: Section: National News: A10. Atwood, along with TV game-show legend and animal rights activist Bob Barker, actor William Shatner, and a group of other Canadian authors that included Michael Ondaatje, appealed to Edmonton City Council to move Lucy the elephant from an enclosure the group claimed was too small, and that its concrete floors have caused infections that plague the pachyderm’s sensitive feet. Evidently as a result, Lucy suffered from a variety of medical conditions including arthritis, obesity and an undiagnosed respiratory problem.

September 2010: Section: Technology: 54.
Interview with social media expert Amber MacArthur about her first book Power Friendining: Demystifying Social Media to Grow Your Business. In it, she talks about Atwood who’s become an unlikely social-media success story. Excerpt: “CB: How has she managed to make this stuff work for her? AM: The funny thing about her, she really doesn’t understand how all the back-end technology works. She’s just very business savvy, and she understands that all of these tools are important to her career and to the future of selling books, or whatever else she might be doing out there. She understands the power of the medium, and she’s made an effort to get involved with her audience. She’s 70 now, and it’s amazing how much she’s doing, and how she’s connected with people. And she’s figured it out on her own. CB: She’s taken control of her personal brand. AM: Exactly. I always use her as an example. People think they’re too old to learn this stuff? I don’t think so.”

WAGNER, Erica. “Erica Wagner.” The Times (London) 21 August 2010: Section: Saturday Review: 9. How Atwood brought Robert Bringhurst to Britain: Excerpt: “Once upon a time—that’s the proper way to begin this tale—I was exchanging e-mails with Margaret Atwood. I can’t remember what we were discussing, now: what I do recall is that she signed off ‘Mouse Woman.’ Not having any idea why she might have done that, I mentioned it in passing to another friend of mine, the storyteller Ben Haggarty. Ask her if she’s reading Robert Bringhurst, he said. So I pinged an e-mail over to MA. ‘Would you be reading Robert Bringhurst, then?’ I asked, or words to that effect. (Nothing like pretending to greater knowledge than you possess, I always say.) I got an immediate reply. ‘How do you know about Robert Bringhurst?’ she asked. ‘Only Canadians know about Robert Bringhurst—and not many of them.’ The truth was that I didn’t know anything about Bringhurst, but thought that if two people I admired so much knew about him, then I’d better get on the case; and so I got hold of A Story as Sharp as a Knife, the first introductory volume to Bringhurst’s trilogy Masterworks of the Classical Haida Mythtellers. It’s not going too far to say that this is one of the few books that has truly, absolutely changed my life. When I’d read it, I e-mailed Atwood again, saying that if she ever wanted to write anything about Bringhurst I’d publish it, no questions asked. Her piece about Bringhurst’s translations of astonishing Native American epics by Skaa and Ghandl, oral poets of the Haida people who were speaking their work at the turn of the 20th century, was published under the heading: ‘Uncovered: An American Iliad’ in The Times in February 2004. ‘It’s one of those works that rearranges the inside of your head,’ Atwood said of his work. ‘A profound meditation on the nature of oral poetry and myth, and on the habits of thought and feeling that inform them.’”

New website, “I Write Like” ( http://iwl.me) allows visitors to paste a sample of their prose into a box on the screen. They click on a button and the system goes to work. After a few moments, it spits out a verdict, such as “I write like Ernest Hemingway”—or whichever of the 50 writers, including Atwood, whose work is in the database the algorithm considers to be the best match with your own. Just for fun, Walker typed in the prose of some well-known authors and discovered that “Herman Melville turns out to be a match for Stephen King. So does Margaret Atwood. President Obama’s June speech from the Oval Office matched up to David Foster Wallace. And the lyrics of Lady Gaga’s hit song, ‘Alejandro,’ match up with—brace yourself—Shakespeare.” Available from Lexis-Nexis.

Scholarly Resources


ALVAREZ, Alejandra Moreno. Lenguajes comestibles: anorexia, bulimia y su descodificación en la ficción


This article discusses Margaret Atwood’s ... [two novels] in the context of sustainability. The novels present the ecological crisis as arising from flaws in humanity's biological make-up; sustainability is thus a question of housebreaking the human animal, that is, of aligning human behaviour to the requirements of the planetary oikos. Through her protagonists, Atwood explores possible answers to this question which can be understood as anthropotechnologies in the sense outlined by Peter Sloterdijk in his controversial essay ‘Rules for the Human Zoo.’ Similar to the
latter, Atwood’s novels arrive at a qualified humanism informed by evolutionary biology and disenchanted with human nature.” (Author).


“Between 1989 and 2008, fifteen of Atwood’s novels, essays, and collections of short stories and poetry were published in Japanese translation; however, few of these works found a wide readership. Through interviews and data analyses, this research seeks to ascertain the publishing processes of these translations and understand the positions of the translators and editors bringing Atwood’s works to the Japanese public. As agents of production, Atwood’s translators and editors were involved in creating what Bourdieu calls ‘symbolic value’ in the Japanese field of literary production. In particular, the translators’ unique position in the field allows them to participate actively in creating symbolic value, notably through selecting works and writing afterwords.” (Author).


While Atwood does not refer much to hockey in her work, she has been seen by thousands on the ice. The book references her famous appearance on The Rick Mercer Report back on 31 January 2005 in which she shared hockey tips with viewers. See pp. 141-142.


“This thesis identifies and examines a conjunction between white postcolonial cultural and species concerns within recent novels from South Africa, Canada, New Zealand and Australia. The argument takes as a starting point a suggestion by Philip Armstrong that postcolonial and animal studies discourses might form an alliance based on a common antagonist: humanism. Here, this idea is applied in the context of literature by white postcolonial writers. I explore the extent and nature of the alliance and the degree to which it can be called successful within the selected novels. Each of the five chapters concerns a different text, and the thesis is also divided into two sections. The first addresses the contrasting approaches to humanism and to animals offered by J.M. Coetzee’s Disgrace (1999) and Yann Martel’s Life of Pi (2001). The second addresses the representation of these themes in Fiona Farrell’s Mr Albones’ Ferrets (2007), Julia Leigh’s The Hunter (1999), and Margaret Atwood’s Oryx and Crake (2003), set in the past, present and future respectively, to illustrate the temporal dimension of the white postcolonial-animal alliance in question. Overall, the thesis emphasizes the relevance of species concerns within white postcolonial culture, and posits the existence of a thread running through contemporary white postcolonial novels in which animals are a priority. All of the novels examined here, I argue, represent animals as more than victims in relation to humanist discourse: they emphasize animals’ potential to disrupt that discourse by affecting the attitudes of individual humans or by resisting humanist endeavours by their own actions. The result of this, I suggest, is that animals appear as allies in white postcolonial cultures’ attempts at self-definition against historical colonialism and contemporary globalisation, while white postcolonial literature portrays animals in ways that promote positive human perceptions of them.” (Author). Available from http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/6520/ (1 August 2011).


“Oryx and Crake is one of Atwood’s most apocalyptic novels, placing it in a long line of oracular literary texts in Western culture, reaching back to the book of Daniel in Hebrew scripture (165 BC) and the book of Revelation in the Christian New Testament (late first century AD). Jewish and Christian apocalyptic texts express the expectation of an imminent cosmic cataclysm in which God will destroy the ruling powers of evil and raise the righteous to life in a new messianic kingdom. Usually the work’s pseudonymous narrator offers a dire warning about the current situation and a prophetic revelation of an impending future. The language of apocalypse is
designed primarily to elicit fear and resentment concerning this cataclysmic prospect but at the same time to offer encouragement and comfort as the elect await the new world that will come into being. Atwood’s novel grows out of this tradition, but is ingeniously embodied in the more secularized genres of popular contemporary literature.” (Author).


“The aim of my essay, starting with the discovery of DNA and passing through the most advanced products of genetic engineering and the myth of Faust, consists in analyzing the effects of this unscrupulous use of zoe which turns out to suggest a dehumanized and too mechanized vision of the human body.” (Author).


In writing her lively introduction to the book which sets Atwood’s three novels within the context of her life and literary career, Bouson manages to incorporate some of the best-known lines and jokes from both Atwood and her critics.


Introduction to the book.


“Utopian literature has typically viewed the body as a pitfall on the path to social perfectibility, and utopian planners envision societies where the troublesome body is distanced as much as possible from utopia’s guiding force—Reason. However, after two world wars, the failure of communism, and a century of corrupt ‘utopian’ projects like Hitler’s social engineering, dystopian societies justified on the grounds of ‘rational planning’ fail to convince us, and the body has risen as the new locus for identity and agency, a point of stability in a dangerous and unstable environment. In this dissertation, I argue that utopian literature in the late twentieth century has identified the body as key to imagining new alternatives and re-connecting with an increasingly jeopardized sense of immediate, embodied experience. Protagonists in utopian literature looking to escape dehumanizing and bureaucratic worlds find their loophole in the sensual rush of adrenaline and instinct and the jarring rejuvenation of nerve and muscle, experiences which are much more immediately real and trustworthy than the tenuous dictates of institutions that tumble easily into absurdity and terror. Survival necessitates a raw and transformed identity that transgresses the tightly regimented boundaries of civilization and embraces the tumultuous chaos of the fringes and countercultures. Here, utopia thrives. I ground this study in theoretical and sociological texts which recognize the centrality of the body in society and the dynamic potentiality of utopian thinking, and then examine how these developments unfold in utopian literature since the midtwentieth century. The body as utopia surfaces in a variety of ways: as the longing for movement in Kurt Vonnegut’s Player Piano; as the creation of alternative spaces defined by embodiment in Angela Carter’s Heroes and Villains and Chuck Palahniuk’s Fight Club; as the exuberant immersion in the modified body in Chuck Palahniuk’s Rant; and as the search for perfection in a detached and corporate world in Margaret Atwood’s Oryx and Crake. I conclude with an assessment of utopia in the twenty-first century, referring to Cormac McCarthy’s The Road as a barometer of the grim state of utopian possibility as we head into the next century.” (Abstract). For more see DAI-A 71.08 (February 2011).


“This dissertation considers literary parody as reading in performance. If we accept that parody reads its source texts, we also acknowledge the potential for a performative reading of these sources. Literary parody is not only citation, but a process of recitation as well. If so, parodic fiction that recites poetry embodies the structure, style, and tone of its source texts. I will attempt to examine the poetics of this performance trope through a particular form of parody. By parodying the cadences and intonations of poetic language, the ‘poetic novel’ invites readers to enact the gestures of its textual performance. If literary parody reads its sources, I propose that any subsequent act of reading constitutes rereading. Rereading a poetic novel requires that we must interpret the discursive ambiguity, even ambivalence, of poetry. In effect, poetic novels operate through apostrophe both to source texts and to readers. Such a rhetorical address relies on our identification with the pathos provoked by the self-referential qualities of poetic language. Supposing that parody is an occasion for reading in performance, the poetry within specific prose...
narratives affords a performative opportunity. As its title suggests, this dissertation will relate the implications of parody to narratives by particular poet-novelists in Canada that cite and recite poetry. I will consider how parody manipulates literary conventions by looking at theories by Linda Hutcheon, Margaret Rose, and Robert Phiddian. I will perform a close reading of poetic novels by Leonard Cohen and Michael Ondaatje: Margaret Atwood, Jane Urquhart, and Anne Michaels; Robert Kroetsch; and finally, Malcolm Lowry. “He’ll strive to embrace the ironies of parody that alternately asserts or subverts literary conventions, while simultaneously encouraging disjunctive readings of several poetic novels.” (Author). For more see DAI-A 71.08 (February 2011).


“Since its development by Montaigne, the personal essay has been a site of self-creation through giving one’s perspective on the thoughts of others. In my paper, I will explore recent hybrid autobiographical volumes written by Spanish Rosa Montero (La Loca de la casa, 2003), Canadian Margaret Atwood (Negotiating with the Dead: a Writer on Writing, 2002), Mexican-American Richard Rodriguez (Brown: the Last Discovery of America, 2002) and European-born, Jewish-American George Steiner (Errata: an Examined Life, 1997). I will deliberately depart from some of the enclosed territories that some literary studies have created of late, by bringing together four writers who only share a historical time and a literary genre in one of their several books.” (Author).


See especially Chapter 7, “Before, During and After Postmodernism,” pp. 182-205 in which Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale is discussed, pp. 189-197.


“In this essay, Shari Evans covers themes of science fiction and the hope that the right ethical decisions in a society can reverse inequality, all of which are discussed in Margaret Atwood’s book, Oryx and Crake. The novel examines how different codes of ethics and forced gender roles or identities can fail in a society with numerous versions of reality or themed space.” (Journal).


“Margaret Atwood tells the story of five generations of Canadian women who find alternatives to the oppressive rules imposed by their husbands and fathers. Constrained by a patriarchal mentality, which reduces women to mere puppets, Atwood’s protagonists imitate patriarchal discourses and submit themselves to patriarchal laws to expose the contestable nature of these laws. Their parody of masculine models results as an effect of the strong relationships with the other women in their family. It is through these connections among women that female characters are successful at subverting patriarchal models.” (Author).


“While in Oryx and Crake, Margaret Atwood filters the demise of a high tech world through the eyes of Snowman/Jimmy, a romantic loser, in The Year of the Flood, she foregrounds two female perspectives, those of Toby and Ren who are associated with an environmentalist cult, God’s Gardeners. Like Snowman, Toby and Ren contemplate a scenario in which they are among the few humans left on earth; unlike him, they are not attacked by pigoons, but by the extremely dangerous Paintball men who plan to shoot them. A female perspective does not presuppose female power. In The Year of the Flood, women are neither leaders nor decision makers as the futuristic society envisioned by the author is controlled by big corporations and male scientists and policed by corporate security forces. Instead, Atwood’s female characters who are prostitutes, trapeze dancers, depressed or disinterested mothers, counter girls at SecretBurgers, or spa cosmeticians, perform menial jobs and occupy peripheral positions in society.” (Author).
Women learn social rules through observation and communication, and these rules are reinforced through vision. Visual reinforcement may take the forms of advertisements and beauty magazines, as well as observation and surveillance. Eventually, victims internalise the dominant ideology; they become self-policing, enforcing the rules within themselves and in other victims. Atwood’s novels show women as victims and their journeys towards becoming ‘creative non-victims.’ *Surfacing* and *Cat’s Eye*, two novels in which the protagonists are both artists, effectively demonstrate the relationship between language and vision and how they are used to reinforce patriarchal ideology. Initially, the Surfacer and Elaine Risley use language and vision to reinforce patriarchal ideology. Gradually, however, they use language and vision to move towards becoming ‘creative non-victims,’ reclaiming their voices and bodies as Hélène Cixous urges women to do. Although the novels’ endings are not definitive as to how successful these victims are in becoming non-victims, Atwood shows that it is possible for an individual to change the way she views the world. The acts of recognizing and voicing victimisation enable victims to work towards becoming non-victims.” (Author).


This reference book on the American short story includes this entry on a Canadian author, written by a professor from the National Taiwan University.


“My argument here is that McEwan and Atwood have followed a parallel path: from something a lot like ecofeminism, which identifies environmental crisis as a specifically modern and Western problem with ideological origins in patriarchy and consumerism, to a Darwinian viewpoint that identifies the interaction of these contingent and local factors with transhistorical human nature as key elements in the complex aetiology of global ecological concerns. In arguing thus, I am at odds with three constituencies (of increasing size): Atwood scholars, who have typically appropriated her work for their routine assertions of anti-essentialism, cultural constructionism, and creaking post-Freudian models of the mind; ecocritics who have typically allied themselves with ecophilosophers in identifying anthropocentrism as the core conceptual problem with
Western civilization in its relations with more-than-human nature; and literary critics and theorists quite generally, who typically valorize ‘difference’ and associate Darwinism with biological determinism and right wing ideologies.” (Author).


“This article will focus on Atwood’s depiction of sex trafficking, another urgent problem of contemporary society that persists in the future imagined in Atwood’s text. Through Oryx, a character that is trafficked and then exploited in various sex industries, Atwood intervenes in discursive and political debates concerning legislation against trafficking, and she exposes a tendency of some sex-trafficking abolitionist groups to appropriate the voice of trafficked persons in a manner disturbingly reminiscent of previous Western colonizing and evangelizing missions.” (Author).


“The odd conflation of terms in my analysis of Margaret Atwood’s notion of moral and environmental debt points towards the peculiarity of the voice that I discern in her recent work, a voice that resembles what might emerge from a document produced by a group of thinkers from the disciplines of biology, economics, religious studies, and literature. The addition of thought from the discipline of religious studies represents the greatest peculiarity, and the greatest contribution of her recent work. To have a concept of moral and environmental debt, humankind must have a sense of responsible behaviour, a sense that acknowledges and accepts our dependence upon one another—our vulnerability—and the interconnection of ourselves with nature. But where does such acknowledgement arise from?” (Author).


“The writer considers the potential as teaching tools of three postapocalyptic novels The Road by Cormac McCarthy, Oryx and Crake by Margaret Atwood, and Earth Abides by George Stewart. Using these novels about the future as a basis for discussion about the present can creatively engage first-year students in critical thinking about consumerism and global environmental sustainability.” (Journal).


“Margaret Atwood’s new poems, The Door (2007), encourage a re-examination of her work for earlier instances of the door trope. Her breakthrough novel The Handmaid’s Tale (1986) bears the most fruit in such a rereading. In the futuristic American theocracy ‘Gilead,’ Commander Fred and his wife Serena Joy attempt to force the handmaid Offred into becoming a surrogate mother. The door to Offred’s room does not shut tightly, much less lock, troping her body from which she cannot bar intruders. The door trope is most prominent, however, in the open double doors of the black van into which she finally steps, promising a rescue or her imprisonment and death. In ‘Historical Notes to The Handmaid’s Tale,’ less an appendix than a last chapter, the van doors open wide to mark the ‘open ending’ of Offred’s narrative. This open ending, represented by the
open doors of the black van, has actually been constructed by Atwood’s fictional editors, Professors Pieixoto and Wade, as an entry to their own concerns with history, at the expense of Offred’s suffering as an oppressed woman.” (Author). Available from http://www.openlatch.com/LATCH%20%28Vol%202%20CR%20%20art%20Trope%20of%20Doors,%20by%20Ingersoll,%20LATCH%20%28Vol%202%20%202009%20%29,%20pp.%2001-16%29.pdf (1 August 2011).


“In this paper, the association between style of dressing and the natural circumstances in The Blind Assassin is described. Many novelists consider clothes as constructive performance to narrate a particular incidence or circumstance. In Atwood’s The Blind Assassin, one can see the association between the variety of clothes and the circumstances of the character.” (Authors). Available at http://www.languageinindia.com/march2010/atwookisabella.pdf (1 August 2011).


"Margaret Atwood, a Canadian poet, novelist and critic, is noted for the feminism [sic?]and mythological themes. Her texts derive from the traditional realist novel, where the female protagonist is victimized by gender and politics. Atwood’s fiction is often symbolic and she has moved easily between satire, fantasy and suffering. In the year 2000, Atwood earned the Booker prize, Britain’s top literary award for fiction through The Blind Assassin. In her novels, Atwood creates women characters that are forced to reconstruct themselves in a more self reliant and courageous form as they seek to establish their relationship to the world and to the individuals around them. This research paper throws light on the History of War and its impact on [the] economy of Canada based on the novel The Blind Assassin. This study examines historical evidences by analyzing the records and survivals of the past in the novel. History and Fiction are discourse system[s] of signification by which one can capture the essence of the past.” (Authors). Available at http://www.languageinindia.com/oct2010/isabellaatwoodwar.pdf (1 August 2011).


“Perhaps hope is the key sentiment behind the cautionary tale, indicating the primary tension in apocalyptic narratives is between prevention and prediction: After all, why warn us about something that is inescapable? ... As an apocalyptic writer who retains a comic, or skeptical, distance from the nightmares she presents, Atwood’s jeremiads offer not so much predictions of inevitabilities, but warnings of possibilities ...; their ambiguous and open-ended narratives resist closure, leaving an escape route ‘into the darkness within; or else the light’ (The Handmaid’s Tale 295).” (Author).


“the two novels under discussion...figure women who embark on their individual quests for selfhood which are precipitated by different attitudes toward the human condition.” (Author).


“The LongPen™ is a remote-controlled pen and videoconferencing device conceived by
Canadian author Margaret Atwood in 2004 and initially intended to bring ‘live’ author signings to far away locations. The LongPen™ allows for individually inscribed long distance signatures and writing while maintaining an original record, written with pen and ink. LongPen™ specimens were compared with control specimens using different speeds, pen pressures, and types of pens. Preliminary indications are that LongPen™ inscriptions can be identified or associated with their author. Size and form are maintained and artifacts are subtle. Some limitations with respect to the capture of long tapered strokes, delicate connecting strokes, and differences in line width were noted. Factors which may impact forensic handwriting examinations include limited amounts of writing, light pen pressure, date of the writing, type of writing instrument, dimensions of the writing, and failure to consider that the device has been used.” (Author).


“Margaret Atwood’s latest novel, The Year the Flood, asks important questions about the consequences of various kinds of destructive behavior, among which the two most emphasized are violence committed against humans by other humans, especially sexual violence committed against women by men, and violence committed by humans against the environment. The narrative also presents an easily discernible parallel between the two kinds of violence. Despite being speculative fiction, or maybe because of that, the novel ends without providing answers to many of the questions it raises, including the question of whether the individual human characters—or the human species—will survive what can be rightly called an environmental apocalypse caused by human technology and greed. One important factor that may influence the fate of the individual characters—and of the humankind in general, or even of the ecosystem as a whole—can be the regenerative potential of forgiveness.” (Author).


“The paper deals with motifs of power, pain and manipulation in Margaret Atwood’s speculative fiction novels Oryx and Crake (2003) and The Year of the Flood (2009). The conflict of the real and the fictional, the real and the virtual, resulting in emotional death, is the main topic of the paper. This aspect is discussed from the perspective suggested in Jean Baudrillard’s Simulacra and Simulations (1994). In her two books, Atwood concentrates on the speculative and experimental aspects of the genre of speculative fiction (SF) to respond to contemporary situations of political, ecological and cultural crisis.” (Author). Available from http://www.phil.muni.cz/plonedata/wkaa/BSE/BSE%202010-36-1/BSE%202010-36-1%2020135-146%29%20Labudova.pdf (1 August 2011).


“Debates about book censorship and selection are far-reaching and ongoing, however little research has lingered in the spaces of irresolvable tension within these debates, and specifically the debates that focus on novels read in school. In an intertextual analysis of literary theory and editorial-blog responses to a recent debate about the suitability of Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale as a high school text, I work to broaden and trouble understandings of what it means to read this novel in school. The online forum for discussion is a unique space that offers new and different insights into an age-old conversation. Weaving online reader responses to The Handmaid’s Tale debate with a large body of research that struggles with our complicated relationship with reading, this thesis strives to add complexity and depth to an often-polarizing issue.” (Author). For more see MAI 49.02 (April 2011).


“This study examines the use of the fairy tale intertext in contemporary Canadian women’s fiction. In using specific fairy tale plots, themes, motifs, and/or characters within their works of fiction, women writers of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries purposefully express their goal for the revival and continuity of the female narrative voice and sense of agency. To explore the fairy tale-fiction relationship, Margaret Atwood’s Alias Grace and Anne Hébert’s Kamouraska are
approached from what fairy tale scholar Jack Zipes has constructed as the theory of contamination of the fairy tale genre. The fairy tale genre’s integration into contemporary fiction represents an important development where fairy tale narratives are critically reread so as to bring out deeper meanings for the contemporary audience.” (Author). For more see MAI 48.05 (October 2010). For a copy see http://repository.library.ualberta.ca/dspace/bitstream/10048/1089/1/Li+Sheung+Ying_Melissa_Spring+2010.pdf (August 2011).


“This thesis examines the creative appropriation of Shakespeare in theory and practice. It is based on close readings of King Lear alongside three appropriations of the play in works of fiction by three North American women writers: Jane Smiley, Anne Tyler, and Margaret Atwood. The aim is to demonstrate how a ‘palimpsestic’ reading, i.e. a reading in which the reader oscillates between ‘pre-text’ and ‘post-text,’ engenders ethical effects. While previous studies have mainly focused on acts of appropriation as personal or political, this study understands literary appropriation as an ethical process. Chapter one outlines a methodology which takes the reader into consideration as an active part in the dynamic process of appropriation. Instead of emphasizing the successor’s debt to his or her precursor—a debt that can be either denied or affirmed—the method proposed here foregrounds the successor’s commitment to his or her own recipient: the reader, rethinking the respective obligations and responsibilities conventionally attached to predecessors and successors. Above all, it moves away from the question that dominates appropriation studies to date: whether Shakespearean appropriations embody oppositional or celebratory dimensions. The four ensuing chapters examine what the post-texts do to affect or alter the reader’s reception of King Lear. Chapter two shows how Smiley’s A Thousand Acres (1991) attempts to halt judgmental reactions to Lear’s ‘bad’ daughters—Goneril /Ginny and Regan/Rose—by transferring a degree of guilt and responsibility back to Lear/Larry. Chapters three and four examine how censorious reactions to Cordelia are qualified by Tyler’s and Atwood’s respective appropriations of King Lear: Ladder of Years (1995) and Cat’s Eye (1988). These two chapters investigate what happens when a daughter is made to pay back a father’s ‘interest’ and when she finds herself unable to do so. Both show that the expectations of daughterly debt/returns have serious consequences for selfhood, marriage (Ladder of Years), and sisterhood (Cat’s Eye). Chapter five studies all three novels in the light of a motif they all share: the fall into nothingness. By ‘gender-switching,’ i.e. by moving the female characters into the position of Lear, the novels create something out of ‘nothing’ in King Lear: a redemptive pattern which helps to ensure that Shakespeare’s tragedy continues to offer something for everyone, not least for the female reader.” (Author).


“Margaret Atwood offers an immensely influential voice in contemporary literature. Her novels have been translated into over 22 languages and are widely studied, taught and enjoyed. Her style is defined by her comic wit and willingness to experiment. Her work has ranged across several genres, from poetry to literary and cultural criticism, novels, short stories and art. This Introduction summarizes Atwood’s canon, from her earliest poetry and her first novel, The Edible Woman, through The Handmaid’s Tale to The Year of the Flood. Covering the full range of her work, it guides students through multiple readings of her oeuvre. It features chapters on her life and career, her literary, Canadian and feminist contexts, and how her work has been received and debated over the course of her career. With a guide to further reading and a clear, well organised structure, this book presents an engaging overview for students and readers.” (Publisher).


“This project investigates how contemporary American dystopian novels craft an ethics of fear to theorize political resistance. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the subsequent decline of the Soviet Union, writers of speculative fiction have become less concerned with centralized, authoritarian governments. Instead, the under-theorized but increasingly popular dystopian genre
works through contemporary anxieties about corporate power, globalization, environmental destruction, and bio-technological change not only to warn of their dangers, but to provide readers with possible models of resistance. In contrast to the dominant view of dystopian writing as nascent or frustrated utopian hope, I derive a schema of the genre that demonstrates how dystopias promote critique and resistance to cultural trends through an appeal to fear that encourages action without being ideologically prescriptive. Building on this formal analysis, I argue that dystopia is in fact the pre-condition for utopian change as well as the counterweight that challenges utopia’s totalizing impulse by allowing for difference within political unity. Foregrounding dystopia’s concern with ideology critique, ethics, history, and narrative form, I read texts such as Octavia Butler’s Parable of the Sower and Parable of the Talents, Margaret Atwood’s Oryx and Crake, and Marge Piercy’s He, She, and It. My project analyzes the form and rhetoric of these texts to discover how they imagine building ethical communities using strategies such as post-positive realism, narrative identity, and transhistorical memory.” (Author). For more see DAI A 72.01 (July 2011).


“Although touted by promoters as the cutting edge of food science, meat produced in vitro (rather than from a whole animal) is emerging more directly from developments in fine art—more specifically, from the aesthetic experiments of Australian-based artists Oron Catts and Ionat Zurr, who ask: What language do we have to describe the agency of tissue-cultured life? This essay begins to answer this question by tracing a tradition whereby bioengineered meat mediates complex environmental critiques in literary fiction over the past century, including Margaret Atwood’s exemplary novel Oryx and Crake (2003), which depicts biotech industries producing three distinct kinds of ‘real artificial meat,’ all sourced in genetically modified animals.” (Author).


“The following consideration of methodologies in comparative Canadian literary criticism is influenced by Margaret Atwood’s Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature, and Clément Moisan’s Poésie des frontières: étude comparée des poésies canadienne et québécoise. An analysis of the advances and pitfalls in Atwood’s and Moisan’s works of thematic criticism sheds light on what stands to be gained from a broader ground for comparison, one that relinquishes the need to capture all Canadian literary expressions under the net of a single study organized around language and culture. Translation emerges as both a model for such change, and a tool that facilitates a more fluid treatment of differences within recent studies. Contemporary comparisons by E. D. Blodgett, Sylvia Söderlind, Peter Dickinson, and Lianne Moyes seek to forge ahead despite the difficulties inherent to the discipline. Their methodologies demonstrate a desire to find new ways of reading Canadian literatures together, while recognizing Canada’s ever-expanding linguistic and cultural literary diversity.” (Author). For more see MAI 48.04 (August 2010). Available at http://repository.library.ualberta.ca/dspace/bitstream/10048/922/1/McKay_Kristy_Spring+2010.pdf (1 August 2011).


“Margaret Atwood’s The Blind Assassin offers a central character who finds it necessary to utilize a number of different kinds of narratives to represent, understand, and, in some sense, justify her life. That Iris (Chase) Griffen must resort to dividing her story between diverse narratives engages the novel in an exploration of both the function and limits of particular types of narratives. Furthermore, an elusive editor orchestrates the various narratives—some of which are directly attributable to Iris and some are not—to reveal not only how narratives work but how they can be manipulated to subvert their limits.” (Author).


MITTAPALLI, Rajeshwar and A. Aravind REDDY. “Assertion of the Female Self through Motherhood in Margaret Atwood’s Surfacing.” Studies in Contemporary Canadian Literature. Ed. K.V. Dominic. New Delhi: Sarup Book Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2010. 44-55. “The unnamed protagonist...is convinced that ‘motherhood’ marks the fulfillment of a woman’s life since it alone can make her ‘whole.’”


OSBORNE, Carol. “Compassion, Imagination, and Reverence for All Living Things: Margaret Atwood’s Spiritual Vision in The Year of the Flood.” Margaret Atwood Studies 3.2 (August 2010): 30-42. “Atwood is using her novel, and the promotional events connected with it to ‘preach’ the key principles of the fictional God’s Gardeners: environmental stewardship, sustainable living practices, and reverence for the interconnectedness of all living things.” (Author).

(The Blind Assassin) manifest a classic fairy-tale motif and thus are culpable yet blameless enactors of their daughters’ suffering.”


“This thesis explores the representation of trauma in The Handmaid’s Tale by Margaret Atwood, Jasmine by Bharati Mukherjee and selected writings and performances of Karen Finley. While all three create fictionalized spaces for the exploration of the myriad ways trauma can affect an individual, they also act as vehicles for bearing witness to and working through trauma. The fracturing and near destruction of identity is central to this project as it is central to the works discussed within. Trauma cannot help but have a devastating impact on the identity of the traumatized individual and this impact is represented and acted out within the novels and performances discussed. Utilizing scholarship on trauma and literary and art criticism I show how methods often employed by trauma victims can be represented and maneuvered in fiction and performance including trauma induced damage to identity. In addition to arguing that identity is at stake for the trauma victim within these representations, this thesis also argues that trauma is not simple or singular. To participate in an exploration of the trauma within a work means to explore the many events surrounding the trauma and the multiple ways an individual or group has been traumatized.” (Author). For more see MAI 48.04 (August 2010).


“In this paper, I will explore the nature of female-female relationships in Cat’s Eye and the development of Elaine as an adult before turning to a discussion of Robber Bride. I will then demonstrate how the women of Robber Bride run parallel to Elaine to a certain point and then step beyond Elaine to complete her development in a much more positive way. In examining Zenia, I will hold her up to both Elaine and Cordelia to compare how they navigate the patriarchy. I will examine Zenia’s role as compared to the relational aggression of the girls in Cat’s Eye to establish further how Robber Bride flips what has been set up in Cat’s Eye in order to create a feminine-positive novel about surviving in a world dominated and defined by men.” (Author). Ms. Phillips wrote this essay during her senior seminar as an undergraduate at Randolph-Macon College.”


“Not ignoring the dead while writing about the living—indeed, looking into the past in order to understand the present—has been one of the most significant characteristics of Atwood’s novel writing career…. These imperatives would seem to be at the basis of the creative process for Atwood and for her heroines, and in this essay I shall focus on the ways Atwood has resurrected and refashioned Gothic conventions over the past twenty-five years in four novels: Lady Oracle (1976), The Robber Bride (1993), Alias Grace (1996), and the Blind Assassin (2000).” (Author).


“Canada was a British settler colony and hence the new citizens have experienced the necessity of searching for a new culture that identifies them as Canadians different from the colonizer. This search for their identity overlaps with a period of decolonization in which the white settler writers experience a kind of anxiety to get rid of the colonizer’s power over them. The most important period of Canadian literature coincides not only with this decolonization process but with the post-World War II period. By this time postmodernism was emerging as a world-wide movement and, of course, in Canada as well. Consequently it is possible to say that the two different literary theories overlap in Canadian literature making it a hard task to establish a clear-cut classification. However, it would be possible to claim that Margaret Atwood’s Canadian literature possesses

---

3 The data on the journal was incorrectly advanced by one year.
mainly post-modern characteristics, along with some postcolonial elements, which can be identified as some of the factors that caused a reaction in post-modern writers.” (Author).


---. “This essay focuses on metaphors of landscapes and landscapes as metaphors in Margaret Atwood’s The Tent. The Tent is characterized by utter disorientation, loss and absence in a world with no reference points: no landmarks, no signposts. Such interrogations into the certainties around which the characters build their lives continue in The Door (2007). Likewise in The Tent there seem to be no possibilities of self-representation or of autobiographical narration. The ephemeral narrating subjects (or at times the narrated objects, or even those left out of the stories,) often are actual misfits and ill—at—ease individuals. This text, a somehow bleak conglomeration of prose poems (some actual poems) and fictional essays, so fully permeated by paradox and irony, allows Atwood to dismantle, yet again, Descartian subjectivity and positivist epistemology. This paper looks into landscapes whether real or imagined ones as influence on or settings for identity formation; similarly it tries to look into territoriality and its dangers.” (Author).


RIDOUT, Alice. Contemporary Women Writers Look Back: From Irony to Nostalgia. London: Continuum, 2010. See especially Chapter 3: “Parodic Self-Narratives: Margaret Atwood’s Lady Oracle and The Blind Assassin,” pp. 69-102. “In her essay entitled ‘On Being a ‘Woman Writer’: Paradoxes and Dilemmas,’ Margaret Atwood describes how women of her generation ‘had to defy other women’s as well as men’s ideas of what was proper’ in order to write….In Lady Oracle and the Blind Assassin, Atwood tells the story of two such writers.” (Author).


Reply to Niederhoff, Burkhard. “The Return of the Dead in Margaret Atwood’s Surfacing and Alias Grace.” Connotations: A Journal for Critical Debate 17.1-3 (2006-2007): 60-91. Excerpt: “Burkhard Niederhoff’s analysis of Margaret Atwood’s Surfacing (1972) and Alias Grace (1996) speaks cogently of the Canadian author’s fondness for ghosts, her interest in the notion of survival, and her approaches to memory and the kinds of ‘truth’ that memory affords. In what follows here I consider these issues in relation to the technique of ‘uncertainty’ that features in Atwood’s work. Although I agree with much of what Niederhoff has to say about the two texts, I contest his acceptance of the ‘hypnosis scene’ in Alias Grace ‘at face value’ (76), and embellish my own 1998 argument for an ‘elusive narrative’ (14) in this novel and in Atwood’s work more generally. I question Niederhoff’s assertion that ‘not knowing the truth […] makes Grace free’ (87). Could it be, rather, a determination not to reveal the truth that secures her release from prison, or is there, ultimately, no way of making a definitive statement on the matter? Taking words that Atwood has used in her evaluation of Grace as storyteller—‘would we […] believe her?’ I rephrase the question to ask if we should believe Atwood, and conclude that we should not, nor would this ‘trickster creator’ expect us to.” Available from http://www.connotations.uni-tuebingen.de/rogerson01913.htm (1 August 2011).

“This unique exchange of letters between literary icon Sinclair Ross and several prominent writers, publishers, agents, and editors asks why many Canadian artists, especially those in western provinces, spent a lifetime struggling for recognition and remuneration. Featuring exchanges with Earle Birney, Margaret Laurence, [and Atwood, among others], this collection exposes the conditions of cultural work in Canada for much of the twentieth century. This vivid, often moving, selection of professional and personal letters, plus the only formal interview Ross ever gave, provides a valuable resource for those engaged with the history of publishing in Canada, as well as for those with an interest in Canadian literature.” (Publisher). In his first piece of correspondence with Atwood, dated January 1973, Ross thanked her for a complimentary copy of Survival, but confessed that before he had received it he had never heard of Margaret Atwood.


Excerpt: “Seeking a firm basis for optimism in *Oryx and Crake* (2003) is indeed a difficult and dubious task when we consider that the novel has prompted a veritable flood of reviews and articles brimming with apocalyptic dread. Moreover, Atwood’s own numerous writings, website suggestions, and interviews appear to suggest prescribed approaches to *Oryx and Crake.* It’s as if the Children of Margaret have already marked the critical territory, limiting *Oryx and Crake* to a dystopian tradition of dark satire to be read as counterpart to The Handmaid’s Tale. From an ecocritical perspective, however, one finds that despite the obvious apocalypse, Atwood’s novel offers new hope for humanity as well as other life forms.” (Author).


“This essay examines the novel’s depictions of the characters’ actions and how these depictions critique various forms of environmental activism—or the lack thereof. The world of *The Year of the Flood* is one of social stratification; the elite are walled off in compounds, ecoterrorists have splintered from the peaceful Gardeners, and genetic engineers are attempting to create a new breed of humanity. Examining how the individuals in these various groups mobilize for—or against—sustainability sheds light on how our own modes of environmental activism will affect our place in the changing landscape.” (Author).


“[A]uthors could be divided into two groups: those that mention food, indeed revel in it, and those that never give it a second thought.” ...So writes Margaret Atwood in the Introduction to *The Canlit Foodbook: From Pen to Palate—a Collection of Tasty Literary Fare* (1987). Obviously Atwood herself belongs to the former group. It is only natural, therefore, that the works of Atwood, whose main thematic concern is survival, are especially saturated with food. Surprisingly enough, her interest in food and eating had been awakened long before she started a writing career.” (Author). Available from: [http://wwwsoc.nii.ac.jp/jaas/periodicals/JJAS/PDF/2010/06_089_109.pdf](http://wwwsoc.nii.ac.jp/jaas/periodicals/JJAS/PDF/2010/06_089_109.pdf) (1 August 2011).


“Published in *The New Yorker* in 1990 and then included in Atwood’s 1991 collection *Wilderness Tips,* ‘Hairball’ is a remarkable short story that has received little critical attention to date. Part of the wave of late twentieth-century women’s writing that sought to reclaim the female body as literary subject matter, the story has a powerful dimension of self-reflexivity, functioning as an ironic, insightful comment on the changing tradition to which it belongs. ‘Hairball’ probes the still-powerful link between women’s unstable, ‘disgusting’ bodies and their violation of social norms—a link that, I argue below, has a specifically narrative history. Atwood is here reviving a longstanding narrative formula that joins the ‘grotesque’ female body to a story of women’s misconduct to produce a cautionary tale about the dangers of female transgression.” (Author).


While focusing on the depiction of nuns in an earlier time period, Sierra “conclude[s] my dissertation with a chapter that extends this research into the contemporary era with an analysis of Margaret Atwood’s *The Handmaid’s Tale.* The clear physical and psychic similarities between...
the entrapped women of Gilead and the enclosed nuns of Renaissance literature allow me to bridge my examination of concerns for women's agency in patriarchal societies governed with strong Judeo-Christian influences in the early modern era with those of our contemporary era. The militant theocracy and quasi-Medieval religious atmosphere of Gilead helps me round out my arguments from previous chapters and negotiate intersections between the interests of early modern authors and Atwood's post-modern sociopolitical literary activism.” (Author).


This essay reads Atwood’s Oryx and Crake through the lens of the International Relations theory known as neomedievalism. This lens illuminates the more subversive elements of the text as Atwood questions the viability of a post-national world and challenges the capacity of the modern novel to represent it. (Journal).


“The Robber Bride displays the generically hybrid and paradoxical identity that typifies contemporary parodic fiction.” (Author).


“At the heart of Oryx and Crake is a compelling and urgent question that guides Atwood’s speculative fiction: what does it mean to be human in an era of biotechnology and genetic engineering?” (Author).


See especially Chapter 3, “Noah and the Serio-Comical Flood,” pp. 38-63 which (of course) references The Year of the Flood, pp. 59-61. Swindell claims the book is the third of Atwood’s novels to rewrite a biblical story: “the earlier two are the Handmaid’s Tale and The Robber Bride, rewritings respectively of the story of the Virgin Mary and the story of Jezebel.”

TENBUS, Kristy. “Palimpsestuous Voices: Institutionalized Religion as the Subjugation of Women in Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale.” Margaret Atwood Studies 4.1 (October 2011 [i.e. 2010]): 3-13.

“In his frighteningly dystopic novel, 1984, George Orwell presents a world in which [a] history was a palimpsest, scraped clean and reinscribed exactly as often as was necessary.... Orwell employs the word ‘palimpsest’ to reference the ancient practice of reusing vellum or parchment, of scraping off existing writing in order to write something new. The driving force behind this archaic practice was the relative expense of the writing materials; by comparison, the original texts were deemed of little consequence due to changing historical and cultural factors which rendered [them] obsolete either because the language in which they were written could no longer be read, or because their content was no longer valued.... As a result of this repeated practice, however, a paleographic phenomenon occurs—one that is, in its literal sense, generally of interest only to those who study ancient manuscripts. The layers of scraped off writings were ‘often imperfectly erased,’ so that texts mysteriously and stubbornly resurface centuries later, producing ghostly images of an eradicated past.... It is just such a palimpsestuous structure that Margaret Atwood creates in The Handmaid’s Tale in order to show the indelibility of the past and the inevitability of its effects on both the present and the future.... In this essay I will focus on the palimpsestuous voices that construct institutionalized religion as a means for controlling women; I
will also demonstrate how women perpetuate their own subjugation by internalizing and strengthening those voices.” (Author).


“An intertextual, cross-cultural study of the Canadian woman’s experience from the Second War and Post-War era through examination of the existential crisis of the feminine situation as addressed by the fiction of Mme. Gabrielle Roy (Bonheur d’occasion, 1945, and Rue Deschambault, 1955), and Ms. Margaret Atwood (Cat’s Eye, 1985), considered in relation to Le deuxième sexe (1949), by Mme. Simone de Beauvoir.” Full-text available from http://soar.wichita.edu/dspace/handle/10057/2495 (1 August 2011).


“With its elevated situation at the pinnacle of the twentieth century, The Blind Assassin provides a useful platform from which to look back over Atwood’s work, and in particular, to examine her sometimes fractious relationship with feminism.” (Author).


TSAI, Yun-Chu. “Traumatic Memory, Gender Melancholia, and Prospective Multiplicity Negotiating With the Dead in Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale.” MA thesis. Stony Brook University, 2009. 40 pp. “Writing, for Margaret Atwood, is a way to bring back the dead from the past into the realm of the living. This thesis is going to discuss how a person is traumatized in patriarchal heterosexuality, becomes a melancholic subject, and creates productive power through traumatic experience. In Chapter One, we are going to see how Offred the narrator in The Handmaid’s Tale loses her family, friends, and freedom. The traumatic memory creates a melancholic subject who is not able to memorialize, to love, and to mourn. Moreover, Chapter Two shows that male inability to love in the story comes from the double disavowal of never having loved and never having lost the homosexual object. The Commander in Gilead represents the melancholic masculine subject who does not recognize his homosexual attachment and does not know how to love and mourn properly. Furthermore, melancholic femininity in Chapter Three demonstrates not only homosexual attachment in the form of female self-repudiation, but also resistance against patriarchal and heterosexual oppression through laughter and narration. The doubleness of the female characters as well as the ambiguity created by story-telling produces multiplicity of fates and the possibility of [a] prospective future. In conclusion, the process of remembering the traumatic memory makes the narrator less of a melancholic subject and endows her with the power to mourn and to love. It also enables the reader a creative power to imagine any possible future.” (Author). Full text available from http://dspace.sunyconnect.suny.edu/handle/1951/51128 (1 August 2011).


“In The Handmaid’s Tale, Bodily Harm, and Alias Grace, Atwood demonstrates that the connection between language, translation, and the female body is evident in the ways in which language is used to control the female body. Atwood posits that language systems assume the female body is fixed; however, language is inherently unstable. Consequently, if the female body is inscribed by language, the female body is not fixed just as a text is not fixed. Atwood writes the female body as a translation of masculinist texts in order to resist the tradition of constructing the
female body reductively through masculinist language. Through the attempts of her female characters to represent themselves (rather than being represented) in her work, Atwood illustrates that authentic linguistic representation of the female body is impossible because language is a patriarchal construction which defines limitations on female voice and articulates the female body in masculinist terms.” (Author). Available from: http://Dalspace.library.dal.ca/bitstream/10222/13025/1/Vaughan, Crystal, MA,ENGL, Sept 2010.pdf (1 August 2011).

“Closely examining the powerful, formative influence of parental abuse and neglect as well as the World War II conflict that shapes this behavior, Atwood’s novel shows how the childhood traumas of the three characters (Tony, Charis, and Roz) establish patterns of thought and action that make them vulnerable to further abuse and cause them to forge troubled connections with others. But as Tony, Charis, and Roz, in their encounters with Zenia, re-experience their past traumas, they are ultimately able to confront their pain and work though the urge for vengeance and destructive power.” (Author).

Atwood children’s book flagged as a “must read” for the $+ set.


Essay breaks new ground by interpreting Atwood through lens of magic realism, which hitherto “has been largely ignored in [her] works.”

141 pp. “Margaret Atwood’s popular dystopian novel The Handmaid’s Tale engages the reader with a broad range of issues relating to power, gender and religious politics. This guide provides an overview of the key critical debates and interpretations of the novel and encourages you to engage with key questions and readings in your reading of the text. It includes discussion of key themes and concepts including: Representation of women’s roles, gender, sexuality and power, Language, style and form, Dystopias and genre fictions, Power, control and religious fundamentalism. Combining helpful guidance on reading Atwood’s text with overviews of significant stylistic and thematic issues and an introduction to criticism, this is an ideal companion to reading and studying The Handmaid’s Tale.” (Publisher).

“To support my contention of an interdependent development between speculative fiction and science, I will look at two examples from different centuries and cultures, from different branches of science, written by authors of different genders.” (Author).


“Early in his paper on the return of the dead in two novels by Margaret Atwood, Burkhard Niederhoff wisely steers clear of the old Canadian national thematic chestnut, survival. Whether survival really constitutes the central theme of Canadian literature,’ he writes, ‘is a question that need not detain us here.’ (60). What he redirects our attention to, instead, is the way in which one type of survival—or, more specifically, persistence—recurs in Atwood’s fictional, poetic, and non-fictional oeuvre: the return of the dead from the underworld. The two novels that Niederhoff carefully examines, Surfacing and Alias Grace, date from 1972 and 1996 respectively, but the fascination with voyages from Hades persists in Atwood’s thought, as witnessed in her 2000 Empson Lectures at Cambridge, published in 2002 as Negotiating with the Dead: A Writer on Writing. The title neatly encapsulates Atwood’s thesis: that writing is a species of unworldly congress with the departed; a means of making the irretrievable potentially retrievable through the invigoration of texts by readers. Niederhoff goes further, though, than a simple tracing of this motif through two works by Atwood: in my response to his further analysis, I will, first of all, think about the application of his interpretation to other works, ponder his major insights, and suggest an additional critical framework, that of the postcolonial gothic, through which we might understand the implications of these ghostly encounters.” (Author). Available from http://www.connotations.uni-tuebingen.de/york01913.htm (1 August 2011).


How Atwood mounts a critique of the epic from a perspective that foregrounds issues of class as well as of gender.

Reviews of Atwood’s Books

Booklist 106.18 (15 May 2010): 45. By Isabel SCHON. “The story of two smiling boys who enjoy sitting arriba en el árbol (up in a tree) without a care in the world before they realize that they can’t get down is engagingly depicted in [translator Miguel] Azaola’s sprightly Spanish rendition. Folding contemporary Spanish expressions into the easy, rhyming texts (‘Cuando llueve es fatal . . . tenemos paraguas . . . ‘menos mal!’), Azaola adds an up-to-date tone to this edition of Atwood’s original version, published in Canada in 1976. A playful read for beginning Spanish readers or a vocabulary builder for Spanish learners.”

Stuttgarter Zeitung 2 January 2010: Section: LITERATUR: 33. By Rainer MORITZ. (474 w.)
The Observer 26 September 2010: Section: Observer Review Books Pages: 49. By Charlotte NEWMAN. (314 w.)


Globe and Mail 9 October 2010: Section: Weekend Review: R11. By Marsha LEDERMAN. “Facing yet another book tour, Margaret Atwood decides to do things differently this time. To promote her most recent novel, The Year of the Flood, she embarks on an eco-friendly audience-participant extravaganza by boat and train. In churches across Britain and North America, audiences—along with Atwood—are ‘treated’ to a theatrical rendering of the book. To be frank, some of these performances seem simply awful, but in the film they’re generally kept to a mercifully short length. The documentary itself does offer more insight into Atwood, who seems to be getting livelier as she ages, than the premise might suggest: She travels with a stash of bird-friendly coffee, she wheels her own luggage around, and she gardens like a pro. These scenes really are a treat, no

British Journal of Canadian Studies 23.2 (2010): 314. By Judy HAIVEN. (535 w.) “This reader wants to experience an author whose message ‘afflicts the comfortable and comforts the afflicted.’ Atwood only tells stories; she does not criticize politicians, economists or bankers.”

Sewanee Review 118.3 (2010): xciii-xcv. By Nikolai SLIVKA. “Margaret Atwood here and throughout the second half of her book forces literary texts to conform to her rigid preconceptions. Despite such lapses Payback remains a perceptive account of debt’s cultural heritage and its turbulent psychological undercurrents.”


Alternatives Journal (Waterloo, ON) 36.3. (2010): 8. By Stephen BOCKING. (1336 w.) Joint review with Douglas Coupland’s Generation A. “In both novels environmental collapse is mainly a device that sets the story in motion. In The Year of the Flood, there is no explanation of how corporations took over, or what caused the Waterless Flood (except a suggestion of corporate fiddling with viruses). Perhaps this lack of accounting for the past is necessary—what matters more is how characters respond. But this inattention to detail has consequences. Bypassing the decline eliminates the possibility of intervention. Instead, these grim scenarios are made to seem inevitable—the unstoppable unfolding of humanity’s tragic shortsightedness. Presenting doom as our necessary fate can be deeply disempowering.”

The Guardian 10 July 2010: Section: Guardian Review Pages: 16. By Isobel MONTGOMERY. (183 w.)

Manly Daily (AU) 29 January 2010: Section: Features: 20. By Natasha WYNDHAM. (130 w.) “Atwood’s writing is as brilliant as ever, poetic and yet earthy and dryly funny, she skillfully combines tragedy and comedy, often in the same sentence.”

Hudson Review 62.4 (Winter 2010): 663-672. By Susan BALÉE. Tucked in a longer set of reviews titled “Woman Writers of a Certain Age” are some comments about TYOTF. “Atwood has lots of fun making up hymns for the Gardeners to sing and playing, Clockwork Orange style, with idioms. The poor people outside the pharmaceutical company’s gated communities live in the Pleeblands; Gardeners who get depressed are ‘fallow’; SecretBurgers have protein from sources no one wants to think about. It’s an enjoyable read, but one is not sorry when it’s over. Atwood’s invented world isn’t the real world, and eventually one grows tired of both the lingo and the landscape.”

Organization & Environment 23.2 (June 2010): 248-250. By Gregory R. BERRY. “Atwood’s book remains an affirmation about what is good about human beings—our affections, loyalties, patience, and even courage although all hampered by our crazy cleverness and laziness. Atwood revels in questions about the meaning of humanity and of our responsibility to other creatures and the global commons. The journey of Toby and Ren is a journey made by two credible human beings, at long odds, yet remains a journey of hope for the human race. The novel is ultimately a story of the human race’s qualities of resilience and redemption as we battle to survive. Perhaps, given a second chance, paradise will be regained.”


Quadrant 54.4 (April 2010): 9-13. By Michael GIFFIN. “As a work of speculative fiction; as a logical extension of our present world; as an exploration of what might happen once humans finally usurp the gods; as a perfect balance of the imminent and the immanent, The Year of the Flood is destined to become a classic. It’s worth remembering Atwood has been writing since the mid-1950s and the latter half of her career has been dedicated to pushing the boundaries of her personal achievements; to turning out a body of fiction in which each new novel, as idea and as art, is unlike any of its predecessors. As she’s never been one to rest on her laurels, or write to a formula, each new novel is a virtuoso
performance. Are there many literary authors who have achieved this? Where will Atwood take us next? And, if her fiction really is about ‘the power of language to transform our perception of how the world works,’ can it influence us, and help us make the world a better place?” Available from http://www.spanielbooks.com/atwood_and_the_end.pdf (1 August 2011).

The Times 31 July 2010: Section: Saturday Review Pages: 10. By Christina KONING. (229 w.) “[The novel] is entertainingly done, with the details of Atwood’s imagined future world—prisons run as reality game-shows; restaurants selling burgers made from suspiciously unidentifiable meat—providing some agreeable shivers. But in the end, the absence of any real structure, or of characters who are more than just ciphers, makes this a curiously unengaging read. One would have hoped to have been made to care more about the end of the world.”

Women’s Review of Books 27.2 (March 2010): 19. By Katherine V. SNYDER. (1969 w.) “The novel’s plot relies a bit heavily on coincidence, though the pleasures of the intersections among the main characters—both within this novel, and between this novel and Oryx and Crake, whose male protagonist is a bit player here as Ren’s (largely offscreen) love interest—are undeniable. It would be peevish to cavil at the unlikeliness of these particular characters surviving and then reuniting, given the even greater implausibility of anyone at all making it through the supervirulent cataclysm. The science-fiction genre of ‘cozy catastrophe,’ to which The Year of the Flood belongs, requires this kind of romantic implausibility, this postapocalyptic ‘meeting cute,’ and it would be missing the point to wish it away. Wish fulfillment is precisely the point here—both the antiapocalyptic wish to save the world from total destruction and the apocalyptic wish to wipe the slate clean and get things right the second time around. The ending of The Year of the Flood is left less explicitly open than that of Oryx and Crake, yet plenty of questions remain to be answered: is there a future between Toby and Zeb, the one-time lover of Ren’s mother and the long-held object of Toby’s apparently unrequited affection? Will Ren find a future with her love interest, or will she be able to move on? And with whom and toward what? And what about the Crakers, the bioengineered transhumans whose first contact with the blighted environment they have been fashioned to inhabit is left largely untreated here? Atwood is reported to have another installment in the works—Vintage, the imprint of Random House in Canada, in its catalogue refers to ‘the MaddAddam trilogy’—which means that we might just find out.”


Reviews of Books on Atwood

APPLETON, Sarah, ed. Once Upon a Time: Myth, Fairy Tales, and Legends in Margaret Atwood’s Writing. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2008. Marvels & Tales 24.1 (2010): 174+. By Casie HERMANSSON. “But for Shuli Barzilai’s lively account of tracking a new intertext (the Tasmanian tiger and written reports thereof) in Atwood’s writing, Sarah Appleton’s collection might be better subtitled ‘Or, Essays in Honor of Sharon Rose Wilson.’ With the exception of Atwood’s early novel Life before Man (1979), the essays here largely focus on writings published since Wilson’s book and, as such, supplement it. Wilson’s (then-) definitive text, Margaret Atwood’s Fairy Tale Sexual Politics (1993), is therefore a common intertext for these essays, although it is cited in only four of the nine chapters. Wilson herself updates her book and other writings with her essay on The Blind Assassin (2000), ‘Fairy Tales, Myths, and Magic Photographs in The Blind Assassin,’ first published in 2002. In this sense the book is a useful supplement and tribute (to Atwood, to Wilson) but does not redefine the terms of either one of these writers.”
University of Toronto Quarterly 79.1 (Winter 2010): 502. By Lorraine YORK. “The essays in this volume analyze, one by one, Margaret Atwood’s ten novels to date. Ten essays, nine of which have appeared in essay collections or journals between 1987 and 2002, plus one new essay on The Blind Assassin and a new interview with Atwood herself make for a retrospective volume on the novel form. . . . The editor [Branko Gorjup]’s rationale for bringing these essays together is partly one of convenience . . . and one of context: he argues that this sequence of ten essays, each one devoted to a specific Atwood novel, arranged chronologically according to the novels’ date of publication, allows the reader to ‘follow the various stages in the “novelistic” evolution of Atwood’s craft.’ But does it? The novel-by-novel approach does yield some occasional comparisons, sometimes explicit, sometimes implicit, but the effect is more atomistic than contextual.”

McWILLIAMS, Ellen. Margaret Atwood and the Female Bildungsroman. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009. Contemporary Women's Writing 4.2 (2010): 153 -154. By Coral Ann HOWELLS. “This book approaches Margaret Atwood’s fiction from a refreshingly new perspective, for although critics have frequently remarked on her revisions of traditional literary genres, nobody before has traced Atwood’s continuous negotiations with any one specific genre throughout her writing career. McWilliams’s focus on the Bildungsroman is particularly apt given Atwood’s nationalist and feminist commitments and her powerful influence on other contemporary Canadian women writers. As argued here, Atwood has rehabilitated a traditionally masculine genre into a distinctively feminine form, opening up new possibilities for women’s life writing.”

European Journal of American Culture 29.2 (2010): 175-155. By Lorraine YORK. “In summation, this is a study that combines areas of rich promise with continuing attachments to methodologies that require updating or re-examination as sites of privilege—like the Bildungsroman itself.

Journal of American Studies 44.4 (1 November 2010): e73. By Zalfa FEGHALI. “I find it surprising that she makes no mention of Atwood’s poetry. Nor does she open up the possibility for reading Atwood’s poetic works through the lens of her more inclusive Bildungsroman framework. I would have liked to see a little more engagement with Atwood as a poet and cultural representative, if even in the form of a caveat explaining why it remains untouched over the course of her study.... Any reservations aside, I found this study to be both well-crafted and thorough. In a veritable sea of scholarship on Atwood, McWilliams’s study is original in its approach and thought-provoking in its application.”

Review of English Studies 61.250 (2010): 490-492. By Fiona TOLAN. “As a writer for whom Power Politics (the title of her 1971 poetry collection) have always been a defining concern, Atwood’s notably feminist engaged works of the 1970s and 1980s have in recent years been largely superseded by growing preoccupations with speculative fiction, environmentalism, globalisation and economics (for the latter, see Payback: Debt and the Shadow Side of Wealth, 2008). These themes perpetuate a longstanding engagement with inequality, injustice and personal and social responsibility that clearly chime with feminist debate, but they also arguably mark today’s internationally renowned Atwood as a quite different figure from the Atwood of the late 1960s and 1970s, when formative works such as The Edible Woman (1969), Surfacing (1972) and Lady Oracle (1976) were distinguishing her as a powerful new voice in Canadian literature. As Atwood criticism has correspondingly moved away from an earlier preponderance of feminist and female gothic readings, critical studies (such as Continuum’s forthcoming Margaret Atwood: The Robber Bride, The Blind Assassin, Oryx and Crake, edited by J. Brooks Bouson) are increasingly weighted towards the recent works. Consequently, there is something refreshing about Ellen McWilliams’s 2009 monograph, Margaret Atwood and the Female Bildungsroman, which brings its reader so determinedly back to the beginning.”

Nischik (Univ. of Constance, Germany) develops a theoretical lens through which to understand Atwood’s ongoing examination of gender in light of her experimentation with literary and nonliterary forms. Nischik argues that ‘Atwood’s focus on gender issues tends to result in revising the traditional design and demarcation of lines of (sub)genres, concerning both content/theme ... and form.’ The author approaches her subject by genre, and concludes with an interview she conducted with Atwood in 2006. Offering interpretations of some of Atwood’s best-known and less-familiar works (in the latter case, her early cartoons among other things), Nischik has written chapters that are individually strong but which together provide a way to read Atwood’s oeuvre as a ‘significant cultural document of our times.’ Summing Up: Highly recommended.

The Goose 8 (Fall 2010): 49-51. By Jill E. ANDERSON. “Nischik’s work ... has two primary goals: first, to examine the concept of ‘engendering genre,’ which Nischik explains is the way genre and gender intersect, and to ‘simply refer to a foregrounding of gender in a specific generic format’; and second, to recover some of Atwood’s overlooked work not just for the sake of future Atwood criticism at large but also for the sake of contributing to and expanding gender studies in Atwood’s work.... Overall, Nischik is making important and useful connections between gender and genre in Atwood’s work, laying the ground for future critics interested in these subjects. Nischik covers a lot of terrain here; each chapter could easily turn into a separate book in and of itself, with all her nuances and complexities included. And while I think she sometimes has to sacrifice some detail for scope of her work, Nischik’s strength is in the minutiae and in her close reading. This is what Atwood scholarship needs now, and Nischik provides a strong framework for anyone interested in Atwood scholarship, whether one is just starting out or an experienced scholar.”


Canadian Literature 206 (Autumn 2010):191-193. By Coral Ann HOWELLS. “This study of the relationship between Margaret Atwood’s fiction and feminism over the past forty years is structured as a double narrative, being both a historical survey of shifts and trends in Western feminist discourse as it has developed and also a critical assessment of Atwood’s engagements with that discourse in her novels from The Edible Woman to Oryx and Crake. Here Tolan faces a challenge since Atwood has consistently refused to be defined or over-determined by the feminist label, and feminist politics is only one component in her fiction, along with human rights and environmentalism. Tolan’s solution is to identify the connections between feminism and these other topics while centering her analysis on the cluster ‘gender, femininity and sexuality’ as the dominant factor in Atwood’s work. She argues from the historicist position that while Atwood’s novelistic production is embedded in her contemporary context, she also challenges social myths and assumptions in a process of continual critical engagement with her culture. The result, as Tolan phrases it, is that ‘the feminism to be read in Atwood’s novels is not the feminism to be discovered in feminist textbooks.’”